# Coffee Creek Master Plan Appendix 

## Section G. Traffic Analysis

# MEMORANDUM 

DATE: February 12, 2007
TO: Todd Chase, OTAK
Sandy Young, City of Wilsonville
FROM: Scott Mansur, PE
SUBJECT: Coffee Creek Transportation Technical Memorandum \#2 P06097x201x000

This memorandum provides a summary of the transportation analysis performed for the Coffee Creek industrial area located west of the I-5/Stafford Road interchange in the City of Wilsonville. This study focuses on the existing and future traffic conditions related to the Coffee Creek land use planning efforts.

## Project Description

In 2002, the Coffee Creek area (Urban Reserve Area 42) was annexed into the City of Wilsonville urban growth boundary (UGB) and was designated as a Regionally Significant Industrial Area (RSIA). A prior Urban Reserve study by OTAK ${ }^{1}$ identified the need for industrial, complementary commercial, and office uses within Coffee Creek boundaries. At this time, the City of Wilsonville is seeking Master Plan approval for the portion of land south of Day Road, which is consistent with the land that was annexed into the City. The land north of Day Road is being considered for conceptual purposes with the likelihood that it could be master planned in the future.

## Existing Conditions

The following sections summarize the current traffic and transportation conditions in the study area. The following nine intersections (seven exist today and two are future intersections) were chosen for analysis:

- I-5 Northbound Ramp Terminal @ Boones Ferry Road-Elligsen Road
- I-5 Southbound Ramp Terminal @ Boones Ferry Road-Elligsen Road
- Boones Ferry Road @ Day Road
- Boones Ferry Road @ Commerce Circle $/ 95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue
- Grahams Ferry Road @ Clutter/Ridder
- Graham's Ferry Road @ Day Road
- Grahams Ferry Road @ Tonquin Rd
- Day Road @ Kinsman Road (future)
- Ridder Road @ Kinsman Road (future)

The study area is shown in Figure 1.
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Figure 1: Study Area

## Traffic Counts

Traffic counts were conducted at the seven existing intersections within in the Coffee Creek study area. Peak period (7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM) weekday turning movement counts were conducted to provide information regarding traffic volume, capacity, pedestrian movements, bicycle movements, truck activity and transit flow. Figure 2 summarizes the existing turn movement counts in the study area. These counts were used to establish existing operating conditions, which will serve as a baseline for analyzing future development options for the Coffee Creek area.

## Functional Classification

Table 1 summarizes the various functional classifications for streets in the study area based on the City of Wilsonville Transportation System Plan (TSP) ${ }^{2}$ adopted in June 2003 and the Washington County TSP ${ }^{3}$ adopted in October 2002. Roadway classifications form the basis for street design considerations, particularly relating to access management and mobility.

Table 1: Study Area Roadway Network

| Roadway | Classification <br> (Wilsonville TSP) | Classification <br> (Washington Co.) | Cross <br> Section | Posted <br> Speed | Existing <br> Sidewalks |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| I-5 | Principal Arterial | Principal Arterial | 6 lanes | 65 | None |
| Boones Ferry | Major Arterial | Arterial | 5 lanes | 35 | Partial |
| Elligsen Road | Major Arterial | Arterial | 6 lanes | 35 | Partial |
| Day Road | Major Collector | Arterial | 3 lanes | 35 | South side |
| Commerce <br> Circle | Local Street | Local | 2 lanes | 25 | Partial |
| $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Minor Arterial | Local | 3 lanes | 35 | Yes |
| Grahams Ferry <br> Road | Minor Arterial | Arterial N of <br> Day/Collector S of | 2 lanes | 45 | Partial |
| Clutter Road | Major Collector | Day <br> Collector | 2 lanes | 35 | None |
| Ridder Road | Minor Arterial | Collector | 3 lanes <br> w/CTL | 35 | Partial |
| Tonquin Road | Minor Arterial | Arterial | 2 lanes | 45 | None |

## Access Management

Table 2 summarizes the access spacing standards for the roadways in the study area adjacent to the proposed development site as adopted in the City's TSP ${ }^{4}$. In general, the speed, level of mobility and the relative safety of a roadway is related to the number of accesses and the traffic volume it carries. It is in the City's best interest to control the number and spacing of access along its major roadways. The minimum and desirable access spacing standards vary depending on roadway type. In the City of Wilsonville, minor arterial roadways require a minimum access spacing of 600 feet, whereas major collectors only require 100 feet of spacing between accesses. An access is any point along a roadway where vehicles may enter the traffic stream, including other roads or driveways.
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Figure 2: Turn Movement Counts

Table 2: Access Spacing for Roadways Adjacent to Proposed Development Site

| Roadway | Classification <br> (Wilsonville TSP) | Posted <br> Speed | Minimum <br> Access <br> Spacing (ft) | Desirable <br> Access <br> Spacing |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grahams Ferry Road | Minor Arterial | $35-50$ | 600 | 1 mile |
| Day Road | Major Collector | $25-40$ | 100 | $1 / 2$ mile |
| Ridder Road | Minor Arterial | $35-50$ | 600 | 1 mile |
| Clutter Road | Major Collector | $25-40$ | 100 | $1 / 2$ mile |
| Tonquin Road | Minor Arterial | $35-50$ | 600 | 1 mile |

Source: City of Wilsonville Transportation System Plan, Adopted June 2, 2003. Table 4.0.

## Vehicle Traffic Operation

The concept of level of service has been developed to correlate traffic volume data to subjective descriptions of traffic performance at intersections. Level of service (LOS) is used as a measure of effectiveness for intersection operation. It is similar to a "report card" rating based upon average vehicle delay. Level of service A, B, and C indicate conditions where vehicles can move freely. Level of service D and E are progressively worse. Level of service F represents conditions where traffic volumes exceed the capacity of a specific movement, in the case of unsignalized intersections, or an entire intersection, in the case of a signal control, resulting in long queues and delays. Level of service D or better is generally desirable for signalized intersections.

Unsignalized intersections provide levels of service for major and minor street turning movements. For this reason, LOS E and even LOS F can be acceptable under conditions where signalization is not warranted or would adversely affect intersection operation as a whole. A summary of descriptions of level of service for signalized and unsignalized intersections has been attached in the Appendix.

Traffic operation standards for this project are based on the City of Wilsonville, Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) for the study area roadways. All of the applicable standards are based on HCM methodology ${ }^{5}$. The City of Wilsonville has a minimum performance standard of LOS D for its arterial and collector street network ${ }^{6}$. The RTP standards for level of service are shown in Table 3, the OHP standards for volume to capacity ratio are listed in Table 4 and the Washington County standards are summarized in Table 5.

Table 3: Regional AM/PM Peak Hour Performance Standards - RTP

| Roadway | Classification | Preferred Operating <br> Standard |  | Acceptable Operating <br> Standard |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Hour | $\mathbf{2 d}^{\text {nd }}$ Hour | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Hour | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Hour |
| I-5 | Principal Arterial | E | D | E | E |
| Boones Ferry | Minor Arterial (ODOT) | E | D | E | E |

2004 Regional Transportation Plan, July 8, 2004 (Table 1.2). LOS D defined as demand to capacity ratio of 0.8 to 0.9 , LOS E 0.9 to 1.0 , and LOS F 1.0 to 1.1.

[^2]Table 4: Oregon Department of Transportation Volume-to-Capacity Standards - OHP

| Highway | Classification | VIC Standard* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1^{\text {st }}$ Hour | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Hour |
| I-5 | Interstate Highway | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Boones Ferry | District Highway | 0.99 | 0.99 |

*Based on the December 13, 2000 Amendment to the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan. V/C is volume-to-capacity ratio.
Table 5: Washington County Peak Hour Performance Standards - TSP

| Roadway | Classification | Preferred Operating <br> Standard |  | Acceptable Operating <br> Standard |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Hour | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Hour | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Hour | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Hour |
| Boones Ferry <br> Road | Arterial | D | D | E | D |
| Grahams Ferry <br> Road | Arterial - N. of Day Rd. <br> Collector - S. of Day Rd. <br> Day Road | D | D | E | D |

Washington County 2020 TSP, October 29, 2002 (Table 5) LOS D defined as demand to capacity ratio of 0.81 to 0.9 , LOS E 0.91 to 0.99 .

Existing transportation conditions have been evaluated to provide a baseline scenario to compare with future scenarios and to determine existing deficiencies. Analysis of the existing traffic conditions was conducted in the morning and evening peak hours when traffic volumes are greatest. The existing study intersection operations are shown in Table 6.

All of the study intersections currently operate at a level of service and volume to capacity ratio that comply with City, County, State and Regional guidelines. The lowest level of operating service occurred at the Boones Ferry $/ 95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection, which had a LOS D during both the AM and PM peak hours.

Table 6: AM and PM Peak Hour Existing Intersection Performance

|  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Delay | LOS | VIC | Delay | LOS | VIC |
| Signalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I-5 Northbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 9.0 | A | 0.55 | 8.8 | A | 0.70 |
| I-5 Southbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 17.4 | B | 0.75 | 15.5 | B | 0.48 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Commerce Cir - 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | 38.3 | D | 0.82 | 45.9 | D | 0.80 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | 11.4 | B | 0.62 | 12.8 | B | 0.41 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 16.3 | B | 0.55 | 24.8 | C | 0.62 |
| Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | 14.0 | A/B | 0.22 | 12.9 | A/B | 0.39 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin | 15.1 | A/C | 0.52 | 19.1 | A/C | 0.56 |
| Signalized Intersection LOS: <br> LOS = Level of service <br> Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection <br> V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio. <br> Unsignalized Intersection LOS: <br> A/A = Major Street left turn level of service/minor street level of service <br> V/C = Volume-to-capacity ratio provided for the worst approach. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Field Observations/Queuing

Field observations were conducted at the study area intersections during the peak periods ${ }^{7}$. The AM peak hour observation showed a high volume of left turns on Boones Ferry Road at $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. More than 600 left turns make this movement in the AM peak hour with only one 400 ' left turn pocket. The queues were observed to spill back to the I-5 southbound ramp terminal thus impacting the I-5 southbound off ramp.
During the PM peak period, there were several notable queues that were observed. At the intersection of $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Boones Ferry Road, queues extended to Ridder Road from approximately 4:10 to 4:30. The excessive queues on $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue only occurred for about a 20 minute period. After this short peak, queues and this approach ranged from 400' to 500'.

At the intersection of Boones Ferry Road/Day Road, the northbound left turn queues routinely exceeded the 200 feet of available storage. There is sufficient width on Boones Ferry Road south of Day Road to extend the existing left turn pocket. Striping modifications would be necessary to extend the left turn pocket.
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## Collision Data

Collision data was obtained within the study area from ODOT for a three year period (2003-2005). Table 8 displays the number of collisions and associated collision rate for the study intersections. The data was analyzed and revealed that none of the study intersections currently have collision rates higher than 1.0. Typically, a collision rate equal to or greater than 1.0 collisions per Million Entering Vehicles (MEV) would indicate that there could possibly be a safety problem. The highest crash rate observed ( 0.51 crashes per MEV) was at the I-5 Southbound Ramp Terminal/Boones Ferry Road intersection. Of the 29 crashes reported in the study area, none of the collisions had fatalities or involved pedestrians or bicycles.

Table 7: Study Area Collision Summary (2003-2005)

| Intersection | Collisions | Collision Rate/MEV |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I-5 Northbound Ramp Terminal @ Boones Ferry Road - | 9 | 0.28 |
| Elligsen Road |  |  |
| I-5 Southbound Ramp Terminal/Boones Ferry Road - Elligsen | 15 | 0.51 |
| Road | 0 | 0.00 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 5 | 0.18 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Commerce Circle - 95th Avenue | 0 | 0.00 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | 0 | 0.00 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | 0 | 0.00 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road |  |  |

## Future Conditions

The following sections describe the future impacts of the proposed Coffee Creek industrial area on the study area transportation system. The future conditions evaluation includes trip generation, trip distribution and assignment, motor vehicle intersection capacity analysis, queuing and internal circulation.

## Coffee Creek Alternatives

Two land use alternatives have been developed by the project team for the Coffee Creek project area, including comments from the Coffee Creek Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The Coffee Creek area is generally bounded by properties just north of Day Road, the existing railroad tracks to the west, the BPA power lines to the east, and Ridder Road/Clutter Road to the south. Both alternatives have similar roadway networks with two exceptions. Alternative 2 shows an extension of Commerce Circle South to the future extension of Kinsman Road. This connection would provide an east/west connection to Kinsman Road between Day Road and Ridder Road. The second network change is a realignment of Clutter Road and Grahams Ferry Road intersection. This realignment would provide safe intersection sight distance caused by the existing Grahams Ferry Road grade separated crossing. The Coffee Creek alternatives that depict the proposed roadways, pedestrian connections and zoning are shown in Figures 3 and 4.
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## Insert Figure 3
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## Insert figure 4

## Coffee Creek Master Plan Area - South of Day Road

The area south of Day Road that is within the Wilsonville UGB is considered a Regionally Significant Industrial Area (RSIA). A RSIA is considered an area which is near the region's most significant transportation facilities for the movement of freight and other areas most suitable for movement and storage of goods. The area south of Day Road includes approximately 193 total acres with 164 gross build able acres. This area is projected to generate approximately 1,480 new jobs. The land use for the project area south of Day Road is summarized in Table 8. It should be noted that there are no differences in proposed land uses between Alternatives 1 and 2 for the master plan area south of Day Road.

Table 8: Coffee Creek Area South of Day Road Land Use Summary

| Coffee Creek Area | Public <br> Facilities* | Industrial | Service <br> Commercial | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Acres/Employment |  |  |
| South of Day Road <br> (Alternative 1 \& 2) | $29 /-$ | $154 / 1390$ | $10 / 90$ | $193 / 1,480$ |
| *includes public right-of-way for arterial and collector roads, utilities, and parks. |  |  |  |  |

## Coffee Creek Conceptual Area - North of Day Road

The Coffee Creek project area North of Day contains portion of RSLA and therefore contains Industrial, as well as service commercial zoning. The project area north of Day Road encompasses approximately 74 total acres with approximately 55 build able acres under Alternative 1 and 65 build able acres under Alternative 2. Alternative 2 assumes approximately 10 additional acres could be developed over alternative because of a residential component of the project just west of Boones Ferry Road that has topography that would be conducive to residential development as compared to industrial. The area north of Day Road will produce between 260 and 420 jobs depending on the alternative. Table 9 compares the number of jobs and build able acres between each alternative.

Table 9: Coffee Creek Area North of Day Road Land Use Summary
$\left.\begin{array}{cccccc}\hline \text { Coffee Creek Area } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Public } \\ \text { Facilities* }\end{array} & \text { Industrial } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Service } \\ \text { Commercial }\end{array} & \text { Residential } & \text { Total } \\ \hline & & & \text { