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INTRODUCTION TO THE TRANSPORTATION CONCEPT REPORT

What is a Transportation Concept Report?

The Transportation Concept Report (TCR) is a long-term planning document that each Caltrans district prepares for every State highway, or portion thereof, in its jurisdiction, and is where long-range corridor planning in Caltrans usually begins. The purpose of a TCR is to determine how a highway will be developed and managed so that it delivers the targeted level of service (LOS) and quality of operations that are feasible to attain over a twenty-year period as indicated in the route concept.

The concept facility will provide the amount of vehicle-carrying capacity necessary to achieve the concept LOS and, in some cases, people-carrying capacity will also be incorporated. Auxiliary lanes are not considered a part of the mainline roadway and, therefore, are not included in the number of travel lanes indicated in a concept.

In addition to the 20-year route concept, the TCR includes an ultimate concept, which is the ultimate goal for the route beyond the twenty-year planning horizon. Ultimate concepts must be used cautiously however, because unforeseen changes in land use and other variables make forecasting beyond twenty years difficult.

How does the TCR fit in with local and regional planning efforts?

As owner/operator of the State highway system, Caltrans establishes a long-range vision for its highways and determine overall strategies for their management. This is achieved by taking into consideration the numerous factors encompassed in the human and natural environments in which a particular route exists. During development of a TCR, Caltrans’ objective is to have local, regional, private sector, and State consensus on corridor concepts, planning strategies, and improvement priorities.

State highways within each local jurisdiction should be recognized and included in the circulation element of the general plan. The jurisdiction should also adopt the concept LOS standard (the minimum level or quality of operations that is appropriate for each route segment and is considered to be reasonably attainable within the 20-year planning period) indicated in the TCR, along with the concept improvements described in the TCR as necessary to meet the concept LOS. The jurisdiction has the option of adopting a higher LOS standard and acknowledging the inconsistency with the TCR and the associated funding participation limitations by the State for State highway improvements. Typical concept LOS standards in District 10 are LOS C in rural areas and LOS D in urban areas.

Does the TCR have to be read from cover to cover in order to get pertinent information about a route segment?

Caltrans does not intend for TCRs to be read from cover to cover as one would read a book. Rather, the TCR is a reference document with segment-specific information presented in a concise and readable format that allows the user to easily access, in one place in the document, all the necessary data and information that pertains to a particular segment of the route.

This format creates a certain amount of repetition in the TCR, as the route is divided into segments for analysis. Each segment’s Fact Sheet contains a variety of technical, statistical, cultural, environmental and other useful information that provide a deeper understanding of the route and a context for the concepts developed for it.

TCRs also include estimated right-of-way widths, and a scan of environmental resources and issues known to exist in the vicinity of the highway. Right-of-way and environmental information provided in a TCR are relative to the route or route segment and are not to be considered project specific. Precise right-of-way needs and environmental resources cannot be defined until the appropriate environmental and engineering studies are completed.

In the back of the TCR is a glossary of terms and acronyms used for this report.

Concept Improvements

The range of improvements available to achieve a route concept is heavily influenced by environmental, political, and fiscal conditions. In many areas, planned projects are subject to meeting air quality conformity standards. Unanticipated safety projects and routine roadway maintenance are not included in route concept improvements, although both will occur throughout the corridor as needed.

Because a highway is but one part of an interconnected transportation network, District 10 takes a corridor approach to developing TCRs. The corridor may include additional transportation systems, such as bus or rail transit service, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, heavy rail, ports, airports, interregional bus service, local roadways, and facilities for neighborhood electric vehicles, used occasionally by older citizens for local mobility. All of these systems reduce excess highway demand by providing travelers and shippers of goods with non-highway or non-driving options. Expansion of those that can provide a notable improvement to mobility within the corridor are included as concept improvements.

Where a LOS is ‘F’, the TCR recommends general operational improvements and alternate modes of travel as starting places for further study. However, because the number of route segments with a concept LOS ‘F’ is expected to increase, operational (that is, non-capacity-increasing) improvements are now the primary strategy for optimizing the operation of the existing highway infrastructure. To fully integrate this strategy, future TCRs will include an operational analysis of heavily-congested urban route segments. The results of this analysis will determine which specific operational improvements will become concept improvements.

District 10 strives to improve the quality and usefulness of its TCRs. Future updates will be expanded to include performance measures and, if available, plans that help incorporate specific, context-sensitive features into highway projects.
The TCR provides long range system planning for highways, and identifies the potential future need for capacity increasing improvements. Employing Highway Capacity Manual (HCM 2000) methodologies, the TCR projects current traffic volumes twenty years into the future and compares future outcomes with the current facility and concept LOS, recommends future concept facilities, and defines the Ultimate Transportation Corridor (UTC) needed for the preservation of future right of way beyond its twenty year planning horizon.

Throughout its full extent, State Route (SR) 88 is on the Interregional Road System (IRRS), but is not included as either a High Emphasis Route or a Focus Route. The concept LOS standard for facilities with the IRRS designation in District 10 is ‘C’ for rural and ‘D’ for urban.

The Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) has functionally classified SR-88 as an Other Principal Arterial and is on the Federal Highway System (FHS) from its intersection with SR-99 through to its terminus at the Nevada Stateline. SR-88 is not a part of the strategic highway network. SR-88 is a Terminal Access route consistent with the Surface Transportation Assistance Act’s provisions throughout much of its length. SR-88 is both pedestrian and bicycle accessible, and is designated and considered eligible for State or federal scenic highway status along portions of the route.

Current and future LOS for SR-88 are deficient in San Joaquin and Amador Counties. The concept facility required to address these deficiencies include a four lane expressway on new or existing alignments, except for towns where restricted right of way and commercial access would dictate a four lane conventional highway on the existing alignment. Throughout both Amador and San Joaquin Counties, many of the deficient segments occur in mountainous or rolling terrain, and attaining concept LOS can be likely achieved with operational improvements. Planned or programmed projects to meet these deficiencies are identified in the county discussion.

Initial planning documents do not consider costs, design, or prioritization, and are subject to refinement and revision as better information or methods become available. The information provided reflects best practices and do not necessarily constitute standards, specifications, or regulations. Every effort has been made by the District 10 Planning Division to ensure the accuracy and precision of the data presented.
San Joaquin County, in the guise of Stockton, has historically been the commercial and industrial hub of the Northern San Joaquin Valley. Roads and later railroad lines generally radiated outwards to the east and south, avoiding the numerous waterways of the Delta, to connect to the various mining towns of the Mother Lode, and agricultural towns of the Valley. The Delta provided water transport connection with the San Francisco Bay. Many of the routes involved in the past transport of primary goods (food, metal ore, and timber) became state highways as was the case with SR-88.

Thirteen segments of SR-88 in San Joaquin County (SJ-88) were analyzed. These divisions follow considerations of changes in traffic volume, its composition, or its flow; a change in the number of lanes; whether the segment was urban or rural; and, changes in transportation planning or land use planning agency. This method deviates from that suggested in HCM (2000), but provides for a more concise characterization for the need for capacity increases, verses operation improvements generally beyond this document’s scope.

For California, LOS traditionally measured highway performance, though once a highway segment approaches or exceeds LOS ‘F’, other performance measures may be employed. To characterize LOS, two software applications were employed—Highway Capacity Software (HCS) and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) transportation applications also known as LOSPLAN (packaged together under the McTrans HCS trademark). Unique differences in application of the two programs to SJ-88 in determining a segment’s LOS need to be considered when those determinations differ. Where discrepancies arose, determinations obtained with the FDOT models were considered closer to present or future conditions.

Application of HCS (version 5.4) consistent with HCM (2000) employed the Two Lane Highway option. At the time of analysis, the Urban Streets module was unavailable, precluding analysis of interrupted flow conditions. Supplementing HCS, analysis was performed using the FDOT’s HIGHPLAN and ARTPLAN. HIGHPLAN and HCS typically provide equivalent results and serve as a useful means to assess modeling errors. HIGHPLAN has unique features making it better amenable to analyze features of segments with two way left turn lanes (three lane or five lane conventional highways), which are characteristic of three of the segments considered. HCS permits analysis of passing lanes as operational improvements in lieu of capacity increasing improvements, but distances between intersections and numerous access points violate the expressway design standards presumed in the application. With this in mind, the passing lane analysis was not employed though several segments east of the Eight Mile Road intersection would appear amenable to evaluation.

ARTPLAN best characterizes the performance of segments subject to interrupted flow. Interrupted flow generally results from closely spaced traffic signals with low speed limits, and heavy traffic volumes both on the main line and the cross street. These conditions generally will produce an LOS of ‘F’ due to their traffic volumes exceeding the road’s capacity. Segment nine (Jack Tone Road to Elliot and Tully Roads) was assessed with ARTPLAN, while segments five and six (Eight Mile Road to Harney Lane; and, Harney Lane to Kettelman Lane) were assessed employing both HIGHPLAN and ARTPLAN.

Over the past fifteen years, the number of signalized intersections on SJ-88 has increased from one (Eight Mile Road) to six (with the addition of Alpine Road, Harney Lane, Kettelman Lane, SR-12W, Elliot/Tully Roads, and SR-12E). The result has been overall improvement of intersection operations at the expense of segment operations. At lower volumes, the segments with signals at both ends show uninterrupted traffic flow, consistent with meeting the needs for interregional commutes from Calaveras, and Amador Counties; but with increasing traffic volumes appear to shift to interrupted flow, which better meet local transportation needs at the expense of regional travel. Although it appears unclear what percentage of peak hour commute traffic is interregional, the expected outcome has been increased travel time for trips originating outside of San Joaquin County. This change is most noticeable with analysis of segment six, but is expected to also affect segment five, and possibly segment seven (Kettelman Lane to SR-12 West --Victor Road) though this is not clear with present traffic projections. In the future, the number of signalized intersections on SJ-88 between Lockeford and Eight Mile Road will continue to increase, as further urbanization occurs.

Future forecast volumes were obtained through three linear projections, from twenty years previous to present, the local transportation planning jurisdiction’s travel demand model (TDM), and a twenty year state-wide growth projection from present. Comparison is made between the three projections for consistency, and may result in one projection being dropped, usually because it markedly overestimates or underestimates future growth compared to a transportation planning jurisdiction’s TDM.

SJ-88 serves three communities, Waterloo, Lockeford, and Clements. Past and current economic activities relied upon agriculture (nut crops and wines), though Lockeford was historically associated with river trade. The communities currently serve as suburban enclaves within the greater Stockton area, with residents working away from the community.

According to the 2010 census, more than a quarter of the inhabitants of Waterloo and Lockeford identified themselves as Latino (26.6%, and 29.6% compared to 38.9% for San Joaquin County and 32.4% for California), with all other racial categories under represented compared to State averages, save ‘white’. Median household income is below the state average, ($43,750 for Lockeford compared to $46,816 for California, 2000 Census) but greater than that for San Joaquin County as a whole ($41,282, 2000 Census).

General plans characterize and distribute future population density, and thus influence future traffic volumes. The San Joaquin County General Plan (2010) designates much of the adjoining properties along SJ-88 to rural residential, low density residential, and general agriculture designations. Within the twenty year planning horizon of this document, any traffic increase on SJ-88 will likely reflect growth outside the immediate corridor. Improvements along the facility will require upgrades on new alignments to expressway, but will retain conventional highway design features along existing alignments where access rights have not been acquired, consistent with SJ-88 being a component of the IRRS.

