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## Engineering and Traffic Survey



SPEED LIMIT 45

Willdan Engineering
13191 Crossroads Pkwy N Suite 405
City of Industry, CA 91746
562.908.6200

November 16, 2021
Mr. Nick Minicilli, PE, TE
Senior Civil Engineer
City of Temecula
41000 Main Street
Temecula, CA 92590
Subject: 2021 Engineering and Traffic Survey
Dear Mr. Minicilli:
As requested, Willdan has completed an Engineering and Traffic (E\&T) Survey to justify and update the posted speed limits along 39 street segments in the City of Temecula. These segments were last surveyed in 2014 and require an update to comply with the 7 year limitation set forth in the California Vehicle Code (CVC).

We are pleased to submit the enclosed Report that describes the E\&T survey procedures and contains recommendations for posted speed limits on the City's arterial and collector street system. A summary of these recommendations is included in the Analysis. Supporting documentation for each speed zone recommendation is provided in the Appendices.

The Report was conducted in accordance with applicable provisions of the CVC, following procedures outlined in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (California MUTCD) dated November 2014, and as required by Section 627 of the CVC. The Report is intended to satisfy the requirements of Section 40802 of the CVC to enable the continued use of radar for traffic speed enforcement.

We appreciate the opportunity to serve the City of Temecula and the assistance and cooperation afforded to us during the course of this study.

Very truly yours,

WILLDAN


Nicolle Spann, P.E., T.E.
Traffic Engineer
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This Engineering and Traffic (E\&T) Survey is intended to be the basis for the establishment, revision, and enforcement of speed limits for selected streets within the City of Temecula. This E\&T Survey presents recommended speed limits for 39 street segments in the City of Temecula. E\&T Surveys are required by the State of California to establish intermediate speed limits on local streets and to enforce those limits using radar or other speed measuring devices. These surveys must be updated every 5 or 7 years to ensure the speeds reflect current conditions as dictated by the California Vehicle Code (CVC). The CVC also requires that the surveys be conducted based on the methodology required by The California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (California MUTCD) dated November 2014.

The survey was requested by the City for the proper posting of speed limits and to enable the Police Department to utilize radar or other electronic speed measuring devices for speed enforcement. CVC Sections 40801 and 40802 require E\&T Surveys that verify the prima facie speed limit before enforcement by such a device is legal. The law further specifies that these surveys be conducted every 5 years. The surveys can be extended to 7 years provided the City's police officer(s) have completed a 24 -hour radar operator course [CVC 40802(c)(2)(B)(i)(I)]. Additionally, some surveys may be extended to 10 years if a traffic engineer certifies that no changes in roadway or traffic conditions have occurred [CVC 40802 (c)(2)(B)(i)(II)]. These provisions assure that posted speed limits are kept reasonably current.

The E\&T Surveys for the City were conducted in accordance with procedures outlined in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (California MUTCD) dated November 2014 and as required by Section 627 of the CVC. The Code further describes three elements of an E\&T Survey:

1. Measurement of prevailing speed;
2. Accident history; and
3. Roadway characteristics not readily apparent to the motorist.

Posted speed limits are established primarily to protect the general public from the reckless and unpredictable behavior of dangerous drivers. They provide law enforcement with a clearly understood method to identify and apprehend violators of the basic speed law (CVC Section 22350). This law states that "No person shall drive a vehicle on a highway at a speed greater than is reasonable or prudent having due regard for weather, visibility, the traffic on, and the surface and width of the highway, and in no event at a speed which endangers the safety of persons or property." The posted speed limit gives motorists a clear warning of the maximum speed that is reasonable and prudent under typical driving conditions.

The basic fundamentals for establishing speed limits recognize that the majority of drivers behave in a safe and reasonable manner, and therefore, the normally careful and competent actions of a reasonable driver should be considered legal. Speed limits established on these fundamentals conform to the consensus that those who drive the highway determine what speed is reasonable and safe, not on the judgment of one or a few individuals. A radar speed study is usually used to record the prevailing speed of reasonable drivers.

Speed limits are also established to advise drivers of conditions which may not be readily apparent to a reasonable driver. For this reason, accident history, roadway conditions, traffic characteristics, and land use must also be analyzed before determining speed limits. Speed limit changes are usually made in coordination with physical changes in roadway conditions or roadside developments. Unusually short zones of less than one-half mile in length should be avoided to reduce driver confusion.

Additionally, it is generally accepted that speed limits cannot be successfully enforced without voluntary compliance by a majority of drivers. Consequently, only the driver whose behavior is clearly out of line with the normal flow of traffic is usually targeted for enforcement.

## ELEMENTS OF THE ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY

The California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (California MUTCD) dated November 2014 specifies the methodology to be used for completing E\&T Surveys. This methodology includes an evaluation of current vehicle speeds, accident history and conditions not readily apparent to motorists. The basic elements of the E\&T Survey are discussed in more detail as follows:

## Speed Sampling

Existing vehicle speeds are surveyed by a certified radar operator with a calibrated radar unit in an unmarked vehicle. Speed samples are taken for each segment representing a statistically significant sample of current traffic. This data is then evaluated to identify the distribution of speeds. A key element in the evaluation is the identification of the 85th percentile speed. The $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed is the speed at or below which 85 percent of the traffic travels. This threshold represents what is historically found to be a safe and reasonable speed for most drivers based on common roadway conditions. Therefore, a speed limit is established at the nearest 5-mile per hour (mph) increment to the 85th percentile speed, except as shown in the two options below.

## Options:

1. The posted speed may be reduced by 5 mph from the nearest 5 mph increment of the $85^{\text {th }}$-percentile speed, in compliance with CVC Section 627 and 22358.5.
2. For cases in which the nearest 5 mph increment of the $85^{\text {th }}$-percentile speed would require a rounding up, then the speed limit may be rounded down to the nearest 5 mph increment below the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed, if no further reduction is used. Refer to CVC Section 21400(b).

If the speed limit to be posted has had the 5 mph reduction applied, then an E\&TS shall document in writing the conditions and justification for the lower speed limit. The reasons for the lower speed limit shall be in compliance with CVC Section 627 and 22358.5

The following examples are provided to explain the application of these speed limit criteria:
A. Using Option 1 above and first step is to round down: If the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed in a speed survey for a location was 37 mph , then the speed limit would be established at 35 mph since it is the closest 5 mph increment to the 37 mph speed. As indicated by the option, this 35 mph established speed limit could be reduced by 5 mph to 30 mph if conditions and justification for using this lower speed limit are documented in the E\&TS.
B. Using Option 1 above and first step is to round up: If the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed in a speed survey for a location was 33 mph , then the speed limit would be established at 35 mph since it is the closest 5 mph increment to the 33 mph speed. As indicated by the option, this 35 mph speed limit could be reduced by 5 mph to 30 mph if the conditions and justification for using this lower speed limit are documented in the E\&TS.
C. Using Option 2 above and first step is to round up: If the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed in a speed survey for a location was 33 mph , instead of rounding up to 35 mph , the speed limit can be established at 30 mph , but no further reduction can be applied.

## Collision History

Reported collisions are reviewed for each street segment to determine if there is a higher than average rate of collisions. A segment that has an above-average collision rate typically suggests conditions that are not readily apparent to motorists.

A summary of the collision rates for the 39 surveyed street segments is provided in Table 2.

## Conditions Not Readily Apparent To Motorists

Each street segment is field inspected to identify roadway conditions that may not be readily apparent to motorists. A determination is made whether any conditions are significant and warrant the recommendation of the speed limit 5 mph or more below the basic speed limit. It is important to note that The California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (California MUTCD) dated November 2014 recommends exercising great care when establishing speed limits 5 mph or more below the basic speed limit.

## SURVEY CONDITIONS

## SURVEY LOCATIONS

The procedures described below describe the criteria and methods used to survey selected streets within the City of Temecula. The specific location of the radar speed survey for each street segment was selected after considering the following:

1. Minimum stop sign and traffic signal influence.
2. Minimum visibility restrictions.
3. Non-congested traffic flow away from intersections and driveways.
4. Minimum influence from curves or other roadway conditions that would affect the normal operation of a vehicle.

## DATA COLLECTION

Data of existing conditions was obtained including prevailing speed of vehicles, traffic collisions, visibility restrictions, and roadway conditions within the community. Speed data and field reviews were conducted at 39 locations during the months of July and August 2021.

## Speed Data

Radar speed measurements were conducted at 39 locations during the months of July and August 2021. The radar speed distribution forms are in Attachment B. All surveys were conducted in good weather conditions, during off-peak hours on weekdays. The radar unit was operated from an unmarked vehicle to minimize any influence on driver behavior. Typically, a minimum sample size of 100 vehicles or the total samples during a maximum period of 2 hours were obtained for each segment. Traffic speeds in both directions were recorded for individual segments.

## Collision Data

Collision data was obtained from the California Highway Patrol's Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) electronic collision database. For this study, collision data was used from the latest 3 years of reported accidents from January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2020. The collision rates for the 39 segments are expressed in accidents per million vehicle miles (A/MVM). To calculate these rates, 24-hour traffic volumes were collected for each street segment. This information was then entered into the following formula to determine the collision rate:

$$
R=\frac{A x 1,000,000}{t \times 365 \frac{\text { days }}{\text { year }} x l x v}
$$

A = Number of midblock collisions over time period
$R=$ Collision Rate (accidents/million vehicle miles)
$t=$ Time Period Covered (in years)
$I=$ Length of Segment (miles)
$v=$ Traffic Volume (average daily traffic)
The segment collision rate was then compared to the average statewide collision rate. The average statewide collision rates were obtained from 2018 Collision Data on California State Highways published by Caltrans.

## Field Review Data

A field review was conducted for each of the selected street segments in the City with consideration for the following factors:

1. Street width and alignment (design speed);
2. Pedestrian activity and traffic flow characteristics;
3. Number of lanes and other channelization and striping patterns;
4. Frequency of intersections, driveways, and on-street parking;
5. Location of stop signs and other regulatory traffic control devices;
6. Visibility obstructions;
7. Land use and proximity to schools;
8. Pedestrian and bicycle usage;
9. Uniformity with existing speed zones and those in adjacent jurisdictions; and
10. Any other unusual condition not readily apparent to the driver.

## CRITERIA

Survey data was compiled and analyzed to determine the recommended speed limit in accordance with several criteria contained in The California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (California MUTCD) dated November 2014. Some of the criteria used are:
A. The critical speed or 85th percentile speed is that speed at or below which 85 percent of the traffic is moving. This speed is the baseline value in determining what the majority of drivers believe is safe and reasonable. Speed limits set higher than the critical speed are not considered reasonable and safe. Speed limits set lower than the critical speed make a large number of reasonable drivers "unlawful," and do not facilitate the orderly flow of traffic. The "basic speed limit" is the nearest 5 mph increment to the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed.
B. The 10 mile per hour ( mph ) pace speed is the 10 mph increment that contains the highest percentage of vehicles. It is a measure of the dispersion of speeds across the range of the samples surveyed. An accepted practice is to keep the speed limit within the 10 mph pace while considering the critical speed and other factors that might require a speed lower than the critical speed.
C. The collision rate for each street segment is compared to average collision rates that can be reasonably expected to occur on streets and highways in other jurisdictions, in proportion to the volume of traffic per lane mile. These average collision rates have been developed by the State of California and are considered reasonable for use in the City of Temecula.

## RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Engineering and Traffic Survey Forms, presented in Appendix A, illustrate results of a thorough evaluation of the available data and recommend a speed limit for each street segment surveyed. A complete summary of all recommendations is shown in Table 2. In each case, the recommended speed limit was consistent with the prevailing behavior as demonstrated by the radar speed measurements. Typically, a speed limit in the upper range of the 10 -mile pace was selected unless a collision rate significantly higher than expected was discovered or roadway conditions not readily apparent to the driver were identified. Any segments with recommended speed limits 5 mph or more below the basic speed limit are fully explained later in this report.

The Legislature, in adopting Section 22358.5 of the CVC, has made it clear that physical conditions, such as width, curvature, grade and surface conditions, or any other condition readily apparent to a driver, in the absence of other factors, would not be the basis for special downward speed zoning. In these cases, the basic speed law (CVC Section 22350 ) is sufficient to regulate such conditions.

The recommendations contained in this Report are intended to establish prima facie speed limits. They are not intended to be absolute for all prevailing conditions. All prima facie
speed violations are actually violations of the basic speed law (Section 22350 of CVC). This statute states that a person shall not drive a vehicle at a speed greater than is safe having regard for traffic, roadway, and weather conditions. A prima facie limit is intended to establish a maximum safe speed under normal conditions.

Table 1 identifies the street segments with recommended changes in posted speed limits and Table 2 summarizes the recommendations for all surveyed segments.

## TABLE 1

STREET SEGMENTS WITH RECOMMENDED SPEED CHANGES

| No. | Street | From | To | Existing | New | Change |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Avenida Buena Suerte | Del Rey Road | Avenida Centenario | 30 | 25 | -5 |
| 2 | Avenida Centenario | Avenida Buena Suerte Via Norte | 30 | 25 | -5 |  |
| 5 | Channel Street | Butterfield Stage Road Chaote Street | 35 | 25 | -10 |  |
| 11 | Harveston Drive | Harveston Way | Fairmont Ln | 35 | 30 | -5 |
| 12 | Harveston Drive | Fairmont Ln | Lakeview Road | 35 | 30 | -5 |
| 14 | La Paz Street | Temecula Parkway | Ynez Road | 35 | 25 | -10 |
| 16 | Murrieta Hot Springs <br> Road | Pourroy Road | Butterfield Stage <br> Road | NP | 50 | PL |
| 23 | Overland Drive | Enterprise Circle | Jefferson Avenue | 35 | 30 | -5 |
| 26 | Rainbow Canyon Road | South City Limits | Temecula Creek Inn | 40 | 35 | -5 |
| 27 | Rainbow Canyon Road Temecula Creek Inn | Pechanga Parkway | 40 | 35 | -5 |  |
| 28 | Redhawk Parkway | Vail Ranch Parkway | Wolf Valley Road | 45 | 40 | -5 |
| 29 | Redhawk Parkway | Wolf Valley Road | Peppercorn Drive | 45 | 40 | -5 |
| 30 | Redhawk Parkway | Peppercorn Drive | El Chimisal / <br> Tehachapi Pass | 45 | 40 | -5 |
| 31 | Redhawk Parkway | El Chimisal / <br> Tehachapi Pass | Nighthawk Pass | 45 | 40 | -5 |
| 33 | Temecula Lane | Loma Linda Drive | Canterfield Drive | NP | 25 | PL |
| 34 | Vail Ranch Parkway | Nighthawk Pass | Harmony Lane / <br> Terzich Drive | 45 | 40 | -5 |
| 35 | Vail Ranch Parkway | Harmony Lane / <br> Terzich Drive | Redhawk Parkway | 45 | 40 | -5 |


| TABLE 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. | Street | From | To | Dist. <br> (mi.) | ADT |  | dent Act. | Posted Speed Limit | 85\% Speed | 10 mi. Pace | $\%$ in Pace | Rec. Speed Limit | Comments |
| 1 | Avenida Buena Suerte | Del Rey Road | Avenida Centenario | 0.54 | 293 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 30 | 27 | 19-28 | 97 \% | 25 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 2 | Avenida Centenario | Avenida Buena Suerte | Via Norte | 0.27 | 256 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 30 | 31 | 23-32 | 95 \% | 25 | * |
| 3 | Business Park Drive | Rancho California Road | Rancho Way | 0.89 | 1,030 | 1.60 | 1.00 | 35 | 40 | 27-36 | 63 \% | 35 | * |
| 4 | Business Park Drive | Rancho Way | Diaz Road | 0.36 | 1,487 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 35 | 37 | 26-35 | 68 \% | 35 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 5 | Channel Street | Butterfield Stage Road | Chaote Street | 0.3 | 553 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 35 ** | 27 | 17-26 | 81 \% | $25^{* *}$ | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 6 | Country Glen Way | Via Rio Temecula | Temecula Parkway | 0.19 | 1,018 | 1.60 | 4.72 | 35 | 35 | 26-35 | 73 \% | 35 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 7 | Date Street | Ynez Road | Lakeview Road | 0.5 | 13,079 | 0.91 | 0.14 | 50 | 50 | 42-51 | 84 \% | 50 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 8 | Date Street | Lakeview Road | East City Limits | 0.52 | 7,500 | 0.98 | 0.00 | 45 | 43 | 31-40 | 65 \% | 45 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 9 | Del Rey Road | Via Norte | Solana Way | 0.38 | 1,305 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 30 | 31 | 23-32 | 82 \% | 30 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 10 | Del Rey Road | Solana Way | Calle Pina Colada (S) | 0.44 | 2,760 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 30 | 32 | 23-32 | 86 \% | 30 | Closest to 85th Speed |

[^0]| TABLE 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. | Street | From | To | Dist. <br> (mi.) | ADT | Accid <br> Exp | dent Act. | Posted Speed Limit | 85\% Speed | 10 mi. Pace | \% in Pace | Rec. Speed Limit | Comments |
| 11 | Harveston Drive | Harveston Way | Fairmont Ln | 0.6 | 1,874 | 1.60 | 0.81 | 35 | 32 | 22-31 | 76 \% | 30 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 12 | Harveston Drive | Fairmont Ln | Lakeview Road | 0.32 | 1,848 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 35 | 32 | 23-31 | 76 \% | 30 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 13 | Harveston Drive | Lakeview Road | Harveston School Road | 0.57 | 1,201 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 30 ** | 32 | 22-31 | 72 \% | 30 ** | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 14 | La Paz Street | Temecula Parkwa | Ynez Road | 0.26 | 10,309 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 35 | 37 | 28-37 | 82 \% | 25 | * |
| 15 | Loma Linda <br> Road | Pechanga Parkwa | Via Del Coronado | 0.52 | 3,617 | 1.60 | 0.49 | 35 ** | 39 | 30-39 | 72 \% | $35^{* *}$ | California MUTCD Option 2 |
| 16 | Murrieta Hot Springs Road | Pourroy Road | Butterfield Stage Road | 0.77 | 21,383 | 0.91 | 0.11 | NP | 49 | 37-46 | 66 \% | 50 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 17 | Nicolas Road | Winchester Road | North General Kearny Road | 0.59 | 8,681 | 0.93 | 0.18 | 45 | 43 | 33-42 | 80 \% | 45 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 18 | Nicolas Road | North General Kearny Road | Joseph Road | 0.64 | 9,028 | 0.93 | 0.16 | 45 | 49 | 38-47 | 68 \% | 45 | California MUTCD Option 2 |
| 19 | Nicolas Road | Joseph Road | Calle Medusa | 0.47 | 7,177 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 45 | 48 | 39-48 | 73 \% | 45 | California MUTCD Option 2 |
| 20 | Nicolas Road | Calle Medusa | Calle Girasol | 0.14 | 4,097 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 45 | 48 | 38-47 | 73 \% | 45 | California MUTCD Option 2 |

[^1]*** Accident rate units: Collisions per One Million Vehicle Miles

| TABLE 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. | Street | From | To | Dist. <br> (mi.) | ADT | Acci Rate Exp. | dent Act. | Posted Speed Limit | 85\% Speed | 10 mi. Pace | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { in } \\ & \text { Pace } \end{aligned}$ | Rec. Speed Limit | Comments |
| 21 | North General Kearny Road | Margarita Road | Calle Pina Colada | 0.56 | 4,630 | 0.93 | 0.00 | 40 ** | 43 | 34-43 | 70 \% | 40 ** | California MUTCD Option 2 |
| 22 | Old Town Front Street | Temecula Parkwa | Santiago Road | 0.65 | 11,485 | 1.44 | 0.37 | 40 | 42 | 32-41 | 66 \% | 40 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 23 | Overland Drive | Enterprise Circle | Jefferson Avenue | 0.22 | 5,736 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 35 | 31 | 23-32 | 87 \% | 30 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 24 | Overland Drive | Jefferson Avenue | Ynez Road | 0.33 | 19,821 | 0.93 | 0.00 | 40 | 45 | 37-46 | 74 \% | 40 | * |
| 25 | Overland Drive | Ynez Road | Margarita Road | 0.29 | 16,382 | 0.91 | 0.19 | 40 | 38 | 29-38 | 67 \% | 40 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 26 | Rainbow Canyon Road | South City Limits | Temecula Creek Inn | 1.09 | 15,029 | 1.60 | 0.11 | 40 | 37 | 29-38 | 84 \% | 35 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 27 | Rainbow Canyon Road | Temecula Creek Inn | Pechanga Parkway | 0.5 | 10,880 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 40 | 42 | 33-42 | $73 \%$ | 35 | * |
| 28 | Redhawk Parkway | Vail Ranch Parkway | Wolf Valley Road | 0.37 | 27,546 | 0.91 | 0.45 | 45 | 41 | 33-42 | 82 \% | 40 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 29 | Redhawk Parkway | Wolf Valley Road | Peppercorn Drive | 0.5 | 14,401 | 0.91 | 0.00 | 45 | 39 | 30-39 | 75 \% | 40 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 30 | Redhawk Parkway | Peppercorn Drive | El Chimisal / Tehachapi Pass | 0.92 | 9,379 | 1.60 | 0.11 | 45 | 40 | 31-40 | 75 \% | 40 | Closest to 85th Speed |

[^2]| TABLE 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. | Street | From | To | Dist. (mi.) | ADT | Acci Rate Exp. |  | Posted Speed Limit | 85\% Speed | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \mathrm{mi} . \\ & \text { Pace } \end{aligned}$ | \% in Pace | Rec. Speed Limit | Comments |
| 31 | Redhawk Parkway | El Chimisal / <br> Tehachapi Pass | Nighthawk Pass | 0.2 | 6,205 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 45 | 40 | 31-40 | 82 \% | 40 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 32 | Township Road | Village Road | Harveston Drive | 0.06 | 911 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 25 | 25 | 16-25 | 88\% | 25 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 33 | Temecula Lane | Loma Linda Drive | Canterfield Drive | 0.24 | 571 | 1.60 | 0.00 | NP | 26 | 18-27 | $90 \%$ | 25 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 34 | Vail Ranch Parkway | Nighthawk Pass | Harmony Lane / Terzich Drive | 0.76 | 5,629 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 45 | 40 | 31-40 | 78 \% | 40 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 35 | Vail Ranch Parkway | Harmony Lane / Terzich Drive | Redhawk <br> Parkway | 0.59 | 4,429 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 45 | 39 | 30-39 | $85 \%$ | 40 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 36 | Via Norte | Solana Way | Del Rey Road | 0.35 | 849 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 30 | 31 | 24-33 | 91\% | 30 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 37 | Via Norte | Del Rey Road | Calle Pina <br> Colada (N) | 0.34 | 2,092 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 30 | 36 | 29-38 | 72 \% | 30 | * |
| 38 | Via Norte | Calle Pina Colada | Avenida Centenario | 1.06 | 1,720 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 35 | 37 | 28-37 | 75 \% | 35 | Closest to 85th Speed |
| 39 | Via Norte | Avenida Centenaric | cAvenida Del Reposo | 0.82 | 852 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 35 | 35 | 26-35 | 71 \% | 35 | Closest to 85th Speed |

[^3]
## SEGMENTS WITH SPECIAL CONDITIONS

The following segments surveyed had recommended speed limits that were 5 miles per hour (mph) or more below the critical speed due to conditions not readily apparent to the driver. Each segment is discussed below.

## Segment \#2 - Avenida Centenario - Avenida Buena Suerte to Via Norte

This segment is currently posted at 30 mph and has 1 through lane in each direction undivided with an ADT of 256 vehicles per day. The adjacent land is residential along the 0.27 -mile-long segment. The critical speed is 31 mph and would normally justify a 30 mph posted speed limit. However, due to hidden driveways that may not be apparent to unfamiliar drivers, and to maintain uniformity between adjacent street segments, a lower speed limit is prudent. It is recommended that the speed limit be posted at 25 mph for the above reasons.

## Segment \#3 - Business Park Drive - Rancho California Road to Rancho Way

This segment is currently posted at 35 mph and has 1 through lane in each direction undivided with an ADT of 1,030 vehicles per day. The adjacent land is commercial along the 0.89-mile-long segment. The critical speed is 40 mph and would normally justify a 40 mph posted speed limit. However, due to horizontal curves, and to maintain uniformity between adjacent street segments, a lower speed limit is prudent. It is recommended that the speed limit remain at 35 mph for the above reasons.

## Segment \#14 - La Paz Street - Temecula Parkway to Ynez Road

This segment is currently posted at 35 mph and has 1 through lane in each direction undivided with an ADT of 10,309 vehicles per day. There are single family homes on both sides of the street. The critical speed is 37 mph and would normally justify a 35 mph posted speed limit. When qualifying an appropriate speed limit, local authorities may consider if an E\&T is necessary or if a prima facie speed limit is appropriate on a local residential roadway. In order to be defined a local roadway, the segment needs to be classified as a local roadway on the California Road System Map, primarily provides access to abutting residential property, is less than 40 -feet wide, has no more than 1 lane in each direction. and is less than 0.5 miles of uninterrupted roadway. This segment is classified as a local street on the California Road System Map and primarily provides access to abutting residential property. La Paz Road has 1 through lane in each direction and is 25 -feet wide and is 0.26 miles long between traffic controls. This roadway meets the requirements to classify as a prima facie local roadway, therefore it is recommended that the speed limit be posted at 25 mph .

## Segment \#24 - Overland Drive - Jefferson Avenue to Ynez Road

This segment is currently posted at 40 mph and has 2 through lane in each direction undivided with an ADT of 19,821 vehicles per day. The adjacent land is commercial along the 0.33-mile-long segment. The critical speed is 45 mph and would normally justify a 45 mph posted speed limit. However, to maintain uniformity between adjacent street segments, a lower speed limit is prudent. It is recommended that the speed limit remain at 40 mph for the above reasons.

## Segment \#27 - Rainbow Canyon Road - Temecula Creek Inn to Pechanga Parkway

This segment is currently posted at 40 mph and has 1 through lane in each direction undivided with an ADT of 10,880 vehicles per day. The adjacent land is vacant and a golf course along the 0.5 -mile-long segment. The critical speed is 42 mph and would normally justify a 40 mph posted speed limit. However, due to an unmarked crosswalk that may not be apparent to unfamiliar drivers, and to maintain uniformity between adjacent street segments, a lower speed limit is prudent. It is recommended that the speed limit be posted at 35 mph for the above reasons.

## Segment \#37 - Via Norte - Del Rey Road to Calle Pina Colada (N)

This segment is currently posted at 30 mph and has 1 through lane in each direction undivided with an ADT of 2,092 vehicles per day. The adjacent land is residential along the 0.34 -mile-long segment. The critical speed is 36 mph and would normally justify a 35 mph posted speed limit. However, due to hidden driveways that may not be apparent to unfamiliar drivers, and to maintain uniformity between adjacent street segments, a lower speed limit is prudent. It is recommended that the speed limit remain at 30 mph for the above reasons.

## APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF CALIFORNIA VEHICLE CODE

SECTION 1. Section 627 of the Vehicle Code:
Section 627.
(a) "Engineering and traffic survey," as used in this code, means a survey of highway and traffic conditions in accordance with methods determined by the Department of Transportation for use by state and local authorities.
(b) An engineering and traffic survey shall include, among other requirements deemed necessary by the department, consideration of all of the following:
(1) Prevailing speeds as determined by traffic engineering measurements.
(2) Accident records.
(3) Highway, traffic, and roadside conditions not readily apparent to the driver.
(c) When conducting an engineering and traffic survey, local authorities, in addition to the factors set forth in paragraphs (1) to (3), inclusive, of subdivision (b) may consider all of the following:
(1) Residential density, if any of the following conditions exist on the particular portion of highway and the property contiguous thereto, other than a business district:
a. Upon one side of the highway, within a distance of a quarter of a mile, the contiguous property fronting thereon is occupied by 13 or more separate dwelling houses of business structures.
b. Upon both sides of the highway, collectively, within a distance of a quarter of a mile, the contiguous property fronting thereon is occupied by 16 or more separate dwelling houses or business structures.
c. The portion of highway is longer than one-quarter of a mile but has the ratio of separate dwelling houses or business structures to the length of the highway described in either subparagraph (A) or (B).
(2) Pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

Section 21400.
(b) The Department of Transportation shall revise the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, as it read on January 1, 2012, to require the Department of Transportation or a local authority to round speed limits to the nearest five miles per hour of the 85th percentile of the free-flowing traffic. However, in cases in which the speed limit needs to be rounded up to the nearest five miles per hour increment of the 85th-percentile speed, the Department of Transportation or a local authority may decide to instead round down the speed limit to the lower five miles per hour increment, but then the Department of Transportation or a local authority shall not reduce the speed limit any further for any reason.

## Basic Speed Law

22350. No person shall drive a vehicle upon a highway at a speed greater than is reasonable or prudent having due regard for weather, visibility, the traffic on, and the surface and width of, the highway, and in no event at a speed which endangers the safety of persons or property.

## Speed Law Violations

Section 22351.
(a) The speed of any vehicle upon a highway not in excess of the limits specified in Section 22352 or established as authorized in this code is lawful unless clearly proved to be in violation of the basic speed law.
(b) The speed of any vehicle upon a highway in excess of the prima facie speed limits in Section 22352 or established as authorized in this code is prima facie unlawful unless the defendant establishes by competent evidence that the speed in excess of said limits did not constitute a violation of the basic speed law at the time, place and under the conditions then existing.

## Prima Facie Speed Limits

Section 22352.
The prima facie limits are as follows and shall be applicable unless changed as authorized in this code and, if so changed, only when signs have been erected giving notice thereof:
(a) Fifteen miles per hour:
(1) When traversing a railway grade crossing, if during the last 100 feet of the approach to the crossing the driver does not have a clear and unobstructed view of the crossing and of any traffic on the railway for a distance of 400 feet in both directions along such railway. This subdivision does not apply in the case of any railway grade crossing where a human flagman is on duty or a clearly visible electrical or mechanical railway crossing signal device is installed but does not then indicate the immediate approach of a railway train or car.
(2) When traversing any intersection of highways, if during the last 100 feet of the driver's approach to the intersection, the driver does not have a clear and unobstructed view of the intersection and of any traffic upon all of the highways entering the intersection for a distance of 100 feet along all those highways, except at an intersection protected by stop signs or yield right-of-way signs or controlled by official traffic control signals.
(3) On any alley.
(b) Twenty-five miles per hour:
(1) On any highway other than a state highway, in any business or residence district unless a different speed is determined by local authority under procedures set forth in this code.
(2) When approaching or passing a school building or the grounds thereof, contiguous to a highway and posted with a standard "SCHOOL" warning sign, while children are going to or leaving the school either during school hours or during the noon recess period. The prima facie limit shall also apply when approaching or passing any school grounds which are not separated from the highway by a fence, gate or other physical barrier while the grounds are in use by children and the highway is posted with a standard "SCHOOL" warning sign. For purposes of this
subparagraph, standard "SCHOOL" warning signs may be placed at any distance up to 500 feet away from school grounds.
(3) When passing a senior center or other facility primarily used by senior citizens, contiguous to a street other than a state highway and posted with a standard "SENIOR" warning sign. A local authority may erect a sign pursuant to this paragraph when the local agency makes a determination that the proposed signing should be implemented. A local authority may request grant funding from the Pedestrian Safety Account pursuant to Section 894.7 of the Streets and Highways Code, or any other grant funding available to it, and use that grant funding to pay for the erection of those signs, or may utilize any other funds available to it to pay for the erection of those signs, including, but not limited to, donations from private sources.

## Increase of Local Speed Limits to 65 Miles Per Hour

Section 22357.
(a) Whenever a local authority determines upon the basis of an engineering and traffic survey that a speed greater than 25 miles per hour would facilitate the orderly movement of vehicular traffic and would be reasonable and safe upon any street other than a state highway otherwise subject to a prima facie limit of 25 miles per hour, the local authority may by ordinance determine and declare a prima facie speed limit of $30,35,40,45,50,55$ or 60 miles per hour or a maximum speed limit of 65 miles per hour, whichever is found most appropriate to facilitate the orderly movement of traffic and is reasonable and safe. The declared prima facie or maximum speed limit shall be effective when appropriate signs giving notice thereof are erected upon the street and shall not thereafter be revised except upon the basis of an engineering and traffic survey. This section does not apply to any 25 mile per hour prima facie limit, which is applicable when passing a school building or the grounds thereof or when passing a senior center or other facility primarily used by senior citizens.
(b) This section shall become operative on the date specified in subdivision (c) of Section 22366.

## Downward Speed Zoning

Section 22358.5.
It is the intent of the Legislature that physical conditions such as width, curvature, grade and surface conditions, or any other condition readily apparent to a driver, in the absence of other factors, would not require special downward speed zoning, as the basic rule of Section 22350 is sufficient regulation as to such conditions.

## Boundary Line Streets

## Section 22359.

With respect to boundary line streets and highways where portions thereof are within different jurisdictions, no ordinance adopted under Sections 22357 and 22358 shall be effective as to any such portion until all authorities having jurisdiction of the portions of the street concerned have approved the same. This section shall not apply in the case of boundary line streets consisting of separate roadways within different jurisdictions.

## Speed Trap Prohibition

Section 40801.
No peace officer or other person shall use a speed trap in arresting, or participating or assisting in the arrest of, any person for any alleged violation of this code nor shall any speed trap be used in securing evidence as to the speed of any vehicle for the purpose of an arrest or prosecution under this code.

## Speed Trap

Section 40802.
(a) A "speed trap" is either of the following:
(1) A particular section of a highway measured as to distance and with boundaries marked, designated, or otherwise determined in order that the speed of a vehicle may be calculated by securing the time it takes the vehicle to travel the known distance.
(2) A particular section of a highway with a prima facie speed limit that is provided by this code or by local ordinance under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 22352, or established under Section 22354, 22357, 22358, or 22358.3, if that prima facie speed limit is not justified by an engineering and traffic survey conducted within five years prior to the date of the alleged violation, and enforcement of the speed limit involves the use of radar or any other electronic device that measures the speed of moving object. This paragraph does not apply to a local street, road, or school zone.
(b)(1) For purposes of this section, a local street or road is one that is functionally classified as "local" on the "California Road System Maps," that are approved by the Federal Highway Administration and maintained by the Department of Transportation. When a street or road does not appear on the "California Road System Maps," it may be defined as a "local street or road" if it primarily provides access to abutting residential property and meets the following three conditions:
(A) Roadway width of not more than 40 feet.
(B) Not more than one-half of a mile of uninterrupted length. Interruptions shall include official traffic control signals as defined in Section 445.
(C) Not more than one traffic lane in each direction.
(2) For purposes of this section "school zone" means that area approaching or passing a school building or the grounds thereof that is contiguous to a highway and on which is posted a standard "SCHOOL" warning sign, while children are going to or leaving the school either during school hours or during the noon recess period. "School zone" also includes the area approaching or passing any school grounds that are not separated from the highway by a fence, gate, or other physical barrier while the grounds are in use by children if that highway is posted with a standard "SCHOOL" warning sign.
(c)(1) When all the following criteria are met, paragraph (2) of this subdivision shall be applicable and subdivision (a) shall not be applicable:
(A) When radar is used, the arresting officer has successfully completed a radar operator course of not less than 24 hours on the use of police traffic radar, and the
course was approved and certified by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training.
(B) When laser or any other electronic device is used to measure the speed of moving objects, the arresting officer has successfully completed the training required in subparagraph ( A ) and an additional training course of not less than two hours approved and certified by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training.
(C)(i) The prosecution proved that the arresting officer complied with subparagraphs (A) and (B) and that an engineering and traffic survey has been conducted in accordance with subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2). The prosecution proved that, prior to the officer issuing the notice to appear, the arresting officer established that the radar, laser, or other electronic device conformed to the requirements of subparagraph (D).
(ii) The prosecution proved the speed of the accused was unsafe for the conditions present at the time of alleged violation unless the citation was for a violation of Section 22349, 22356, or 22406.
(D) The radar, laser, or other electronic device used to measure the speed of the accused meets or exceeds the minimal operational standards of the National Traffic Highway Safety Administration, and has been calibrated within the three years prior to the date of the alleged violation by an independent certified laser or radar repair and testing or calibration facility.
(2) A "speed trap" is either of the following:
(A) A particular section of a highway measured as to distance and with boundaries marked, designated, or otherwise determined in order that the speed of a vehicle may be calculated by securing the time it takes the vehicle to travel the known distance.
(B)(i) A particular section of a highway or state highway with a prima facie speed limit that is provided by this code or by local ordinance under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 22352, or established under Section 22354, 22357, 22358, or 22358.3, if that prima facie speed limit is not justified by an engineering and traffic survey conducted within one of the following time periods, prior to the date of the alleged violation, and enforcement of speed limit involves the use of radar or any other electronic device that measures the speed of moving objects:
(I) Except as specified in subclause (II), seven years.
(II) If an engineering and traffic survey was conducted more than seven years prior to the date of the alleged violation, and a registered engineer evaluates the section of the highway and determines that no significant changes in roadway or traffic conditions have occurred including, but not limited to, changes in adjoining property or land use, roadway width, or traffic volume, 10 years.
(ii) This subparagraph does not apply to a local street, road, or school zone.

