

September 3, 2015

Jeff Naess  
Bowman & Williams Consulting Civil Engineers  
1011 Cedar Street  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

**Re: Dunslee Way Development Traffic Impact Analysis,  
Scotts Valley, California – Peer Review**

Dear Jeff:

Hatch Mott MacDonald (HMM) has prepared a peer review of the April 2015 traffic impact analysis report by TJKM Transportation Consultants (TJKM) for the proposed Dunslee Way development project at Dunslee Way and Scotts Valley Drive in Scotts Valley, California. The City of Scotts Valley has requested a peer review of this report. This letter summarizes our review.

#### **A. Peer Review Comments**

In general, the TJKM report is thorough and comprehensive with respect to the size of the project and its location, and is largely consistent with the City's traffic study guidelines. The analysis summarized within the report is also sound, and we generally agree with its conclusions. However, there are a few issues that would require further clarification or revision. Below is a summary of these issues:

1. Page 6, Level of Service Standard: The TJKM traffic impact analysis correctly states that the level of service standard for the City of Scotts Valley is “the transition between LOS C and LOS D on street facilities.” However, the report erroneously concludes that this means LOS D conditions are acceptable throughout the city. In fact, the word “transition” in this case refers to the border of LOS C and LOS D, not LOS D conditions. Although this change would not result in any changes to the report conclusions, it is still recommended that the traffic impact analysis be revised to reflect the correct level of service standard.
2. Page 6, Criteria of Significance: The Criteria of Significance section should be revised to reflect the following:
  - a. The report incorrectly characterizes which scenarios would be compared when evaluating if a project would have a significant impact. A significant impact would occur when comparing scenarios that include and exclude the study project, such as Existing Plus Project and Existing conditions. However, the report erroneously says that a significant impact would occur only when comparing Cumulative and Existing conditions. This is also inconsistent with the way that the criteria of significance was applied later in the report. The report should be revised accordingly.
  - b. “Acceptable conditions” should be revised to note that that LOS C is acceptable, not LOS D, and LOS D should be added to the “unacceptable conditions”.

- c. The criteria of significance for unsignalized intersections should be revised to note that a significant impact would not occur unless an intersection's traffic volumes also meet the peak hour signal warrant.
3. Figures 1, 3-9, Volume and Lane Configuration Exhibits: The following modifications should be made to these figures:
  - a. Near Granite Creek Road, the exhibits erroneously labels "Scotts Valley Drive" as "Scotts Valley Road."
  - b. Granite Creek Road is depicted as passing underneath State Route 17, when, in fact, it travels over the freeway.
  - c. The location of the project site should be added to these exhibits.
4. Page 11, Figure 4, Trip Distribution: The trip distribution on Scotts Valley Drive north of Granite Creek Road is noted as 45%. Presumably this large distribution percentage reflects Scotts Valley Drive south of Granite Creek Road, as likely most of this distribution is bound for State Route 17 and there are few major destinations located off of Scotts Valley Road north of Granite Creek Road that would attract traffic to and from the proposed project. The location of this percentage should be checked and modified if necessary.
5. Page 12, 17, and 21, Impact Significance Evaluation: Under all of the "Plus Project" scenarios evaluated (i.e. Existing Plus Project, Background Plus Project and Cumulative Plus Project), the project concluded that as the peak hour signal warrant was not met, the project did not represent a significant impact at the Scotts Valley Drive / Victor Square intersection. However, as noted earlier, the report did not include meeting the signal warrant as one of the criteria of significance on Page 6. As noted earlier, the criteria of significance description on Page 6 should be modified to be consistent with what was actually used within the report.
6. Appendix J, Signal Warrant Evaluation: For the signal warrant analysis, only a part of the peak hour signal warrant was prepared at the Scotts Valley Drive / Victor Square intersection. In addition to a peak-hour volume warrant, the 2014 California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD) also includes a peak-hour delay warrant, and states that a traffic signal is warranted if either the volume-based or delay-based warrant is met. The delay-based warrant should also be evaluated under all scenarios where the volume-based peak hour warrant was evaluated.



Hatch Mott  
MacDonald

**B. Conclusion**

If you have any questions regarding the contents of this peer review or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Jeff Waller or me at your convenience. Thank you for the opportunity to assist you with this project.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "L. Trujillo".

Leo Trujillo, PE, TE  
Principal Engineer  
T 408.848.5263 F 408.848.2202  
leo.trujillo@hatchmott.com

jt:jmw  
enclosures