Few multimodal opportunities exist on SJ-88. The current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) includes one funded expansion of the bicycle network adjacent to the highway (RTP project # 2011-8009, which indicates the City of Stockton will construct a Class III bicycle lane along Eight Mile Road from I-5 to Jack Tone Road). Planned efforts include future construction of Class III bike lanes on Eight Mile Road, Live Oak Road, Harney Lane, Tully Road, and Liberty Road. No local transit service is provided along SJ-88, and there are no direct passenger rail or air travel links on the route.

SJ-88 has an important role in the interregional movement of goods and services between California and Nevada, its role is less pronounced in San Joaquin County, than in Alpine or Amador Counties. The primary route of goods.
transport runs along SJ-88 from Amador County to SR-12 East south of Lockeford, and moves outwards on SJ-12 West to SR-99, I-5 or the Bay Area. Although several warehouses and truck transport firms employ SJ-88 near SR-99, their location reflects access to SR-99 rather than deployment on SJ-88.

All highway segments, save segments one and two, are currently deficient, or will become so in the next twenty years. Review of the District 10 Status of Projects and the San Joaquin County Council of Government's (SJCOG) RTP (2011) indicates that no financially constrained or programmed projects exist to address the deficiency, but that a financially unconstrained project is included in the RTP to address the highway segments between SJ-12 West and the Amador County line (segments eight through thirteen) with the intention to install passing lanes (RTP, 2011, Project # 07-1037).
### SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 2

**State Route 88**

**Transportation Concept Report**

**San Joaquin County Council of Governments**

**Caltrans Department of Transportation District 10**

**Concept Level of Service:**
- 2030

**Ultimate Transportation Corridor:**
- Four lane expressway

**Comments:**

#### SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

**Segment Location:**
- Wilcox Road to Alpine Road

**Post Mile:**
- 0.400-3.210

**Functional Classification:**
- Principal Arterial

**Local Planning Jurisdiction:**
- San Joaquin County Council of Governments

**Number of Lanes:**
- Two

**Terrain:**
- Level Right of Way Width (ft.): 50

**Grade %:**
- N/A Shoulder Width (ft.): 8

**Accessible to Bicycles:**
- Yes Median Width (ft.): 10

**Bridge Needs:**
- Distressed Lane Miles: 2.87

**Facility Type:**
- N/A Present Serviceability Rating: 3

**Regional Planning Jurisdiction:**
- San Joaquin County Council of Governments

**Facility Type:**
- N/A

**Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Elements & Detection:**

**Post Mile ITS Element Status Direction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITS Element</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Mile</th>
<th>LOS Plan HCS</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Peak Hour Volume</th>
<th>Peak Hour Directional Split</th>
<th>Truck Volume % of Total ADT</th>
<th>Peak Hour % of Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 4.935</td>
<td>PM PM PM</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>70/30</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 5.18</td>
<td>PM PM PM</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>70/30</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 5.42</td>
<td>PM PM PM</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>70/30</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Travel Forecast Data**

- **Average Daily Traffic**: 6,600
- **Peak Hour Volume**: 640
- **Peak Hour Directional Split**: 70/30
- **Travel Forecast Data**: 2009

**Flood Plains**

- **Degree of Impact**: Moderate
- **Cultural Resources**: Moderate to High
- **Wetlands**: Moderate to High
- **Leaking Underground Tanks**: Low
- **Non-attainment Air Quality**: Ozone
- **Particulate Matter 10 m**: Non-attainment
- **Particulate Matter 2.5 m**: Non-attainment
- **Carbon Monoxide**: Non-attainment

**Existing Transportation Network**

- **Bridge Needs**: Distressed Lane Miles 0.97
- **Crossing Type**: Bridge Name: Calaveras River Bridge

**Programmed Projects**

- **Postmile**: 5.18
- **Location**: Calaveras River Bridge

**Concept Level of Service**

- **Concept Facility**: Four lane expressway on new alignment, four lane conventional on existing alignment
- **Overall Transportation Corridor**: Four lane expressway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Mile</th>
<th>ITS Element</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bridge Needs**

- **Distressed Lane Miles**: 0.97

**Comments**

- This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.

**Environmental Status**

- **Degree of Impact**: Moderate
- **Cultural Resources**: Moderate to High
- **Wetlands**: Moderate to High
- **Leaking Underground Tanks**: Low
- **Non-attainment Air Quality**: Ozone
- **Particulate Matter 10 m**: Non-attainment
- **Particulate Matter 2.5 m**: Non-attainment
- **Carbon Monoxide**: Non-attainment

**Existing Transportation Network**

- **Bridge Needs**: Distressed Lane Miles 0.97
- **Crossing Type**: Bridge Name: Calaveras River Bridge

**Programmed Projects**

- **Postmile**: 5.18
- **Location**: Calaveras River Bridge

**Concept Level of Service**

- **Concept Facility**: Four lane expressway on new alignment, four lane conventional on existing alignment
- **Overall Transportation Corridor**: Four lane expressway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Mile</th>
<th>ITS Element</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bridge Needs**

- **Distressed Lane Miles**: 0.97

**Comments**

- This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
## SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 5

### STATE ROUTE 88

#### TRANSPORTATION CONCEPT REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route Designation</td>
<td>SEGMENT 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Eight Mile Road to Harney Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Mile</td>
<td>5.518-9.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Urban/Urbanized</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>3.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro City Limits</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Planning Jurisdiction</td>
<td>San Joaquin County Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agency/Entity</td>
<td>San Joaquin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification (Nondesignated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width (ft.)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Width (ft.)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width (ft.)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Width (ft.)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Needs</td>
<td>Disinterested Lane Miles 4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
<td>Scenic Highway (Designated): No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type</td>
<td>Scenic Highway (Eligible): No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional Road System</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Emphasis Route</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Network, Terminal Access</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Route Gateway Route</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Access</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Expressway System</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Highway Network</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Agreement</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal Freight Facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Service</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Sled Traffic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Legal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Army National Guard</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Intermodal Freight Facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location On Route</td>
<td>0.43, 0.51, 0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>PM, PM, PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Projects</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Replace rail at Calaveras River, Mosher Slough, Bear Creek, and Bear Creek Overflow Bridges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roadway Information

- **Post Mile**: 5.518-9.610
- **Rural/Urban/Urbanized**: Rural
- **Length**: 3.092
- **Metro City Limits**: No
- **Functional Classification**: Principal Arterial

#### Local Planning Jurisdiction

- **Number of Lanes**: Two
- **Lane Width (ft.)**: 12
- **Right of Way Width (ft.)**: 32
- **Shoulder Width (ft.)**: 4
- **Median Width (ft.)**: N/A

#### Bridge Needs

- **Distressed Lane Miles**: 4.75

### Functional Classification

- **Principal Arterial**
- **Scenic Highway (Designated)**: No
- **Scenic Highway (Eligible)**: No

### Interregional Road System

- **Yes**

### High Emphasis Route

- **No**

### National Network, Terminal Access

- **Yes**

### National Highway System

- **Yes**

### Freeway Expressway System

- **Yes**

### Strategic Highway Network

- **No**

### Freeway Agreement

- **No**

### Intermodal Freight Facility

- **No**

### Level of Service

- **PM**

### Type of Service

- **Four lane conventional**

### Year

- **2009, 2010, 2020**

### LOS

- **Level of Service (LOS)**: PM 1.01/2.3 6.090/8.900

### Peak Hour Volume

- **915**

### Peak Hour Directional Split

- **70% to 30%**

### Truck Volume % of Total ADT

- **7.4%**

### Peak Hour % of Trucks

- **5.9%**

### Peak Hour % of Congestion

- **5.9%**

### Peak Hour % of Bottlenecks

- **5.9%**

### Post Mile

- **5.518**

### Location

- **Mosher Slough, Bear Creek, and Bear Creek Overflow Bridges**

### Description

- **Replace rail at Calaveras River, Mosher Slough, Bear Creek, and Bear Creek Overflow Bridges**

### Comments

- **Mosher Slough, Bear Creek, and Bear Creek Overflow Bridges**

### Bicycle Facility

- **Yes**

### Airports

- **Yes**

### Pedestrian Facility

- **Yes**

### Freight Distribution

- **Yes**

### Transit Bus

- **No**

### Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA)

- **Yes**

### California Legal

- **Yes**

### California Army National Guard

- **No**

### Environmental Status

- **Low**

### Flood Plains

- **High**

### Cultural Resources

- **No**

### Wetlands

- **No**

### Leaking Underground Tanks

- **Low**

### Special Status Species

- **No**

### Possible Hazardous Waste

- **No**

### Air Quality

- **Non-attainment**

### Ozone

- **Non-attainment**

### Particulate Matter 10 m

- **Non-attainment**

### Carbon Monoxide

- **Attainment**

### Note

- This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.

---

**Travel Forecast Data**

- **Peak Hour % of Trucks**: 5.9
- **Peak Hour Directional Split**: 70/30
- **Peak Hour Volume**: 915
- **Peak Hour % of Congestion**: 5.9
- **Peak Hour % of Bottlenecks**: 5.9

---

**Bicycle Facility**

- **Yes**

**Airports**

- **Yes**

**Pedestrian Facility**

- **Yes**

**Freight Distribution**

- **Yes**

**Transit Bus**

- **No**

---

**Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA)**

- **Yes**

**California Legal**

- **Yes**

**California Army National Guard**

- **No**

---

**Environmental Status**

- **Low**

**Flood Plains**

- **High**

**Cultural Resources**

- **No**

**Wetlands**

- **No**

**Leaking Underground Tanks**

- **Low**

**Special Status Species**

- **No**

**Possible Hazardous Waste**

- **No**

---

**Air Quality**

- **Non-attainment**

**Ozone**

- **Non-attainment**

**Particulate Matter 10 m**

- **Non-attainment**

**Carbon Monoxide**

- **Attainment**

---

**Note**: This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
### San Joaquin County - Segment 6

#### State Route 88

**Description:**  
Harney Lane to Kettleman Lane

**Post Mile:**  
9.610-10.650

**Length:**  
1.041

**Number of Lanes:**  
Two

**Level Right of Way Width (ft.):**  
36

**Shoulder Width (ft.):**  
0

**Median Width (ft.):**  
N/A

**Distressed Lane Miles:**  
3.30

**Principal Arterial:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Mile</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Designated</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Access to Intermodal Freight Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.610</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.620</td>
<td>0.79/1.64</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.320</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 - 2030 Travel Forecast Data:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Daily Traffic (ADT)</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>10,650</td>
<td>Two lane conventional highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>13,858</td>
<td>Two lane conventional highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>17,622</td>
<td>Two lane conventional highway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peak Hour % of Trucks:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peak Hour Volume:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume/Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peak Hour Directional Split:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>70/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>70/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>70/30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of Service (LOS):**

- PM 9.610-10.650: LOS Plan HCS PM II

**Bicycle Facility:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Urban/Urbanized</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Quality:**

- Sulfur Dioxide: Non-attainment
- Carbon Monoxide: Non-attainment
- Lead: Non-attainment
- Particulate Matter 10 m: Non-attainment
- Particulate Matter 2.5 m: Non-attainment
- Hydrocarbons: Non-attainment
- Oxides of Nitrogen: Non-attainment