## Speed Trap Evidence

Section 40803.
(a) No evidence as to the speed of a vehicle upon a highway shall be admitted in any court upon the trial of any person in any prosecution under this code upon a charge involving the speed of a vehicle when the evidence is based upon or obtained from or by the maintenance or use of a speed trap.
(b) In any prosecution under this code of a charge involving the speed of a vehicle, where enforcement involves the use of radar or other electronic devices which measure the speed of moving objects, the prosecution shall establish, as part of its prima facie case, that the evidence or testimony presented is not based upon a speed trap as defined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 40802.
(c) When a traffic and engineering survey is required pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 40802, evidence that a traffic and engineering survey has been conducted within five years of the date of the alleged violation or evidence that the offense was committed on a local street or road as defined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 40802 shall constitute a prima facie case that the evidence or testimony is not based upon a speed trap as defined in paragraph (2) subdivision (a) of Section 40802.

## APPENDIX A Street Segment Data



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.540 | miles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 36 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | FAIR |  |
| Roadway Conditions | FAIR |  |
| Lighting | NONE |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

STREET Avenida Centenario
FROM Avenida Buena Suerte

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Via Norte

## SPEED FACTORS

| Date of Speed Survey | $7 / 27 / 2021$ | Posted Speed Limit | 30 mph |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Time of Speed Survey | $1: 59 \mathrm{PM}$ | Speed Justification |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 29 mph | UNIFORMITY W/ ADJ. SEG., HIDDEN |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 31 mph | DWYS |  |
| Average Speed | 29 mph |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | $23-32$ |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 95 | Recommended Speed Limit 25 mph |  |
| Number of Survey Samples | 55 |  |  |

Number of Years Studied 3 years

Total Collisions
Statewide Average Collision Rate
Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles

3 years
0
1.60 Collisions/MVM
0.00 Collisions/MVM

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

Average Daily Traffic
Number of Lanes
Type of Traffic Control
Crosswalks?
Pedestrian Traffic
Truck Traffic
On-Street Parking
Sidewalks?
Driveways?

256 Date Counted 7/13/2021
2 LANES
STOP @ VIA NORTE
NONE
LIGHT
LIGHT
BOTH SIDES
NONE
BOTH SIDES

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.270 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 36 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | FAIR |  |
| Roadway Conditions | FAIR |  |
| Lighting | NONE |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |  |

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.890 | miles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 56 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | GOOD |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | NONE |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | COMMERCIAL |  |

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.360 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 56 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | GOOD |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | NONE |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | COMMERCIAL |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 



## COLLISION HISTORY

| Number of Years Studied | 3 | years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Collisions | 0 |  |
| Statewide Average Collision Rate | 1.60 | Collisions/MVM |
| Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles | 0.00 | Collisions/MVM |

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic | $553 \quad 7 / 13 / 2021$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes | 2LANES + BIKE LANES Counted |  |
| Type of Traffic Control | TS @ BUTTERFIELD STAGE, STOP @ DORCHESTER DR |  |
|  |  | BOTH SIDES |
| Crosswalks? | LIGHT |  |
| Pedestrian Traffic | LIGHT |  |
| Truck Traffic | BOTH SIDES |  |
| On-Street Parking | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Sidewalks? | NONE |  |
| Driveways? |  |  |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.300 miles |
| :--- | :--- |
| Width | 43 |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |
| Visibility | FAIR |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.190 miles |
| :--- | :--- |
| Width | 56 feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |
| Visibility | GOOD |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |
| Adjacent Land Use | COMMERCIAL, RESIDENTIAL |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

| STREET | Date S |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM | Ynez R |
| SPEED FACTORS |  |

Date of Speed Survey
Time of Speed Survey
50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed)
85th Percentile Speed
Average Speed
10 mph Pace Speed
Percentage of Vehicles in Pace
Number of Survey Samples

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Lakeview Road

## COLLISION HISTORY

| Number of Years Studied | 3 | years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Collisions | 1 |  |
| Statewide Average Collision Rate | 0.91 | Collisions/MVM |
| Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles | 0.14 | Collisions/MVM |

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic | 13,079 Date Counted | 7/15/2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Lanes | 4 LANES + MEDIAN + BIKE LANES |  |
| Type of Traffic Control | TS @ YNEZ RD, LAKEVIEW RD |  |
| Crosswalks? | @ TS |  |
| Pedestrian Traffic | MODERATE |  |
| Truck Traffic | LIGHT |  |
| On-Street Parking | NONE |  |
| Sidewalks? | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Driveways? | NONE |  |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.500 miles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 110 feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |
| Visibility | GOOD |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |

Field Study By BC

NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


STREET Date Street
FROM Lakeview Road

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO East City Limits

## SPEED FACTORS

| Date of Speed Survey | $7 / 21 / 2021$ | Posted Speed Limit |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Time of Speed Survey | $2: 45 \mathrm{PM}$ | Speed Justification |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 37 mph | CLOSEST TO 85TH SPEED |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 43 mph |  |  |
| Average Speed | 37 mph |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | $31-40$ |  | Recommended Speed Limit 45 mph |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 65 |  |  |
| Number of Survey Samples | 233 |  |  |

## COLLISION HISTORY

Number of Years Studied
Total Collisions
Statewide Average Collision Rate
Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles

3 years
0
0.98 Collisions/MVM
0.00 Collisions/MVM

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic |  | 7,500 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes | 6 LANES + MEDIAN + BIKE LANES | Date Counted |
| Type of Traffic Control |  | TS @ LAKEVIEW RD, KINGWOOD, MARGARITA RD |
|  |  | @ TS |
| Crosswalks? | MODERATE |  |
| Pedestrian Traffic | LIGHT |  |
| Truck Traffic | NONE |  |
| On-Street Parking | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Sidewalks? | NONE |  |
| Driveways? |  |  |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.520 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 110 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | NO |  |
| Visibility | GOOD |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |  |

Field Study By BC
Checked By
NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

| STREET | Del Rey Road | CERTIFICATION DATE | 11/17/2021 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FROM | Via Norte | TO Solana Way |  |

## SPEED FACTORS

| Date of Speed Survey | $7 / 27 / 2021$ | Posted Speed Limit | 30 mph |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Time of Speed Survey | $10: 45 \mathrm{AM}$ | Speed Justification |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 27 mph | CLOSEST TO 85TH SPEED |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 31 mph |  |  |
| Average Speed | 27 mph |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | $23-32$ |  | 30 mph |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 82 | Recommended Speed Limit |  |
| Number of Survey Samples | 108 |  |  |

## COLLISION HISTORY

Number of Years Studied 3 years
Total Collisions 0

Statewide Average Collision Rate
Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles

0
1.60 Collisions/MVM
0.00 Collisions/MVM

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

Average Daily Traffic
Number of Lanes
Type of Traffic Control
Crosswalks?
Pedestrian Traffic
Truck Traffic
On-Street Parking
Sidewalks?
Driveways?

1,305 Date Counted 7/15/2021
2 LANES
STOP @ VIA NORTE, SOLANA WAY

NONE
LIGHT
LIGHT
BOTH SIDES
NONE
BOTH SIDES

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.380 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 36 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | FAIR |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | NONE |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |  |

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

| STREETDel Rey Road <br> Solana Way |  | CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FROM |  |  |  |  |
| TO Calle Pina Colada (S) |  |  |  |  |

## COLLISION HISTORY

| Number of Years Studied | 3 | years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Collisions | 0 |  |
| Statewide Average Collision Rate | 1.60 | Collisions/MVM |
| Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles | 0.00 | Collisions/MVM |

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic | 2,760 | Date Counted |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes | LANES |  |
| Type of Traffic Control | STOP @ SOLANA WAY, AVENIDA BARCA, CALLE PINA COLADA |  |
|  |  | NONE |
| Crosswalks? | LIGHT |  |
| Pedestrian Traffic | LIGHT |  |
| Truck Traffic | BOTH SIDES |  |
| On-Street Parking | NONE |  |
| Sidewalks? | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Driveways? |  |  |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.440 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 36 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | FAIR |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | NONE |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

| STREET | Harves |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM | Harves |
| SPEED FACTORS |  |

Date of Speed Survey
Time of Speed Survey
50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed)
85th Percentile Speed
Average Speed
10 mph Pace Speed
Percentage of Vehicles in Pace
Number of Survey Samples

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Fairmont Ln

## COLLISION HISTORY

Number of Years Studied 3 years
Total Collisions 1

Statewide Average Collision Rate
Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles

7/21/2021
9:00 AM
27 mph
32 mph
27 mph
22-31

Posted Speed Limit 35 mph
Speed Justification
CLOSEST TO 85TH SPEED

Recommended Speed Limit
30 mph

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic | $1,874 \quad$ Date Counted | $7 / 15 / 2021$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes | 2 LANES + BIKE LANES |  |
| Type of Traffic Control | STOP @ HARVESTON WAY, FAIRMOUNT LN |  |
|  |  |  |
| Crosswalks? | @ STOP AND MIDBLOCK |  |
| Pedestrian Traffic | MODERATE |  |
| Truck Traffic | LIGHT |  |
| On-Street Parking | NONE |  |
| Sidewalks? | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Driveways? | NONE |  |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.600 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 46 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | FAIR |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL, PARK |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.320 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 46 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | FAIR |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL, PARK |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


| STREET | Harves |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM | Lakevie |
| SPEED FACTORS |  |


| Date of Speed Survey | $7 / 21 / 2021$ | Posted Speed Limit | 30 mph |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Time of Speed Survey | $11: 06 \mathrm{AM}$ | Speed Justification |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 26 mph | CLOSEST TO 85TH SPEED |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 32 mph |  |  |
| Average Speed | 27 mph |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | $22-31$ |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 72 | Recommended Speed Limit | 30 mph |
| Number of Survey Samples | 125 |  |  |

## COLLISION HISTORY

| Number of Years Studied | 3 | years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Collisions | 0 |  |
| Statewide Average Collision Rate | 1.60 | Collisions/MVM |
| Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles | 0.00 | Collisions/MVM |

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic | 1,201 | Date Counted |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes | 7/15/2021 |  |
| Type of Traffic Control |  | LANES + BIKE LANES |
| Crosswalks? | STOP @ LAKEVIEW RD, HAVERSTON SCHOOL RD |  |
| Pedestrian Traffic | @ STOP |  |
| Truck Traffic | MODERATE |  |
| On-Street Parking | LIGHT |  |
| Sidewalks? | NONE |  |
| Driveways? | BOTH SIDES |  |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.570 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 46 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | FAIR |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL, SCHOOL |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.260 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 26 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | FAIR |  |
| Roadway Conditions | FAIR |  |
| Lighting | NONE |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.520 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 55 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | GOOD |  |
| Roadway Conditions | FAIR |  |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL, SCHOOL |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.770 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 86 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | GOOD |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { STREET } & \text { Nicolas Road } \\ \text { FROM } & \text { Winchester Road }\end{array}$ |  | CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TO North General K | ny Road |
| SPEED FACTORS |  |  |  |
| Date of Speed Survey | 7/21/2021 | Posted Speed Limit | 45 mph |
| Time of Speed Survey | 3:25 PM | Speed Justification |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 38 mph | CLOSEST TO 85TH | PEED |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 43 mph |  |  |
| Average Speed | 38 mph |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | 33-42 |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 80 | Recommended Speed L | it 45 mph |
| Number of Survey Samples | 233 |  |  |

COLLISION HISTORY

| Number of Years Studied | 3 | years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Collisions | 1 |  |
| Statewide Average Collision Rate | 0.93 | Collisions/MVM |
| Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles | 0.18 | Collisions/MVM |

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic | $8,681 \quad$ Date Counted |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes | $4 / 15 / 2021$ |
| Type of Traffic Control | TS @ WINCHESTER RD, RANCHO TEMECULA TOWN CTR, GEN |
|  | KEARNY |
| Crosswalks? | @ TS |
| Pedestrian Traffic | LIGHT |
| Truck Traffic | LIGHT |
| On-Street Parking | NONE |
| Sidewalks? | BOTH SIDES |
| Driveways? | NONE |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.590 miles |
| :--- | :--- |
| Width | 86 feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |
| Visibility | GOOD |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, PARK |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

| $\begin{array}{l}\text { STREET } \\ \text { FROM }\end{array} \quad$ North |
| :--- |
| SPEED FACTORS |

Date of Speed Survey
Time of Speed Survey
50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed)
85th Percentile Speed
Average Speed
10 mph Pace Speed
Percentage of Vehicles in Pace
Number of Survey Samples

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Joseph Road

COLLISION HISTORY
Number of Years Studied
Total Collisions
Statewide Average Collision Rate
Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles

7/22/2021
2:14 PM
43 mph
49 mph
43 mph
38-47
$68 \quad$ Recommended Speed Limit 45 mph

TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic | 9,028 | Date Counted |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes | 4 LANES + BIKE LANES |  |
| Type of Traffic Control |  | TS @ GEN KEARNY |
|  |  | @ TS |
| Crosswalks? | LIGHT |  |
| Pedestrian Traffic | LIGHT |  |
| Truck Traffic | NONE |  |
| On-Street Parking | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Sidewalks? | NO |  |
| Driveways? |  |  |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.640 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 86 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | GOOD |  |
| Visibility | GOOD |  |
| Roadway Conditions | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Lighting | RESIDENTIAL, PARK |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

STREET Nicolas Road
FROM Joseph Road

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Calle Medusa

## SPEED FACTORS

| Date of Speed Survey | $7 / 22 / 2021$ | Posted Speed Limit | 45 mph |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Time of Speed Survey | $2: 41 \mathrm{PM}$ | Speed Justification |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 43 mph | CALIFORNIA MUTCD OPTION 2 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 48 mph |  |  |
| Average Speed | 43 mph |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | $39-48$ |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 73 | Recommended Speed Limit | 45 mph |
| Number of Survey Samples | 215 |  |  |

COLLISION HISTORY
Number of Years Studied
Total Collisions
Statewide Average Collision Rate
Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles

3 years
0
1.60 Collisions/MVM
0.00 Collisions/MVM

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic | 7,177 | Date Counted |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes | LANES |  |
| Type of Traffic Control | NONE |  |
|  |  |  |
| Crosswalks? | NONE |  |
| Pedestrian Traffic | LIGHT |  |
| Truck Traffic | LIGHT |  |
| On-Street Parking | NONE |  |
| Sidewalks? | NONE |  |
| Driveways? | NO |  |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.470 miles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | $26-56$ feet |

Vertical Curve?
NO
Horizontal Curve?
Visibility
YES

Roadway Conditions
Lighting
FAIR
FAIR
NONE
Adjacent Land Use
RELIGIOUS CENTER, VACANT
Field Study By BC Checked By NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

STREET Nicolas Road
FROM Calle Medusa

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Calle Girasol

## SPEED FACTORS

Date of Speed Survey
Time of Speed Survey
50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed)
85th Percentile Speed
Average Speed
10 mph Pace Speed
Percentage of Vehicles in Pace
Number of Survey Samples

7/22/2021
3:16 PM
44 mph
48 mph
44 mph
38-47

73 Recommended Speed Limit 45 mph
Posted Speed Limit 45 mph
Speed Justification
CALIFORNIA MUTCD OPTION 2

## COLLISION HISTORY

Number of Years Studied
Total Collisions
Statewide Average Collision Rate
Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic | 4,097 | Date Counted | $7 / 15 / 2021$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes | 2 LANES |  |  |
| Type of Traffic Control | NONE |  |  |
| Crosswalks? | NONE |  |  |
| Pedestrian Traffic | LIGHT |  |  |
| Truck Traffic | LIGHT | NONE |  |
| On-Street Parking | SOUTH SIDE ONLY |  |  |
| Sidewalks? | NO |  |  |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.140 | miles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 52 | feet |

Vertical Curve?
NO
Horizontal Curve? NO
Visibility GOOD
Roadway Conditions GOOD
Lighting
NONE
Adjacent Land Use
RESIDENTIAL, VACANT
Field Study By BC Checked By NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

| $\begin{array}{l}\text { STREET }\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { North } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { Margar }\end{array}$ |
| :--- |
| SPEED FACTORS |


| Date of Speed Survey | $7 / 28 / 2021$ | Posted Speed Limit | 40 mph |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Time of Speed Survey | $12: 10 \mathrm{PM}$ | Speed Justification |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 38 mph | CALIFORNIA MUTCD OPTION 2 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 43 mph |  |  |
| Average Speed | 38 mph |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | $34-43$ |  | Recommended Speed Limit |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 70 |  | mph |
| Number of Survey Samples | 209 |  |  |

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Calle Pina Colada

Number of Years Studied
Total Collisions
Statewide Average Collision Rate
Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles

3 years
0
0.93 Collisions/MVM
0.00 Collisions/MVM

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

Average Daily Traffic
Number of Lanes
Type of Traffic Control
Crosswalks?
Pedestrian Traffic
Truck Traffic
On-Street Parking
Sidewalks?
Driveways?

4,630 Date Counted 7/15/2021
4 LANES + BIKE LANES
TS @ MARGARITA RD, CAM CAMPOS VERDE
@ TS
MODERATE
LIGHT
NORTH SIDE
BOTH SIDES
NO

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.560 miles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 68 feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |
| Visibility | GOOD |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL, SCHOOL, RELIGIOUS CENTER |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.650 miles |
| :--- | :--- |
| Width | $54-60$ feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |
| Visibility | GOOD |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |
| Adjacent Land Use | COMMERCIAL |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.220 miles |
| :--- | :--- |
| Width | $44-68$ feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |
| Horizontal Curve? | NO |
| Visibility | GOOD |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | NONE |
| Adjacent Land Use | COMMERCIAL |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

$\begin{array}{ll}\begin{array}{l}\text { STREET }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Overla } \\ \text { FROM }\end{array} \\ \text { Jeffers }\end{array}$

| Date of Speed Survey | $7 / 20 / 2021$ | Posted Speed Limit |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Time of Speed Survey | $2: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ | Speed Justification |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 40 mph | UNIFORMITY W/ ADJ. SEG. |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 45 mph |  |  |
| Average Speed | 40 mph |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | $37-46$ |  | Recommended Speed Limit |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 74 |  | mph |
| Number of Survey Samples | 216 |  |  |

Number of Years Studied
Total Collisions
Statewide Average Collision Rate
Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles

3 years
0
0.93 Collisions/MVM
0.00 Collisions/MVM

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

Average Daily Traffic Number of Lanes
Type of Traffic Control
Crosswalks?
Pedestrian Traffic
Truck Traffic
On-Street Parking
Sidewalks?
Driveways?

19,821 Date Counted 7/15/2021
4 LANES
TS @ JEFFERSON AVE, YNEZ RD
@ TS
LIGHT
LIGHT
NONE
BOTH SIDES
NONE

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.330 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 86 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | FAIR |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | COMMERCIAL |  |

Field Study By BC
Checked By
NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { STREET } & \text { Overla } \\ \text { FROM } & \text { Ynez R } \\ \text { SPEED FACTORS }\end{array}$
Date of Speed Survey
Time of Speed Survey
50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed)
85th Percentile Speed
Average Speed
10 mph Pace Speed
Percentage of Vehicles in Pace
Number of Survey Samples

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Margarita Road

COLLISION HISTORY

| Number of Years Studied | 3 | years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Collisions | 1 |  |
| Statewide Average Collision Rate | 0.91 | Collisions/MVM |
| Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles | 0.19 | Collisions/MVM |

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

Average Daily Traffic
Number of Lanes
Type of Traffic Control
Crosswalks?
Pedestrian Traffic
Truck Traffic
On-Street Parking
Sidewalks?
Driveways?

16,382 Date Counted 7/15/2021
4 LANES + MEDIAN + BIKE LANES
TS @ YNEZ RD, NICOLE LN, MARGARITA RD
@TS
LIGHT
LIGHT
NONE
BOTH SIDES
BOTH SIDES

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.290 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 80 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | GOOD |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | COMMERCIAL |  |

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 1.090 miles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 44 feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |
| Visibility | GOOD |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL, GOLF COURSE |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.500 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 32 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | FAIR |  |
| Roadway Conditions | FAIR |  |
| Lighting | NONE |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | GOLF COURSE, VACANT |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.370 miles |
| :--- | :--- |
| Width | 82 feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |
| Visibility | FAIR |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES + MEDIAN |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.500 miles |
| :--- | :--- |
| Width | 82 feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |
| Visibility | FAIR |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES + MEDIAN |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


| $\begin{gathered} \text { CITY OF TEMECULA } \\ \text { ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STREET Redhawk Parkway |  | CERTIFICATION DATE | 17/2021 |  |
| FROM Peppercorn Drive |  | TO El Chimisal / Tehacha | i Pass |  |
| SPEED FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| Date of Speed Survey | 7/14/2021 | Posted Speed Limit | mph |  |
| Time of Speed Survey | 12:03 PM | Speed Justification |  |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 36 mph | CLOSEST TO 85TH SPE |  |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 40 mph | CLOSEST TO 85THSPE |  |  |
| Average Speed | 36 mph |  |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | 31-40 |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 75 | Recommended Speed Limit | 40 mph |  |
| Number of Survey Samples | 228 |  |  |  |
| COLLISION HISTORY |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Years Studied | 3 year |  |  |  |
| Total Collisions | 1 |  |  |  |
| Statewide Average Collision Rate | 1.60 Collis | ions/MVM |  |  |
| Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles | 0.11 Colli | ions/MVM |  |  |
| TRAFFIC FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| Average Daily Traffic | 9,379 | Date Counted 7/13/202 |  |  |
| Number of Lanes | 2 LANES + M | DIAN + BIKE LANES |  |  |
| Type of Traffic Control | TS @ PEPPE | CORN DR, TEHACHAPI PASS |  |  |
| Crosswalks? | @ TS |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian Traffic | LIGHT |  |  |  |
| Truck Traffic | LIGHT |  |  |  |
| On-Street Parking | NONE |  |  |  |
| Sidewalks? | BOTH SIDE |  |  |  |
| Driveways? | NONE |  |  |  |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.920 miles |
| :--- | :--- |
| Width | 82 feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |
| Visibility | FAIR |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES + MEDIAN |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.200 miles |
| :--- | :--- |
| Width | 82 feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |
| Visibility | GOOD |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | EAST SIDE + MEDIAN |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


STREET Township Road
FROM Village Road

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Harveston Drive

SPEED FACTORS

| Date of Speed Survey | $7 / 21 / 2021$ | Posted Speed Limit | 25 mph |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Time of Speed Survey | $12: 10 \mathrm{PM}$ | Speed Justification |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 21 mph | CLOSEST TO 85TH SPEED |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 25 mph |  |  |
| Average Speed | 22 mph |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | $16-25$ |  | Recommended Speed Limit |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 88 |  |  |
| Number of Survey Samples | 67 |  |  |

## COLLISION HISTORY

Number of Years Studied 3 years
Total Collisions 0
Statewide Average Collision Rate
Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles
1.60 Collisions/MVM
0.00 Collisions/MVM

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic |  | $911 \quad$ Date Counted |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes |  | 2 LANES + BIKE LANES |
| Type of Traffic Control |  | STOP @ HARVESTON DR, YIELD @ VILLAGE RD |
|  |  | @STOP |
| Crosswalks? | MODERATE |  |
| Pedestrian Traffic | LIGHT |  |
| Truck Traffic | NONE |  |
| On-Street Parking | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Sidewalks? | NONE |  |
| Driveways? |  |  |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.060 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 44 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | NO |  |
| Visibility | GOOD |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL, SCHOOL |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).



## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.240 miles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 42 feet |
| Vertical Curve? | NO |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |
| Visibility | GOOD |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL, PARK |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS

CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

STREET Vail Ranch Parkway
FROM Nighthawk Pass

CERTIFICATION DATE
11/17/2021
TO Harmony Lane / Terzich Drive

## SPEED FACTORS

| Date of Speed Survey | $7 / 14 / 2021$ | Posted Speed Limit | 45 mph |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Time of Speed Survey | $2: 55 \mathrm{PM}$ | Speed Justification |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 35 mph | CLOSEST TO 85TH SPEED |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 40 mph |  |  |
| Average Speed | 35 mph |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | $31-40$ |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 78 | Recommended Speed Limit | 40 mph |
| Number of Survey Samples | 240 |  |  |

COLLISION HISTORY

| Number of Years Studied | 3 | years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Collisions | 0 |  |
| Statewide Average Collision Rate | 1.60 | Collisions/MVM |
| Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles | 0.00 | Collisions/MVM |

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

Average Daily Traffic
Number of Lanes
Type of Traffic Control
Crosswalks?
Pedestrian Traffic
Truck Traffic
On-Street Parking
Sidewalks?
Driveways?

5,629 Date Counted 7/13/2021
2 LANES + MEDIAN + BIKE LANES
TS @ NIGHTHAWK PASS, STOP @ CAMINO PIEDRA ROJO, HARMONY LN
@ TS, @ STOP AND CAMINO RUBANO
LIGHT
LIGHT
NONE
BOTH SIDES
NONE

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.760 miles |
| :--- | :--- |
| Width | 82 feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |
| Visibility | FAIR |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES + MEDIAN |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL, PARK |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

STREET Vail Ranch Parkway
FROM Harmony Lane / Terzich Drive

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Redhawk Parkway

## SPEED FACTORS

| Date of Speed Survey | $7 / 14 / 2021$ | Posted Speed Limit | 45 mph |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Time of Speed Survey | $1: 50 \mathrm{PM}$ | Speed Justification <br> Spe |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 35 mph | CLOSEST TO 85TH SPEED |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 39 mph |  |  |
| Average Speed | 35 mph |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | $30-39$ |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 85 | Recommended Speed Limit | 40 mph |
| Number of Survey Samples | 225 |  |  |

COLLISION HISTORY

| Number of Years Studied | 3 | years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Collisions | 0 |  |
| Statewide Average Collision Rate | 1.60 | Collisions/MVM |
| Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles | 0.00 | Collisions/MVM |

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic | $4,429 \quad 7 / 13 / 2021$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes | 2 LANES + MEDIAN + BIKE LANES Counted |
| Type of Traffic Control | TS @ REDHAWK PKWY, STOP @ HARMONY LN, |
|  |  |
| Crosswalks? | @ TS AND @STOP |
| Pedestrian Traffic | LIGHT |
| Truck Traffic | LGIHT |
| On-Street Parking | NONE |
| Sidewalks? | BOTH SIDES |
| Driveways? | NONE |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.590 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 82 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | GOOD |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | BOTH SIDES + MEDIAN |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

$\begin{array}{ll}\begin{array}{l}\text { STREET }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Via No } \\ \text { FROM }\end{array} \\ \text { Solana }\end{array}$
Date of Speed Survey
Time of Speed Survey
50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed)
85th Percentile Speed
Average Speed
10 mph Pace Speed
Percentage of Vehicles in Pace
Number of Survey Samples

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Del Rey Road

COLLISION HISTORY

| Number of Years Studied | 3 | years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Collisions | 0 |  |
| Statewide Average Collision Rate | 1.60 | Collisions/MVM |
| Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles | 0.00 | Collisions/MVM |

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic | 849 | Date Counted |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes | 2 LANES |  |
| Type of Traffic Control | STOP @ VIA SOLANA WAY, DEL REY RD |  |
|  |  |  |
| Crosswalks? | NONE |  |
| Pedestrian Traffic | LIGHT |  |
| Truck Traffic | LIGHT |  |
| On-Street Parking | BOTH SIDES |  |
| Sidewalks? | NONE |  |
| Driveways? | BOTH SIDES |  |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.350 | miles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 36 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | FAIR |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | NONE |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |  |

Field Study By BC Checked By NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

STREET Via Norte
FROM Del Rey Road

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Calle Pina Colada (N)

## SPEED FACTORS

Date of Speed Survey
Time of Speed Survey
50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed)
85th Percentile Speed
Average Speed
10 mph Pace Speed
Percentage of Vehicles in Pace
Number of Survey Samples

10/21/2021
11:03 AM
32 mph
36 mph
32 mph
29-38

COLLISION HISTORY

| Number of Years Studied | 3 | years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Collisions | 0 |  |
| Statewide Average Collision Rate | 1.60 | Collisions/MVM |
| Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles | 0.00 | Collisions/MVM |

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

Average Daily Traffic
Number of Lanes
Type of Traffic Control
Crosswalks?
Pedestrian Traffic
Truck Traffic
On-Street Parking
Sidewalks?
Driveways?

| 2,092 | Date Counted | $7 / 13 / 2021$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 LANES |  |  |
| STOP @ DEL REY RD, CALLE PINA COLADA |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| NONE |  |  |
| LIGHT |  |  |
| LIGHT |  |  |
| BOTH SIDES |  |  |
| NONE |  |  |
| BOTH SIDES |  |  |

Posted Speed Limit
30 mph Speed Justification

UNIFORMITY W/ ADJ. SEG., HIDDEN DWYS

Recommended Speed Limit
30 mph

# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

STREET Via Norte
FROM Calle Pina Colada

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Avenida Centenario

## SPEED FACTORS

| Date of Speed Survey | $7 / 22 / 2021$ | Posted Speed Limit | 35 mph |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Time of Speed Survey | $11: 41 \mathrm{AM}$ | Speed Justification |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 33 mph | CLOSEST TO 85TH SPEED |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 37 mph |  |  |
| Average Speed | 33 mph |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | $28-37$ |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 75 | Recommended Speed Limit | 35 mph |
| Number of Survey Samples | 104 |  |  |

## COLLISION HISTORY

Number of Years Studied 3 years
Total Collisions 0

Statewide Average Collision Rate
1.60 Collisions/MVM

Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles
0.00 Collisions/MVM

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

Average Daily Traffic
Number of Lanes
Type of Traffic Control
Crosswalks?
Pedestrian Traffic
Truck Traffic
On-Street Parking
Sidewalks?
Driveways?

1,720 Date Counted 7/13/2021
2 LANES
STOP @ CALLE PINA COLADA,
NONE
LIGHT
LIGHT
BOTH SIDES
NONE
BOTH SIDES

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 1.060 miles |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 36 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | FAIR |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | NONE |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |  |

Field Study By BC
Checked By
NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


# CITY OF TEMECULA <br> ENGINEERING AND TRAFFIC SURVEY 

STREET Via Norte
FROM Avenida Centenario

CERTIFICATION DATE 11/17/2021
TO Avenida Del Reposo

SPEED FACTORS

| Date of Speed Survey | $7 / 22 / 2021$ | Posted Speed Limit | 35 mph |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Time of Speed Survey | $10: 15 \mathrm{AM}$ | Speed Justification |  |
| 50th Percentile Speed (Mean Speed) | 30 mph | CLOSEST TO 85TH SPEED |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 35 mph |  |  |
| Average Speed | 30 mph |  |  |
| 10 mph Pace Speed | $26-35$ |  | Recommended Speed Limit |
| Percentage of Vehicles in Pace | 71 |  | mph |
| Number of Survey Samples | 102 |  |  |

COLLISION HISTORY

| Number of Years Studied | 3 | years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Collisions | 0 |  |
| Statewide Average Collision Rate | 1.60 | Collisions/MVM |
| Collisions per Million Vehicle Miles | 0.00 | Collisions/MVM |

## TRAFFIC FACTORS

| Average Daily Traffic | 852 | Date Counted | $7 / 13 / 2021$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes |  | 2 LANES |  |
| Type of Traffic Control |  | STOP @ AVENIDA DEL REPOSO |  |
|  |  | NONE |  |
| Crosswalks? | LIGHT |  |  |
| Pedestrian Traffic | LIGHT |  |  |
| Truck Traffic | BOTH SIDES |  |  |
| On-Street Parking | NONE |  |  |
| Sidewalks? | BOTH SIDES |  |  |
| Driveways? |  |  |  |

## ROADWAY FACTORS

| Length of Segment | 0.820 | miles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Width | 36 | feet |
| Vertical Curve? | YES |  |
| Horizontal Curve? | YES |  |
| Visibility | FAIR |  |
| Roadway Conditions | GOOD |  |
| Lighting | NONE |  |
| Adjacent Land Use | RESIDENTIAL |  |

Field Study By BC
Checked By
NS
CERTIFICATION: I, Nicolle Spann, do hereby certify that this Engineering and Traffic Survey within the City of Temecula was performed under my supervision and is accurate and complete. I am duly registered in the State of California as a Professional Engineer (Traffic).


## APPENDIX B Radar Speed Distribution Forms









































## APPENDIX C Survey Equipment

## SURVEY EQUIPMENT USED

The radar equipment used by City Traffic Counters to collect speed measurements for this survey was a Stalker-II SDR Model Hand-Held Traffic Radar and a Stalker-ATR Model Hand-Held Traffic Radar both manufactured by Applied Concepts of Plano, Texas. The calibration of each unit was checked before each series of measurements were taken. Tests of the units were conducted in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. The Stalker-II SDR Hand-Held Traffic Radar and Stalker-ATR Model Hand-Held Traffic Radar were last calibrated on January 15, 2019 by RHF Inc.

16202 Keats Circle
Westminster, Calif. 92683

TRAFFIC RADAR CERTIFICATION
TESTED TO NHTSA SPECIFICATIONS / IACP CRITICAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (NHTSA) National Highway and Traffic Safety Administration. (IACP) International Association of Chiefs of Police.
R.H.F. is a certified independent testing and repair facility.


16202 Keats Circle
Westminster, Calif. 92683

## TRAFFIC RADAR CERTIFICATION

TESTED TO NHTSA SPECIFICATIONS / IACP CRITICAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
(NHTSA) National Highway and Traffic Safety Administration. (IACP) International Association of Chiefs of Police.
R.H.F. is a certified independent testing and repair facility.



Willdan Engineering
13191 Crossroads Pkwy N Suite 405
City of Industry, CA 91746
562.908.6200


[^0]:    * See "Segments with Special Conditions" Section for Comments
    *** Accident rate units: Collisions per One Million Vehicle Miles
    ** 25 mph when children are present

[^1]:    * See "Segments with Special Conditions" Section for Comments
    ** 25 mph when children are present

[^2]:    * See "Segments with Special Conditions" Section for Comments
    *** Accident rate units: Collisions per One Million Vehicle Miles
    ** 25 mph when children are present

[^3]:    * See "Segments with Special Conditions" Section for Comments
    *** Accident rate units: Collisions per One Million Vehicle Miles
    ** 25 mph when children are present