**Pedestrian Facility:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Distribution</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Bus</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Elements & Detection:**

- There are no programmed projects for this segment

**Ultimate Transportation Corridor:**

- Four Lane Expressway on new alignment, four lane conventional on existing alignment

**Programmed Projects:**

## San Joaquin County Factsheets - Segment 7

### State Route 88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Kettleman Lane to JCT SR 88/12 W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Mile</td>
<td>10.650-12.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Urban/Agricultural</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Local Planning Jurisdiction: San Joaquin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Width (ft.)</td>
<td>Other Agency/Entity: San Joaquin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width (ft.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Width (ft.)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed Lane Miles</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Servicability Rating</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to Bicycles</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Needs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Name</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge #</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Type</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Principal Arterial

| Two Lane Width (ft.) | 12 |
| Level Right of Way Width (ft.) | 32 |
| Shoulder Width (ft.) | 4 |
| Median Width (ft.) | N/A |

### Scenic Highway (Designated)

| Scenic Highway (Eligible) | N/A |

### Conventional Highway

| Conventional Highway | N/A |

### Ultimate Transportation Corridor:

| Four lane expressway on new alignment, four lane conventional on existing alignment |

## Transportation Concept Report

### Post Mile Location Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Kettleman Lane to JCT SR 88/12 W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Mile</td>
<td>10.650-12.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>12.2/19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>5.1/12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bicycle Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle Facility</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to Bicycles</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Volume</td>
<td>PM 1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Location on Route</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pedestrian Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian Facility</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Intermodal Freight Facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Bus Stop</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ITS elements present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transit Bus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Bus</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Intermodal Freight Facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Bus Stop</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Status</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands: Leaking Underground Tanks:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Status Species:</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Hazardous Waste:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Projects</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Projects</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Intermodal Freight Facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Bus Stop</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Route 88 Transportation Concept Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Mile Location Description</th>
<th>Kettleman Lane to JCT SR 88/12 W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Mile</td>
<td>10.650-12.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>12.2/19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>5.1/12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITS Element</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Intermodal Freight Facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Bus Stop</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

- This information is for overview purposes only and does not reflect a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 8

State Route 88 Transportation Concept Report

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

Description: As SR-33 SR-12 W to Jack Tone Road
Post Mile: 12.240-13.000
Length: 1.360
Functional Classification: Principal Arterial
Local Planning Jurisdiction: San Joaquin County
Other Agency/Entity: San Joaquin County

San Joaquin SR-88 Segment 8

Post Mile: 12.240-13.000
Length: 1.360
Functional Classification: Principal Arterial
Local Planning Jurisdiction: San Joaquin County
Other Agency/Entity: San Joaquin County

Principal Arterial Two Lane Width (ft.): 12
Level Right of Way Width (ft.): 28
Shoulder Width (ft.): 2
Median Width (ft.): 0
Bridge Needs: Distressed Lane Miles 1.32

LOS: C

Bicycle Facility

Airports

Intermodal Container Terminals

Intermodal Freight Facilities

Pedestrian Facility

Park and Ride

Freight Distribution

Transit Bus

Level of Service (LOS) calculated using Highway Capacity Software (HCS+) and Florida Department of Transportation HIGHPLAN 2009 Multilane and Two-Lane Highway Level of Service. Analysis for Conceptual Planning and Preliminary Engineering Version Date 11/17/2010. All LOS reflects vehicles only. LOS does not reflect multi-modal at this time.

Concept Level of Service: C
Concept Facility: 2010
Ultimate Transportation Corridor: Four lane expressway on new alignment, four lane conventional on existing alignment

Comments:

Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)/PAM & substitute

Post Mile: 12.240-13.000
Description: SF 33 and SR-12 Corridor

There are no programmed projects for this segment

Programmed Projects

Note: This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right-of-Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.

Comments:
San Joaquin County Segment 9

Description: Jack Tone Road to Elliot/Tully Roads
Post Mile: 13.600-14.080
Length: 0.480
Functional Classification: Principal Arterial
Local Planning Jurisdiction: San Joaquin County
Other Agency/Entity

Number of Lanes: Two
Terrain: Level
Grade %: N/A
Shoulder Width (ft.): N/A
Access to Bicycles: Yes
Bike Needs: Distressed Lane Miles 0.00

No ITS elements present

No programmed projects for this segment

There are no programmed projects for this segment

Post Mile: 12.2/19.2
Concept Facility: South to east

Comments:
### SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 10

**Description:** E263/1/46. Roads in San Joaquin County

**Post Mile:** 14.060-16.270

**Segment Location:** Rural

**Functional Classification:** Principal Arterial

**Other Agency/Entity:** San Joaquin County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Lanes:</th>
<th>Lane Width (ft.):</th>
<th>Right of Way Width (ft.):</th>
<th>Shoulder Width (ft.):</th>
<th>Median Width (ft.):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bridge Needs:**
- Distressed Lane Miles: 0.00
- Present Serviceability Rating: 3

**Principal Arterial**
- Scenic Highway (Designated): No
- Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes

**Highway Traffic:**
- Post Mile
  - 14.080-16.270
  - 2.190

**Profile:**
- Present Serviceability Rating: 3

**Facility Type:**
- Conventional Highway
- Trucking Network

**Peak Hour Volume:**
- PM: 1,575
- PM: 1,800
- PM: 2,300

**Peak Hour Directional Split:**
- 70/30
- 70/30
- 70/30

**Truck Volume % of Total ADT:**
- 5.9
- 5.9
- 5.9

**Peak Hour % of Trucks:**
- PM: 5.9
- PM: 5.9
- PM: 5.9

**LOS Calculation:**
- Level of Service (LOS) calculated using Highway Capacity Software (HCS) and Florida Department of Transportation HighPLAN 2009 Multiline and Two-Lane Highway Level of Service. Analysis for Conceptual Planning and Preliminary Engineering Version Date: 7/17/2010. All LOS reflects vehicles only. LOS does not reflect multi-modal at this time.

**Ultra Transportation Corridor:**
- Four lane expressway on new alignment, four lane conventional on existing alignment

**Comments:**
- There are no programmed projects for this segment

---

**Note:** This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
### SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 11

**STATE ROUTE 88**

**TRANSPORTATION CONCEPT REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Mile</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Bike Lanes</th>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
<th>Access to Intermodal Freight Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM 16.270</td>
<td>Dead End to JCT SR-88 &amp; 12 E</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 19.174</td>
<td>To Jackson</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Local Planning Jurisdiction</td>
<td>San Joaquin County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Segment Location

- **Post Mile:** PM 16.270-19.174
- **River/Urban/Urbanized:** Rural
- **Shoulder Width:** 7

#### Functional Classification

- **Principal Arterial:** Yes
- **Scenic Highway (Designated):** No
- **Scenic Highway (Eligible):** No

#### Distance

- **Distressed Lane Miles:** 4.00

#### Lanes

- **Number of Lanes:** Two
- **Lane Width:** 12
- **Shoulder Width:** N/A
- **Median Width:** 12

#### Design

- **Level Right of Way Width:** 50
- **Shoulder Width:** N/A

#### Operations

- **Level of Service:** C

#### Planning

- **Concept Facility:** Four lane expressway on new alignment, four lane conventional on existing alignment
- **Ultimate Transportation Corridor:** Four lane expressway

#### Comments

- **Peak Hour % of Trucks:** 5.9 (PM), 7.4 (PM)
- **Peak Hour Volume:** 1,110 (PM), 1,500 (PM)
- **Level of Service (LOS):** Planned

---

**Note:** This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.

---

**Caltrans Department of Transportation District 10**

**State Route 88**

**Transportation Concept Report**

**SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 11**

**916/8097**

**5595**

**PM 16.270-19.174**

**2.904**

**Principal Arterial**

**Two Lane Width (ft.):** 12

**Level Right of Way Width (ft.):** 50

**Shoulder Width (ft.):** N/A

**Median Width (ft.):** 12

**Distressed Lane Miles:** 4.00

**Bridge Needs:** 3

**Bridge Name:** N/A

**Bridge Span:** N/A

**Bridge Type:** N/A

**Bridge Rating:** N/A

**Functional Classification:** Principal Arterial

**Semi Truck Highway (Designated):** No

**Semi Truck Highway (Eligible):** No

**High Emphasis Route:** No

**National Highway System:** Yes

**Freeway Expressway System:** Yes

**Highway Network:** Yes

**Freeway Agreement:** No

**Access to Intermodal Freight Facility:** No

**Footway:** N/A

**South Side:** Yes

**North Side:** Yes

**Lane:** Yes

**Pedestrian Facility:** Yes

**Park and Ride:** No

**Bus:** Yes

**Airport:** Yes

**Intermodal Cargo Facilities:** Yes

**Intermodal Freight Facilities:** Yes

**Peak Hour % of Trucks:** 5.9 (PM), 7.4 (PM)

**Peak Hour Volume:** 1,110 (PM), 1,500 (PM)

**Level of Service (LOS):** Planned

**Concept Level of Service:** C

**2030 Planning Data**

**Forecasted Peak Hour Volume:** 1,110 (PM), 1,500 (PM)

**Level of Service (LOS):** Planned

**Concept Facility:** Four lane expressway on new alignment, four lane conventional on existing alignment

**Ultimate Transportation Corridor:** Four lane expressway

**Memorandum of Agreement:** No

**State Planing Region:** San Joaquin County Council of Governments

**Programmed Projects:**

- **Post Mile:** PM 16.270-19.174
- **Location:** Disch Road to JCT SR-88 & SR-12 E
- **Description:** Intersection improvements

---

**Note:** This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.

---

**Caltrans Department of Transportation District 10**

**State Route 88**

**Transportation Concept Report**

**SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 11**

**916/8097**

**5595**

**PM 16.270-19.174**

**2.904**

**Principal Arterial**

**Two Lane Width (ft.):** 12

**Level Right of Way Width (ft.):** 50

**Shoulder Width (ft.):** N/A

**Median Width (ft.):** 12

**Distressed Lane Miles:** 4.00

**Bridge Needs:** 3

**Bridge Name:** N/A

**Bridge Span:** N/A

**Bridge Type:** N/A

**Bridge Rating:** N/A

**Functional Classification:** Principal Arterial

**Semi Truck Highway (Designated):** No

**Semi Truck Highway (Eligible):** No

**High Emphasis Route:** No

**National Highway System:** Yes

**Freeway Expressway System:** Yes

**Highway Network:** Yes

**Freeway Agreement:** No

**Access to Intermodal Freight Facility:** No

**Footway:** N/A

**South Side:** Yes

**North Side:** Yes

**Lane:** Yes

**Pedestrian Facility:** Yes

**Park and Ride:** No

**Bus:** Yes

**Airport:** Yes

**Intermodal Cargo Facilities:** Yes

**Intermodal Freight Facilities:** Yes

**Peak Hour % of Trucks:** 5.9 (PM), 7.4 (PM)

**Peak Hour Volume:** 1,110 (PM), 1,500 (PM)

**Level of Service (LOS):** Planned

**Concept Level of Service:** C

**2030 Planning Data**

**Forecasted Peak Hour Volume:** 1,110 (PM), 1,500 (PM)

**Level of Service (LOS):** Planned

**Concept Facility:** Four lane expressway on new alignment, four lane conventional on existing alignment

**Ultimate Transportation Corridor:** Four lane expressway

**Memorandum of Agreement:** No

**State Planing Region:** San Joaquin County Council of Governments

**Programmed Projects:**

- **Post Mile:** PM 16.270-19.174
- **Location:** Disch Road to JCT SR-88 & SR-12 E
- **Description:** Intersection improvements

---

**Note:** This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.

---

**Caltrans Department of Transportation District 10**

**State Route 88**

**Transportation Concept Report**

**SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 11**

**916/8097**

**5595**

**PM 16.270-19.174**

**2.904**

**Principal Arterial**

**Two Lane Width (ft.):** 12

**Level Right of Way Width (ft.):** 50

**Shoulder Width (ft.):** N/A

**Median Width (ft.):** 12

**Distressed Lane Miles:** 4.00

**Bridge Needs:** 3

**Bridge Name:** N/A

**Bridge Span:** N/A

**Bridge Type:** N/A

**Bridge Rating:** N/A

**Functional Classification:** Principal Arterial

**Semi Truck Highway (Designated):** No

**Semi Truck Highway (Eligible):** No

**High Emphasis Route:** No

**National Highway System:** Yes

**Freeway Expressway System:** Yes

**Highway Network:** Yes

**Freeway Agreement:** No

**Access to Intermodal Freight Facility:** No

**Footway:** N/A

**South Side:** Yes

**North Side:** Yes

**Lane:** Yes

**Pedestrian Facility:** Yes

**Park and Ride:** No

**Bus:** Yes

**Airport:** Yes

**Intermodal Cargo Facilities:** Yes

**Intermodal Freight Facilities:** Yes

**Peak Hour % of Trucks:** 5.9 (PM), 7.4 (PM)

**Peak Hour Volume:** 1,110 (PM), 1,500 (PM)

**Level of Service (LOS):** Planned

**Concept Level of Service:** C

**2030 Planning Data**

**Forecasted Peak Hour Volume:** 1,110 (PM), 1,500 (PM)

**Level of Service (LOS):** Planned

**Concept Facility:** Four lane expressway on new alignment, four lane conventional on existing alignment

**Ultimate Transportation Corridor:** Four lane expressway

**Memorandum of Agreement:** No

**State Planing Region:** San Joaquin County Council of Governments

**Programmed Projects:**

- **Post Mile:** PM 16.270-19.174
- **Location:** Disch Road to JCT SR-88 & SR-12 E
- **Description:** Intersection improvements

---

**Note:** This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
Amador County typifies the foothill counties that comprise District 10. Like Calaveras, Tuolumne, and Mariposa Counties, historic travel routes (now State highways) in Amador run in an east to west direction, as travel north or southwards would be constrained by the Mokelumne and Cosumnes Rivers Canyons. Like the other counties, Amador lacks the local infrastructure to develop and maintain large numbers of well paying jobs with the result that many residents are employed outside the county. Amador benefits in its proximity to two major urban areas, Sacramento and Stockton. Workers may commute to Sacramento by SR-16 or Stockton by SR-88 (this ignores the work commute from Ione via SR-104). Although the exact number of commuters is unknown, the number can be approximated by peak hour traffic numbers. A rough comparison indicates that SR-88’s peak hour volume exceeds SR-16’s by a three to two ratio. For goods movement, when one considers daily truck traffic, the difference is a two to one ratio (this disparity is likely to remain despite the recent designation of SR-49 as terminal access route between Jackson and SR-16).

Thirteen segments of SR-88 in Amador County (Ama-88) were analyzed. The division of these segments followed consideration of changes in traffic volume or its composition, a change in the number of lanes, whether the segment was urban or rural, and changes in transportation planning or land use planning agency. This method deviates from that suggested in HCM (2000) p.21-13, but provides for a more concise characterization of the need for capacity increases, verses operational improvements outside this document’s scope.

For California, LOS traditionally measured highway performance, though once a highway segment approaches or exceeds LOS ‘F’, other performance measures may be employed. To characterize LOS, two software applications were employed—HCS and FDOT transportation software also known as LOS-P Lan (packaged together under the McTrans HCS trademark). Unique differences in application of the two programs to SJ-88, for determining a segment’s LOS, need to be considered when those determinations differ. Where discrepancies arose, determinations obtained with the FDOT models were considered closer to present or future conditions.

Application of HCS (version 5.4) consistent with HCM (2000) employed the Two Lane Highway option. At the time of analysis, the Urban Streets module was unavailable, precluding analysis of interrupted flow conditions. Supplementing HCS analysis was performed using the FDOT’s HIGHPLAN and ARTPLAN. HIGHPLAN and HCS typically provide equivalent results and serve as a useful means to assess modeling errors. HIGHPLAN has unique features making it amenable to analyze features of segments with two way left turn lanes (three lane or five lane conventional highways), which are characteristic of two of the segments considered (segment four in Martell, and segment eight in Pine Grove). HCS permits analysis of passing lanes as operational improvements in lieu of capacity increasing improvements, but distances between intersections and numerous access points violate the expressway design standards presumed in the application. With this in mind, the passing lane analysis was not employed. Segments would appear amenable to evaluation (This would contribute to the deficient LOS identified for segments with passing lanes, segments ten through fourteen).

ARTPLAN best characterizes the performance of segments subject to interrupted flow. Interrupted flow generally results from closely spaced traffic signals with low speed limits, and heavy traffic volumes both on the main line and the cross street. These conditions generally will produce a LOS of ‘F’ due to their traffic volumes exceeding the road’s capacity. Only two segments of Ama-88 might benefit from this evaluation: segment four (from SR-104E and SR-49N), and segment five from (SR-49S to Court Street). However, at this time it appears the balance between the signal distance and peak hour volumes, currently preclude an interrupted flow scenario.

Future forecast volumes were obtained through three linear projections, from twenty year previous to present, the local transportation planning jurisdiction’s TDM, and a twenty year state-wide growth projection from present. Comparison is made between the three projections for consistency, and may result in one projection being dropped, usually because it markedly overestimates or underestimates future growth compared to a transportation planning jurisdiction’s TDM.

Ama-88 serves five communities—the City of Jackson, Pine Grove, Pioneer, Buckhorn, and Kirkwood, as well as Martell, the County’s commercial hub. Historically associated with the Gold Rush, these towns developed through the twentieth century on the basis of tourism and logging. The median age of Amador County residents is 43, compared to 35.2 years for the State as a whole (2010 census), which suggests much of the recent population growth has consisted of retirees. With a population of 38,091, the racial and ethnic makeup of Amador County was 87% White, 2.5% African American, 1.8% Native American, 1.1% Asian, 0.2% Pacific Islander, 3.6% from other races, and 3.6% from two or more races; and, Hispanic or Latino of any race was 12.5% (US Census, 2010). The median income for a household in the County is $42,280 which is below the State average ($46,813, US Census, 2000).

General plans characterize and distribute future population density, and thus influence future traffic volumes. For rural areas, the Amador County General Plan Land Use Element designates much of the adjoining properties along Ama-88 to rural residential, low density residential, and general agriculture designations. Within the twenty year planning horizon of this document, any traffic increase on Ama-88 will likely reflect growth outside the immediate corridor. Within existing communities and commercial centers, improvements to the facility will require new alignments be expressway, but existing alignments be conventional highway. This would be consistent with SR-88 being on both the freeway and expressway system, and the IRRS.

Because of Ama-88’s IRRS designation, the UTC would typically be designed as expressway to reflect legislative intent. One exception is a recent planning study which evaluated a bypass of Jackson which, led to a local government decision that no new expressway would be built to replace segment five. Therefore, for segment five, the UTC will be conventional highway.

Currently, few multimodal opportunities exist on Ama-88. Deviated fixed route transit routes serve Ione and the several communities east of Jackson on Ama-88. Ama-88 is designated as a Class III bike lane (shared with automobiles), but sub standard shoulder widths may inhibit bicycle use, and should be a component of future upgrades. No passenger rail and few air commute opportunities present themselves in the County. An Amtrak connection may be made in Sacramento via transit, and the same transit route may allow transfers to the Sacramento International Airport. Westover Field near Sutter Hill is the only public airport serving Amador County.

All segments, are currently deficient, or will become so in the next twenty years. These results reflect both the role that terrain may play in highway operations, as well as that portions of the route are not constructed to current design standards for lane and shoulder width, and may not characterize a need for increased capacity. Installation of passing lanes may improve LOS but the effect of such facilities cannot be properly assessed with the currently
AMADOR COUNTY SUMMARY

available modeling software. Further analysis and evaluation are necessary.
Review of the District 10 Status of Projects and the Amador County Transpor-
tation Commission's (ACTC) RTP (2004), indicates that numerous financially
constrained or programmed projects exist to address these deficiencies,
along with a number of financially unconstrained projects.
**State Route 88** Transportation Concept Report

**AMADOR COUNTY**

**Segment 1**

- **Post Mile:** 0.000-5.527
- **Post Mile (End):** 5.527
- **Location:** Urban/Rural: Urban
- **Local Planning Jurisdiction:** Amador County Transportation Commission

**Functional Classification:**
- **Principal Arterial**
- **Rolling Right of Way Width (ft.):** 100-250
- **Shoulder Width (ft.):** 0-8
- **Median Width (ft.):** N/A

**Distressed Lane Miles:** 10.00

**Level of Service (LOS):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Class III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Class III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Travel Forecast Data**

- **Posted Speed:** 55 MPH
- **Existing Facility:** Conventional Highway
- **Number of Lanes:** Two
- **Grade %:** Rolling
- **Volume/Capacity:** 9,200
- **Degree of Impact:** Moderate

**Bicycle Facility:**

- **Existing:** Yes
- **Proposed:** Yes

**Intermodal Freight Facilities**

- **Existing:** No
- **Proposed:** No

**Planning Projects**

- **Programmed Projects:**
  - **SR-88 Buena Vista Rd. Intersection Improvements**
  - **SR-88 and SR-124 Intersection Improvements**
  - **SR-88 Centerville Rumble**

**Legend**

- **AMADOR COUNTY**
- **San Joaquin**
- **Sacramento**

**Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Elements & Detection**

- **Post Mile:** 0.000-5.527
- **ITS Element:** Flashing Beacon
- **Status:** Existing

**Comments:**

- **Note:** This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
### AMADOR COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 2

#### STATE ROUTE 88

**AMADOR COUNTY SEGMENT 2**

**Description:** SR-124 to SR-104W

**Post Mile:** 5.527-7.389

**Functional Classification:** Principal Arterial

**Other Agency/Entity:** Amador County Transportation Commission

**Roadbed Information (approximate):**

- **Number of Lanes:** Two
- **Number of Lanes (ft.):** 12
- **Rolling Right of Way Width (ft.):** 100-150
- **Shoulder Width (ft.):** 0-4
- **Median Width (ft.):** N/A
- **Bridge Needs:** Increased Lane Miles 0.90
- **Bridge #:** N/A
- **Bridge Name:** N/A

**Prospective Network:** Scenic Highway (Designated): No

**State Route 88 at Jackson Valley Rd. (West) Upgrade Intersection Improvements**

1. **Location:** 0.4 m west of SR-104W to 0.5 m west of SR-104E
2. **Design:** Install rumble strips on centerline

**Peak Hour Volume:**

- **SR-88 Buena Vista Rd., Intersection:** 970
- **SR-88 and SR-124 Intersection Improvements:** 1,480

**Travel Forecast Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volume/Capacity</th>
<th>Average Daily Traffic</th>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>Class III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>Class III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>Class III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Restrictions**

- **High Emphasis Route:** Yes
- **Freeway Agreement:** No
- **Facility Type:** Interregional Road System
- **Accessibility:** No

**Environmental Impact**

- **Erosion:** Moderate
- **Vegetation:** Moderate

**Travel Demand**

- **SR-124 to SR-104W:** 970
- **SR-88 Buena Vista Rd., Intersection:** 970

**Highway Capacity Software (HCS+T7F) and Florida Department of Transportation HIGHPLAN**

- **Peak Hour Volume:** 970
- **Peak Hour Volume % of Total ADT:** 7.0%
- **Peak Hour % of Trucks:** 5.6%

**Urban/Local Planning Jurisdiction:** Amador County

**Functional Classification:** Principal Arterial

**Route Designations:** Scenic Highway (Eligible): No

**Public Service Facilities:**

- **Park and Ride:** Yes
- **Transit Bus:** Yes

**Public Transportation Network:**

- **Transit Bus:** Yes

**Programmed Projects:**

- **I-500/14.30:** Improvements from JAM to SR-104
- **7.347/389:** SR-88 and SR-104 Signature & Improvements
- **7.000/1.500:** 0.4 m west of SR-104W to 0.5 m east of SR-104E

**Existing Transportation Network**

- **Highway System:** Scenic Highway
- **Intermodal Freight Facilities:** No
- **Airport:** No
- **Federal Highway on US-104:** Yes
- **Intermodal Connector Facilities:** Yes
- **Intermodal Freight Facility:** No
- **Highway System:** Scenic Highway
- **Intermodal Freight Facility:** No

**Notes:**

- This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
### AMADOR COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 3

#### STATE ROUTE 88

**Description:**
- **State Route 88 W to State Route 88 E**
- **Segment Location:**
- **Post Mile:** 7.389-12.68
- **Run/Urbanized:** Rural
- **Functional Classification:** Principal Arterial
- **Local Planning Jurisdiction:** Amador County Transportation Commission
- **Other Agency/Entity:** Amador County
- **Number of Lanes:** Two
- **Lane Width (ft.):** 13
- **Right of Way Width (ft.):** 100-400
- **Shoulder Width (ft.):** 0-4
- **Median Width (ft.):** N/A
- **Distressed Lane Miles:** 1.00
- **Postmile:** 7.800
- **Bridge Name:** East Ione UP

#### Route Designations

- **Principal Arterial:** Yes
- **Scenic Highway (Designated):** Yes
- **Scenic Highway (Eligible):** No
- **High Emphasis Route:** No
- **Trucking Network:** Yes
- **National Network, Terminal Access:** Yes
- **Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA):** Yes
- **Advisory:** No
- **Additional Restrictions:** No
- **Access to Intermodal Freight Facility:** No

#### Fish: Level of Service

- **Type:** Low
- **Wetlands:** Low
- **Leaking Underground Tanks:** Low
- **Moderate**: 2020

#### PM 7.389-7.800

- **Site:** East Ione UP
- **Type:** Existing
- **Functional Classification:** Principal Arterial
- **Highway Capacity (HCS):** 7.389-12.68
- **HCS LOSPLAN:**
  - **PM 7.389:** LOS B
  - **PM 7.404:** LOS C
  - **PM 7.450:** LOS C
  - **PM 7.500:** LOS B
  - **PM 7.550:** LOS B

#### State Route 88

- **PM 7.389-7.540:**
  - **Location:** 0.45
  - **Direction:** B
  - **LOS:** Class III

- **PM 7.545-7.600:**
  - **Location:** 0.51
  - **Direction:** B
  - **LOS:** Class III

- **PM 7.605-7.710:**
  - **Location:** 0.54
  - **Direction:** B
  - **LOS:** Class III

- **PM 7.715-7.800:**
  - **Location:** 0.57
  - **Direction:** B
  - **LOS:** Class III

#### Planned Projects

- **Amador County Transportation Commission:**
  - **Type:** Programmed Projects
  - **Planning:** 2030
  - **Interval:** Four Lane Expressway

#### Key

- **PM:** Post Mile
- **LOS:** Level of Service
- **B:** Both
- **WB:** Westbound
- **NB:** Northbound
- **EM:** Existing
- **TM:** TMS
- **NM:** N/A
- **PM:** Post Mile
- **LOS:** Level of Service
- **B:** Both
- **WB:** Westbound
- **NB:** Northbound
- **EM:** Existing
- **TM:** TMS
- **NM:** N/A

#### Notes

- This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
AMADOR COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 4

Transportion Concept Report

Segment Location: SR-104 E to SR-49 N

Post Mile: 12.68-14.25

Rural/Urban/Urbanized: Rural

Within City Limits: No

Functional Classification: Principal Arterial

Local Planning Jurisdiction: Amador County Transportation Commission

Other Agency/Entity: City of Jackson

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>1.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade %</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to Bicycles</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width (ft.)</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Width (ft.)</td>
<td>0-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width (ft.)</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Right of Way Width (ft.)</td>
<td>100-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed Lane Miles</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Serviceability Rating</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Arterial Scenic Highway (Designated)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Highway (Eligible)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Network, Terminal Access</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Legal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Restrictions</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Intermodal Freight Facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Mile Location</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Facility</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Transportation Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Distribution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Bus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Mile Location</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Facility</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Transportation Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Distribution</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Bus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Mile Location</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Facility</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Transportation Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Distribution</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Bus</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.

Comments:
**State Route 88 Transportation Concept Report**

**AMADOR COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 5**

**Description:** SR-49 S to Court Street

**Post Mile:** 14.29E-14.9

**Functional Classification:** Principal Arterial

**Local Planning Jurisdiction:** Amador County Transportation Commission

**Number of Lanes:** Two

**Lane Width (ft.):** 12

**Right of Way Width (ft.):** 100-200

**Shoulder Width (ft.):** 0-8

**Median Width (ft.):** N/A

**Bridge Needs:** Distressed Lane Miles 1.30

**Bridge #:** N/A

**Bridge Name:** N/A

**Bridge Type:** N/A

**Bridge Size:** N/A

**Bridge Location:** On Route

**Bridge Planning:** Yes

**Bridge Serviceability Rating:** 3

**Bridge Status:** Planned

**Route Designations:** Conventional Highway

**Functional Classification:** Principal Arterial

**Scenic Highway (Designated):** Conventional Highway

**Interregional Road System:** Yes

**National Network, Terminal Access:** Yes

**Freeway Agreement:** No

**Peak Hour % of Trucks:** 6.0

**Peak Hour Volume:** 1,260

**Level of Service:** PM

**Peak Hour Directional Split:** 55/45

**Level of Service (LOS) calculated using Highway Capacity Software (HCS+T7F) and Florida Department of Transportation HIGHPLAN 2009 Multilane and Two-Lane Highway Level of Service. Analysis for Conceptual Planning and Preliminary Engineering Version Date 7/17/2010. All LOS reflects vehicles only. LOS does not reflect multi-modal at this time.**

**Bicycle Facility:** Yes

**Airports:** No

**Existing Transportation Network:** Yes

**Bicycle Facilities:** Yes

**Existing Commuter Facilities:** Yes

**Existing Freight Facilities:** Yes

**Pedestrian Facility:** Yes

**Park and Rides:** No

**Transit Bus:** Yes

**Planned Projects:**

- **SR-48 to 14.29E**
- **SR-88 Improvements from SR-49 to Court St.**
- **Court Street**

**Comments:**

- No current programmed projects on the segment

**Note:** The information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
### AMADOR COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 6

#### STATE ROUTE 88

**Transportation Concept Report**

**Description:**
- Court Street to Dalton Road

**Post Mile:**
- 14.9-16.88

**Rural/Urban/Urbanized:**
- Rural

**Functional Classification:**
- Principal Arterial

**Overall Planning Jurisdiction:**
- Amador County Transportation Commission

**Other Agency/Entity:**
- City of Jackson

---

### Segment 6

**Location:**
- 28 State Route 88

**Transportation Concept Report**

**Number of Lanes:**
- Three

**Lane Width (ft.):**
- 12.24

**Right of Way Width (ft.):**
- 190-280

**Median Width (ft.):**
- N/A

**Principal Arterial**

- Three Lane Width (ft.): 12-24

- Rolling Right of Way Width (ft.): 100-280

- Shoulder Width (ft.): 0-8

- Yes

- N/A

- Distressed Lane Miles: 0.80

**Principal Arterial**

- Scenic Highway (Designated): Conventional Highway

- Yes

- No

- Yes

- No

- No

- No

- Access to Intermodal Freight Facility

- Low

- Low

- Moderate

- Yes

- Yes

- Yes

- Yes

**Travel Forecast Data**

**Sample Year:**
- 2009

- Volume/Capacity:
  - Average Daily Traffic: 11,100
  - Peak Hour Volume: 12,500
  - Peak Hour Directoronal Split: 55/45

**Peak Hour % of Trucks:**
- 4.8

**Peak Hour % of Total ADT:**
- 4.8

**Peak Hour % of Truck:**
- 4.8

**Peak Hour % of Buses:**
- 4.8

**Peak Hour % of Other:**
- 4.8

**Peak Hour % of Cars:**
- 4.8

**Peak Hour % of Vans:**
- 4.8

**Bicycle Facility**

- Airports

- Intermodal Freight Facilities

- Freight Distribution

- Transit Bus

**Pedestrian Facility**

- Location

- PM

- Location

- PM

**Programmed Projects**

- Operations Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Mile</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.34-14.5</td>
<td>SR 88 and Silver Street</td>
<td>Improvements from SR 49 to Pioneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.73-20.355</td>
<td>SR 88 and Silver Street</td>
<td>Operations Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.29/13.152</td>
<td>Passing lanes between Jackson and Pine Grove</td>
<td>Passing lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.28/15.066</td>
<td>Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>Operations Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.31/14.538</td>
<td>SR 88 Improvements from SR 49 to Court St.</td>
<td>Operations Improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Branch or Division:**

- This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.

**Comments:**

- No current programmed projects on the segment.
State Route 88 Transportation Concept Report

Caltrans Department of Transportation District 10

AMADOR COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 7

16.88-22.69

Principal Arterial

Two Lane Width (ft.): 12

Mountainous

Right of Way Width (ft.): N/A

N/A

Shoulder Width (ft.): 0-8

Yes

Median Width (ft.): N/A

N/A

Distressed Lane Miles: 9.00

PM 16.88-22.69 PM

HCS LOS PLAN HCS LOS PLAN HCS LOS PLAN
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**AMADOR COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 8**

### STATE ROUTE 88: TRANSPORTATION CONCEPT REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>AMADOR COUNTY</th>
<th>SEGMENT 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment Location</td>
<td>Ridge Road to Minot Ave (Pine Grove)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Mile:</td>
<td>22.69-R23.846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length:</td>
<td>1.156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification:</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Planning Jurisdiction:</td>
<td>Amador County Transportation Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agency/Entity</td>
<td>Amador County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Functional Characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Two Lane Conventional Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way (ft.):</td>
<td>100-290 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder/Shoulder (ft.):</td>
<td>0-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Width (ft.):</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Distressed Lane Miles:

| Distressed Lane Miles | 1.20 |

#### Other Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1.156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Additional Restrictions:

| Access to Intermodal Freight Facility | No |

#### Posting Speed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posted Speed</td>
<td>35 MPH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Travel Forecast Data:

- **Volume/Capacity:**
  - **Average Daily Traffic:** 19,260, 24,870, 29,970
  - **Peak Hour Volume:** 1,890, 2,445, 2,945
  - **Peak Hour Directional Split:** 55%/45%, 55%/45%, 55%/45%

#### Air Quality:

- **Ozone:** Non-Attainment
- **Particulate Matter 10 m:** Unclassified
- **Particulate Matter 2.5 m:** Unclassified
- **Carbon Monoxide:** Unclassified

#### Pedestrian Facility:

- **Peak Hour Volume:** 1.16
- **Peak Hour % of Trucks:** 8.4
- **Peak Hour Directional Split:** 55%/45%

#### Bicycle Facility:

- **Peak Hour % of Trucks:** 6.4
- **Peak Hour Directional Split:** 6.4
- **Peak Hour Volume:** 2,242

#### Existing Transportation Network:

- **Multilane and Two Lane Highway Level of Service:** Analysis for Conceptual Planning and Preliminary Engineering Version Data: 7/17/2010
- **LOS reflects vehicles only. LOS does not reflect multi-modal at this time.**

#### Concept Facility:

- **2030:** Four lane expressway on new alignment; four lane conventional on existing alignment
- **Comments:** Four lane expressway

#### Programmed Projects:

- **2009:** Improvements from SR-99 to Pioneer
- **2012:** Improvement on US-49 to Pioneer
- **2013:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2014:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2015:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2016:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2017:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2018:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2019:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2020:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2021:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2022:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2023:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2024:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2025:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2026:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2027:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2028:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2029:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove
- **2030:** Passing lane EB between Jackson and Pine Grove

#### Comments:

- This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
**Segment 9**

**Description:** Mount June to SR-26 W

**Post Mile:** R23.846-R26.791

**Functional Classification:** Principal Arterial

**Local Planning Jurisdiction:** Amador County Transportation Commission

**Other Agency/Entity:** Amador County

### Number of Lanes:
- Lane Width (ft.): 12-24
- Shoulder Width (ft.): 0-8
- Median Width (ft.): 0-12
- Bridge Needs: Distressed Lane Miles 4.00

### Number of Lanes:
- Lane Type: Two
- Right of Way Width (ft.): 100-290
- Shoulder Width (ft.): 3% or greater
- Median Width (ft.): N/A

### Distressed Lane Miles:
- N/A

### Distressed Bridge:
- N/A

### Number of Bridges:
- NA

### Principal Arterial:
- Scenic Highway (Designated): Conventional Highway
- Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes

### Facility Type:
- Conventional Highway
- Scenic Highway (Eligible)

### High Emphasis Route:
- No
- National Network, Terminal Access: No

### Focus Route/Gateway Route:
- No
- Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA): No

### National Highway System:
- Yes
- California Legal: Yes

### Freeway Expressway System:
- Yes
- Advisory: No

### Strategic Highway Network:
- No
- Additional Restrictions: No

### Freeway Agreement:
- No
- Access to Intermodal Freight Facility: No

### Flood Plains:
- Low

### Wetlands:
- Low

### Special Status Species:
- Low

### Possible Hazardous Waste:
- Moderate

### Air Quality:
- Ozone
  - Non-Attainment Maintenance Unclassified
  - Peak Hour % of Trucks: 6.4
  - Peak Hour Directional Split: 60/40

### Environmental Status:
- Flood Plains: High
- Cultural Resources: High
- Waterbodies: Low
- Leaking Underground Tanks: Moderate
- Special Status Species: Low
- Possible Hazardous Waste: Moderate

### Level of Service:
- LOS C
- PM: 1,380
- Peak Hour Directional Split: 60/40
- Peak Hour % of Trucks: 6.4
- Peak Hour Directional Split: 60/40
- Peak Hour % of Trucks: 6.4

### Travel Forecast Data:
- 2009:
  - ADT: 12,600
  - Level of Service: III
  - Peak Hour Volume: 1,380
  - Peak Hour Directional Split: 60/40
- 2020:
  - ADT: 16,500
  - Level of Service: III
  - Peak Hour Volume: 1,820
  - Peak Hour Directional Split: 60/40
- 2030:
  - ADT: 20,100
  - Level of Service: III
  - Peak Hour Volume: 2,210
  - Peak Hour Directional Split: 60/40

### Planned Projects:
- No current programmed projects on the segment

### Comments:
- No comments provided.
**AMADOR COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 10**

**Description:** State Route 88 to Tiger Creek Road

**Segment Location:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SEGMENT 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Mile:</td>
<td>R26.791-R32.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length:</td>
<td>5.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification:</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Planning Jurisdiction:</td>
<td>Amador County Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agency/Entity:</td>
<td>Amador County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Lanes:**
- 2 Lane Width (ft.): 11-12
- Lane Width (ft.): 11-12
- Right of Way Width (ft.): 80-310
- Shoulder Width (ft.): 0-8
- Median Width (ft.): 0-12
- Distressed Lane Miles: 5.60

**Principal Arterial**
- Scenic Highway (Designated): Conventional Highway
- Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes
- National Network, Terminal Access: No
- Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA): No
- California Legal: Yes
- Advisory: No
- Additional Restrictions: No
- Access to Intermodal Freight Facility: Low

**Travel Forecast Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Post-Mile</th>
<th>Average Daily Traffic</th>
<th>Peak Hour Volume</th>
<th>Peak Hour % of Trucks</th>
<th>Peak Hour % of Total ADT</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>10 m</th>
<th>2.5 m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Attainment Maintenance</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Elements & Detection**

**Concept Level of Service:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SEGMENT 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Mile:</td>
<td>R26.791-R32.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Segment Route Concept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Environmental Status**

- **Degree of Impact:** Low
- **Cultural Resources:** Moderate to High
- **Leaking Underground Tanks:** Low
- **Possible Hazardous Waste:** Moderate to High

**Bridge Name:** N/A
- **Bridge Needs:** Present Serviceability Rating: 3

- **I-80 Improvements between Buckhorn and Alpine County Line.**
- **Operational Improvements**
- **Operational Improvements**

**Note:** This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Route 88</th>
<th>Transportation Concept Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description: Tiger Creek Road to Inspiration Point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Mile: R3/555-34.54 Far/Urban/Urbanized: Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length: 2.467 Mile City Limit: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification: Principal Arterial Local Planning Jurisdiction: Amador County Transportation Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agency/Entity: Amador County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes: Two Lane Width (ft.): 11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrain: Mountainous Right of Way Width (ft.): 100-310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade %: 3% or greater Shoulder Width (ft.): 0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to Bicycles: Yes Median Width (ft.): 0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Needs: Distressed Lane Miles: 1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponybridge: Yes Present Serviceability Rating: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Name: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification: Principal Arterial Scenic Highway (Designated): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type: Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional Road System: Yes Trucking Network:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Emphasis Route: No National Terminal Access: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Route/Gateway Route: No Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System: Yes California Legal: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Highway Network: No Advisory: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Additional Restrictions: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: No to Intermodal Freight Facility: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed Lane Miles: 1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Presence: Present Serviceability Rating: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Name: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification: Principal Arterial Scenic Highway (Designated): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type: Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional Road System: Yes Trucking Network:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Emphasis Route: No National Terminal Access: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Route/Gateway Route: No Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System: Yes California Legal: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Highway Network: No Advisory: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Additional Restrictions: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: No to Intermodal Freight Facility: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Route 88</th>
<th>Transportation Concept Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description: Tiger Creek Road to Inspiration Point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Mile: R3/555-34.54 Far/Urban/Urbanized: Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length: 2.467 Mile City Limit: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification: Principal Arterial Local Planning Jurisdiction: Amador County Transportation Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agency/Entity: Amador County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes: Two Lane Width (ft.): 11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrain: Mountainous Right of Way Width (ft.): 100-310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade %: 3% or greater Shoulder Width (ft.): 0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to Bicycles: Yes Median Width (ft.): 0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Needs: Distressed Lane Miles: 1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponybridge: Yes Present Serviceability Rating: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Name: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification: Principal Arterial Scenic Highway (Designated): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type: Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional Road System: Yes Trucking Network:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Emphasis Route: No National Terminal Access: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Route/Gateway Route: No Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System: Yes California Legal: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Highway Network: No Advisory: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Additional Restrictions: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: No to Intermodal Freight Facility: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed Lane Miles: 1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Presence: Present Serviceability Rating: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Name: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification: Principal Arterial Scenic Highway (Designated): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type: Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional Road System: Yes Trucking Network:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Emphasis Route: No National Terminal Access: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Route/Gateway Route: No Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System: Yes California Legal: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Highway Network: No Advisory: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Additional Restrictions: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: No to Intermodal Freight Facility: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed Lane Miles: 1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Presence: Present Serviceability Rating: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Name: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification: Principal Arterial Scenic Highway (Designated): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type: Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional Road System: Yes Trucking Network:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Emphasis Route: No National Terminal Access: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Route/Gateway Route: No Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System: Yes California Legal: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Highway Network: No Advisory: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Additional Restrictions: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: No to Intermodal Freight Facility: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed Lane Miles: 1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Presence: Present Serviceability Rating: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Name: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification: Principal Arterial Scenic Highway (Designated): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type: Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional Road System: Yes Trucking Network:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Emphasis Route: No National Terminal Access: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Route/Gateway Route: No Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System: Yes California Legal: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Highway Network: No Advisory: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Additional Restrictions: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: No to Intermodal Freight Facility: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed Lane Miles: 1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Presence: Present Serviceability Rating: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Name: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification: Principal Arterial Scenic Highway (Designated): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type: Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional Road System: Yes Trucking Network:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Emphasis Route: No National Terminal Access: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Route/Gateway Route: No Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System: Yes California Legal: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Highway Network: No Advisory: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Additional Restrictions: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: No to Intermodal Freight Facility: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed Lane Miles: 1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Presence: Present Serviceability Rating: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Name: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification: Principal Arterial Scenic Highway (Designated): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type: Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional Road System: Yes Trucking Network:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Emphasis Route: No National Terminal Access: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Route/Gateway Route: No Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System: Yes California Legal: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Highway Network: No Advisory: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Additional Restrictions: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: No to Intermodal Freight Facility: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed Lane Miles: 1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Presence: Present Serviceability Rating: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Name: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification: Principal Arterial Scenic Highway (Designated): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type: Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional Road System: Yes Trucking Network:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Emphasis Route: No National Terminal Access: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Route/Gateway Route: No Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA): No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System: Yes California Legal: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Highway Network: No Advisory: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Additional Restrictions: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: No to Intermodal Freight Facility: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**State Route 88 Transportation Concept Report**

**AMADOR COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>AMADOR COUNTY</th>
<th>SEGMENT 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Mile</td>
<td>88.54 R38.305</td>
<td>Rural/Urban/Urbanized: Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>Local Planning Jurisdiction: Amador County Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to Bicycles</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Other Agency/Entity: Amador County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation Facilities**

- **Number of Lanes:** Yes
- **Terrain:** Mountainous
- **Grade %:** 3% or greater
- **Shoulder Width (ft.):** 0-8
- **Median Width (ft.):** N/A
- **Distressed Lane Miles:** 4.00

**Amador SR-88, Segment 12**

- **Other State Highways:** Local Roads
- **County Line:**

**Travel Forecast Data**

- **2009:**
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM

- **2010:**
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM

- **2030:**
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM
  - PM

**Existing Transportation Network**

- **Bicycle Facility:**
  - Location: On Route
  - Planning: PM

- **Air Quality:**
  - Particulate Matter 2.5 m: Non-Attainment
  - Particulate Matter 10 m: Unclassified
  - Carbon Monoxide: Unclassified
  - Ozone: Unclassified

**Environmental Status**

- **Degree of Impact:** High
- **Environmental Status:** Cultural Resources: High
- **Wetlands:** Leaking Underground Tanks: Low
- **Wildlife:** No

**Planning Projects**

- **Intermodal Freight Facility:** Planned
- **No current programmed projects on the segment**

**Segment Route Concept**

- **Concept Level of Service:** C
- **Concept Facility:** 2030
- **Ultimate Transportation Corridor:** Four lane expressway
- **Comments:** No current programmed projects on the segment

**Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Elements & Detection**

- **Position:** 38.180
- **Status:** Existing
- **Direction:** EB
- **Element:** CMS

**Note:** This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
Of the eight counties that comprise District 10, Alpine is the only mountain county. For California, this translates to a place where the landscape is dominated by primary resources controlled by federal or state resource management agencies (96% of the County), with little private land upon which development can occur. Alpine County, along with its terrain, has the smallest population of any county in the State. It presents several challenges to assessing current and future interregional transportation needs. The population, since it is interspersed between one town (Markleeville) and two ski resorts—Kirkwood and Bear Valley, creates weak attractors, with employment centers acting as the likely loci for work day travel. With the exception of the Alpine County Government Center, the large county employers depend on tourism, which may allow commute numbers to be disguised by larger recreational traffic volumes.

Alp-88 serves the communities of Kirkwood, Woodfords, Hung-a-Lei-Ti, and Markleeville (via Alp-89). The route, as a year-round highway, operates to access several recreational activities either within Alpine County or at Lake Tahoe.

Four segments of SR-88 in Alpine County (Alp-88) were analyzed. These divisions follow considerations of changes in traffic volume, its composition, or its flow; a change in the number of lanes; whether the segment was urban or rural; and, changes in transportation planning or land use planning agency. This method deviates from that suggested in HCM (2000), but provides for a more concise characterization for the need for capacity increases, verses operation improvements generally beyond this document’s scope.

For California, LOS traditionally measured highway performance, though once a highway segment approaches or exceeds LOS ‘F’, other performance measures may be employed. To characterize LOS, the HCS Two Lane module (consistent with HCM 2000, version 5.4) was employed.

As Alp-88 is both an IRRS route and functionally classified ‘principal arterial’, segments in Alpine County were classified as Class I two lane highways, rather than as Class II or Class III. These latter two classes reflect driver expectations when travelling through rugged terrain, small towns, or recreation areas, that attaining a high rate of speed may not be met. Although characterizing the present condition of Alp-88 as being Class II or Class III may better reflect current conditions (particularly segment one with its 40 MPH speed limit), using these designations to characterize future conditions may serve to obscure needs for operational improvements.

Future forecast volumes were obtained through two linear projections: from past traffic volumes the previous twenty years to present, and extended twenty years later, and from the Department of Finance’s twenty year population growth projection for Alpine County. The two projections are then compared for consistency, and may result in one projection being dropped, usually because it overestimates or underestimates future growth.

The population of Alpine County is 1,175. Within that population, 75% of the residents report themselves as white, 20.4% as Native American, with the remainder other races. Of the total population, 7.1% report that they have Latino or Hispanic ancestry. The median age of residents is 46.7 years, compared to 35.2 years for the State as a whole (2010 census). The median household income was $41,875 which was below the median statewide household income of $47,493 (2000 Census). Current Department of Finance population projections indicate a population decline of 2.7% for 2012, following a population decline of 6.2% for 2011. Approximately 20% of the population has incomes below the federal poverty line (2000 Census). A significant proportion of the County population is represented by members of the federally-recognized Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada with their Woodfords Community Council at Hung-a-Lei-Ti.

Land uses along the Alp-88 corridor conform to the Toiyabe National Forest Plan, and the Alpine County General Plan (2010). General plans characterize and distribute future population density, and would influence future traffic volumes, while forest plans emphasize land uses necessary to conserve or protect natural resources, and would not directly influence future traffic volumes. The Alpine County General Plan stresses preservation of local communities, and development compatible with the natural setting of Alpine County. The Plan anticipates fostering little to no population growth, and foresees a highway maintenance model consistent with current local revenues and expenditures. It bears noting that no Washoe tribal trust lands are currently contiguous to Alp-88.

Because of little development in or around Markleeville and Woodfords, the housing stock in Alpine County is limited, and many workers in Markleeville live in Douglas County Nevada, and commute in. This in part may be balanced by a resident out commute to obtain goods and services unavailable in Markleeville to either Lake Tahoe or Nevada.

Transit is limited to the Dial-A-Ride Program and has service from Markleeville, Woodfords, and Hung-A-Lei-Ti to Minden, Gardnerville, Dresslerville, Carson City area, South Lake Tahoe, Reno, Placerville, and Truckee. Alpine County does not have any official park-and-ride facilities.

Few other multimodal opportunities exist on SR-88. In 2010 Alpine County adopted a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan which enables them to be eligible for state Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) funding. Some of the proposed improvements include plans to expand the existing bikeways which include bike paths, bike lanes, signage, bike parking, and sidewalks. As of now, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are limited to Lake Alpine (Alp-4), Bear Valley (Alp-4), Kirkwood (Alp-88), Markleeville (Alp-89), and Diamond Valley School (Alp-89). Proposed improvements along Alp-88 include a class II bicycle lane from Kirkwood to northbound SR-89.

Alpine has one general aviation airport (no scheduled service) located near Markleeville. It has no facilities and snow removal service is not provided.

SR-88 has an important role in the interregional movement of goods and services between California and Nevada. This role is less pronounced in San Joaquin County, than in either Alpine or Amador Counties.

The role that recreation travel plays in local Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) measurements remains unclear. What is notable is that traffic volumes increase in an eastward direction, suggesting a sizable portion may be interstate traffic with Nevada. Furthermore, traffic volumes along Alp-88 are quite high as a share of local population, but whether this reflects Alpine County’s remoteness in that there is a need of local residents for every day motor vehicle travel, or just summer and winter recreation peaks cannot be discerned. Given the size of the local traffic share, investment in a traffic management system approach to provide real time detection and recordation of traffic events appears unjustified as more heavily traveled segments of Caltrans District 10’s system go unmonitored.

All segments will not meet the concept LOS of their existing two lane facilities by 2030. This result best reflects the need for greater passing opportunities along the route, rather than expansion to four lanes, given the steep grades.
ALPINE COUNTY SUMMARY

Throughout Alpine County, Review of the District 10 Status of Projects indicates that no current programmed projects exist.

The Alpine County Local Transportation Commission (ACLTC) RTP (2010) indicates that no financially constrained or programmed projects exist at the time of the final draft of this document. The RTP embraces a “maintenance emphasis alternative”, to avoid expenditure for capacity increasing highway projects, given current funding uncertainties and a declining population base. The RTP recognizes that systems needs within Alpine may be better addressed on highways in adjoining Calaveras and Amador Counties (as well as with Mono and El Dorado), and indicates future capacity increases within Alpine County would be incompatible with local planning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Mile</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00-R5.23</td>
<td>Rural/Rural/Rural</td>
<td>Alpine County Local Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of Service:**

- **Peak Hour Volume:** 650
- **Peak Hour Directional Split:** 614/386
- **Peak Hour % of Trucks:** 6.4

**Travel Forecast Data:**

- **2009:**
  - **Volume/Capacity:** 2,750/3,800
- **2010:**
  - **Volume/Capacity:** 4,050/4,050
- **2030:**
  - **Volume/Capacity:** 5,000/5,000

**Peak Hour Volume:**

- **Post Mile:** 0.00-R5.23
- **Location:** Location
- **Peak Hour Volume:** 650
- **Location Description:** Location

**Environmental Status:**

- **Wetlands:** Special Status
- **Flood Plains:** Unclassified
- **Accessible to Bicycles:** Yes
- **Accessible to Pedestrians:** Yes

**Bridge Information:**

- **Bridge Name:** N/A
- **Bridge: N/A
- **Post Mile:** N/A
- **Present Serviceability Rating:** 1

**Concept Level of Service:**

- **2030:**
  - **Concept Facility:** Two lane expressway

**Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Elements & Detection:**

- **Pedestrian Facility:**
  - **Yes/No:** No
  - **PM:** PM

**Bicycle Facility:**

- **Yes/No:** Yes
- **PM:** PM

**Air Quality:**

- **Particulate Matter 10 μm:** Yes
- **Particulate Matter 2.5 μm:** Yes
- **Ozone:** Yes
- **Carbon Monoxide:** Yes

**Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA):**

- **Alpine County:** Yes

**California Legal:**

- **Strategic Highway Network:** Yes
- **Non-Attainment:** Yes

**Intermodal Freight Facilities:**

- **Access to Intermodal Freight Facility:** No
- **Policy: Low to Moderate
- **Degree of Impact:** Low to Moderate

**Post Mile:**

- **Location:** Location
- **Description:** Location

**Concept Summary:**

- **Programmed Segment Route Concept:**
  - **Post Mile:** Location
  - **Description:** There are no current programmed projects.
ALPINE COUNTY FACT SHEETS — SEGMENT 2

STATE ROUTE 88 TRANSPORTATION CONCEPT REPORT

ALPINE COUNTY SEGMENT 2

Description: Carson Pass to SR-89 N
Post Mile: Rs 23-13.4
Length: 8.172
Functional Classification: Principal Arterial
Caltrans Department of Transportation District 10
Local Planning Jurisdiction: Alpine County
Other Agency/Agency

Number of Lanes: Two
Terrain: Mountainous
Accessible to Bicycles: Yes
Bridge Needs: NA

Shoulder Width (ft.): 2 to 3
Median Width (ft.): N/A
Distracted Lane Miles: 19.14
Present Serviceability Rating: 3

Principal Arterial

Two Lane Width (ft.): 12
Mountainous
Right of Way Width (ft.): 120-350
Shoulder Width (ft.): >3

Principal Arterial

Scenic Highway (Designated): Yes
Facility Type: Expressway
Interregional Road System: Yes
High Emphasis Route: No
Regional Highway System: Yes
Freeway Expressway System: No
Strategic Highway Network: No

Degree of Impact

Flood Plains: Moderate
Cultural Resources: Low to Moderate
Wetlands: Low
Special Status Species: Low
Possible Hazardous Waste: Low

Air Quality

Ozone: Unclassified Non-Attainment
Particulate Matter 10 m: Attainment
Particulate Matter 2.5 m: Attainment
Carbon Monoxide: Attainment

Travel Forecast Data

Peak Hour Volume: 2009 2020 2030
Volume/Capacity: 380 480 550
Average Daily Traffic: 2,750 3,400 3,900
Peak Hour Directional Split: 60/40 60/40 60/40
Peak Hour % of Trucks: 6.4 6.4 6.4

Pedestrian Facility

Park and Ride: Location
Freight Distribution: Location
Transit Bus: Location

Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Elements & Detection

None reported

Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Element: Status: Direction

ITS Element: Status: Direction

Note: This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.

Comments:

There are no current or planned projects.

Programmed Projects

There are no current planned projects.
ALPINE COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 3

STATE ROUTE 88 TRANSPORTATION CONCEPT REPORT

ALPINE COUNTY SEGMENT 3

Description: SR 88 N to SR 88 S
Post Mile: 13.4-19.22
Rural/Urban/Urbanized: Rural
Functional Classification: Principal Arterial
Local Planning Jurisdiction: Alpine County
Other Agency/Entity: Alpine County

Number of Lanes: Two
Lane Width (ft.): 12
Right of Way Width (ft.): 120-420
Shoulder Width (ft.): 1 to 10
Median Width (ft.): N/A
Bridge Needs: Distressed Lane Miles 10.95
Present Suitability Rating: 2

Principal Arterial
Two Lane Width (ft.): 12
Mountainous
Right of Way: 120-420
Shoulder: 1 to 10
Median: N/A
Distressed Lane Miles 10.95

Principal Arterial
Scenic Highway (Designated): Yes
Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes

Interregional Road System: Yes
High Emphasis Route: No
National Network, Terminal Access: Terminal Access
National Highway System: Yes
California Legal: Yes
Freeway Expressway System: No
Advocacy: No
Strategic Highway Network: No
Access to Intermodal Freight Facility: Yes

55 MPH Intermodal Commuter Facilities
Yes

2009 Multilane and Two-Lane Highway Level of Service. Analysis for Conceptual Planning and Preliminary Engineering Version Date: 7/17/2010. All LOS reflects vehicles only. LOS does not reflect multimodal at this time.

Overview: This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.

ALPINE COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 3

ALPINE COUNTY SEGMENT 3

Description: SR 88 N to SR 88 S
Post Mile: 13.4-19.22
Rural/Urban/Urbanized: Rural
Functional Classification: Principal Arterial
Local Planning Jurisdiction: Alpine County
Other Agency/Entity: Alpine County

Number of Lanes: Two
Lane Width (ft.): 12
Right of Way Width (ft.): 120-420
Shoulder Width (ft.): 1 to 10
Median Width (ft.): N/A
Bridge Needs: Distressed Lane Miles 10.95
Present Suitability Rating: 2

Principal Arterial
Two Lane Width (ft.): 12
Mountainous
Right of Way: 120-420
Shoulder: 1 to 10
Median: N/A
Distressed Lane Miles 10.95

Principal Arterial
Scenic Highway (Designated): Yes
Scenic Highway (Eligible): Yes

Interregional Road System: Yes
High Emphasis Route: No
National Network, Terminal Access: Terminal Access
National Highway System: Yes
California Legal: Yes
Freeway Expressway System: No
Advocacy: No
Strategic Highway Network: No
Access to Intermodal Freight Facility: Yes

55 MPH Intermodal Commuter Facilities
Yes

2009 Multilane and Two-Lane Highway Level of Service. Analysis for Conceptual Planning and Preliminary Engineering Version Date: 7/17/2010. All LOS reflects vehicles only. LOS does not reflect multimodal at this time.

Overview: This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
### ALPINE COUNTY FACT SHEETS—SEGMENT 4

#### STATE ROUTE 88

**Transportation Concept Report**

**ALPINE COUNTY**

**Segment Location:**

**Post Mile:** 19.223-25.283

**Within City Limits:** Rural

**Length:** 6.060

**Function Classif:** Principal Arterial

**Local Planning Jurisdiction:** Alpine County

**Number of Lanes:** Yes

**Grade %:** N/A

**Accessible to Bicycles:** Yes

**Distracted Lane Miles:** 10.57

**Principal Arterial Scenic Highway (Designated):** Yes

**Expressway Scenic Highway (Eligible):** Yes

**High Emphasis Route:** Yes

**Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA):** Yes

**Operational Status:** Moderate

**Environmental Status:**

- **Degree of Impact:** Low to Moderate
- **Flood Plains:** Moderate
- **Wetlands:** Moderate
- **Special Status Species:** Moderate
- **Possible Hazardous Waste:** Moderate

**Level of Service (LOS) calculated using Highway Capacity Software (HCS+T7F) and Florida Department of Transportation HIGHPLAN Data: LOS 7/17/2010. All LOS reflects vehicles only. LOS does not reflect multimodal at this time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Mile</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.223-25.283</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programmed Projects:**

- There are no current planned projects

**Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Elements & Detection**

**Post Mile:**

**ITS Element:**

- **Status:** None reported

**Notes:** This information is for overview purposes only and does not replace a full report from Right of Way, Environmental, or any other Branch or Division.
APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY

Bicycle Routes: Refers to travel ways specific to users employing bicycles. There are three general classifications: 'II'—bicycles share street with automobiles without separation; 'III'—bicycles share street within their own designated lane; and 'IV'—bicycles travel independent of automobile traffic, often sharing right of way with pedestrians or equestrians.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA): Passed in 1971, CEQA provides the framework in which undertakings that may affect the environment are evaluated and if found to be adverse are to be mitigated for, as part of the governmental decision making process. For local governments, implementation of general plans and land use designations became a requirement and a benchmark for which changes in zoning or land uses could be assessed.

Census Designation: The designation of rural (population below 5,000), or urbanized (population between 5,000 and 50,000), or urban (populations of 50,000 or greater) highways are obtained from the California Road System Maps published by FHWA, based upon census designed urbanized areas, and urbanized clusters. The most recent version dates from 2007.

Class I Two Lane Highway, see Highway Capacity Manual.

Class II Two Lane Highway see Highway Capacity Manual.

Class III Two Lane Highway see Highway Capacity Manual.

Concept Level of Service: see Level of Service.

Conventional Highway: Highway which permits direct access by both road intersections and driveways.

Environmental Status: A qualitative risk inventory of costs and time required to address impacts of highway improvements to resources of environmental value, often given in five parameters (low, low to moderate, moderate, moderate to high, and high).

Expressway: Highway, usually an arterial, typically with access limited to at grade road intersections

Federal Highway System: Designated by the Federal Highway Administration, these segments of state highways serve to either support interstate commerce, national defense, or other responsibilities of the federal government. As such they are eligible for federal funding, and subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Focus Route: see Interregional Road System.

Freeway: A divided arterial highway with full access control and grade separations at intersections.

Highway Capacity Manual (HCM): Published by the National Research Council’s Transportation Research Board, the HCM is the national standard for methodologies to evaluate and estimate highway performance. Approved software packages developed to reduce the computation effort associated with the HCM are Highway Capacity Software’s (HCS) various modules and the Florida Department of Transportation’s ARTPLAN, FREEPLAN, and HIGHPLAN. The most recent update of HCM is for 2010, though several of the software interfaces are not yet currently available. Analyses performed for this document were consistent with HCM 2000.


Interregional Road System (IRRS): A State planning effort that emphasized highways within the Freeway and Expressway system that provided network connections to urban places statewide, but were not yet constructed to freeway or expressway standards. The most recent expression of this plan (1998) discussed Focus and High Emphasis routes, and established short term and long term improvements for these specific routes.

Level: see Terrain.

Level of Service (LOS): A qualitative performance measure that describes the perception of the commuter (driver, bicyclist, pedestrian, transit) of the operational conditions within a traffic stream on a highway segment. Generally scaled in a range from A through F, and historically as a performance measure for automobiles, the LOS targets optimal utility expressed as the concept LOS (C for rural highways on the IRRS, D for urban highways on the IRRS and all routes not on the IRRS). Although the current version of the Highway Capacity Manual includes LOS calculations for users other than drivers, standards have yet to be established by the State.

Mountainous: see Terrain.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA): Established in 1971, this environmental policy applies to federal undertakings or efforts that have a federal nexus. Federal agencies were tasked to develop policies and standards to evaluate and assess the environmental impacts of federal undertakings, while the Act established general policies regarding public notification and report standards.

Rolling: see Terrain.

Rural: see Census Designation.

Terrain: refers to topography specific to its affect on trucks and other heavy vehicle operation (see HCM). Level terrain contains any combination of grades or horizontal or vertical alignments that permit heavy vehicles to maintain the same speed as passenger cars; rolling terrain contains any combination of grades or horizontal or vertical alignments that causes heavy vehicles to reduce their speed substantially below that of passenger car speeds, but not to where they crawl for a significant length of time; mountainous terrain is any combination of grades or horizontal or vertical alignment that causes heavy vehicles to operate at crawl speed for significant distances or at frequent intervals. HCM methodologies address highway segments with level or rolling terrain with a set of constant values. Mountainous terrain requires separate upgrade or downgrade analysis, and recommends that any segment with grades between 2% and 3% with a length of more than half a mile be considered a separate segment.

Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA): Federal highway legislation that included federal design standards and requirements for trucks (see Truck Routes).

Truck Routes: may refer to either federal standards (contained in STAA) or California standards. Routes with an STAA designation permit travel by tractor trailers with a fifty five foot long trailer, or tandems with trailers no greater than twenty eight and a half feet, while California legal routes permit limit the overall truck length to sixty five feet total for single and seventy five for tandems. Advisory truck routes usually possess highway geometrics that limit truck length for safe operation. Restricted truck routes have legal restrictions on the type of truck or activity.

Urban: see Census Designation.

Urbanized: see Census Designation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AADT</td>
<td>Annual Average Daily Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACLTC</td>
<td>Alpine County Local Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTC</td>
<td>Amador County Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>Average Daily Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTA</td>
<td>Bicycle Transportation Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Changeable Message Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG</td>
<td>Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSMP</td>
<td>Corridor System Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>Context Sensitive Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>California Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSMP</td>
<td>District System Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/O</td>
<td>East Of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPW</td>
<td>Expressway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;E</td>
<td>Freeway and Expressway System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDOT</td>
<td>Florida Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHS</td>
<td>Federal Highway System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAR</td>
<td>Highway Advisory Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>Highway Capacity Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV</td>
<td>High Occupancy Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRS</td>
<td>Interregional Road System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Legacy for Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>National Highway System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/O</td>
<td>North Of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTN</td>
<td>National Truck Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeMS</td>
<td>Performance Measurement System (Detection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHV</td>
<td>Peak Hour Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Post Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM-10</td>
<td>Particulate Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTE</td>
<td>Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETEA-LU</td>
<td>Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>State Highway System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJCOG</td>
<td>San Joaquin County Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/O</td>
<td>South of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>State Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAA</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Assistance Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAHHNET</td>
<td>Strategic Highway Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Terminal Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCR</td>
<td>Transportation Concept Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>Transportation Demand Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA-21</td>
<td>Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMS</td>
<td>Traffic Monitoring Station/Transportation Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Under-crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTC</td>
<td>Ultimate Transportation Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>Volume to Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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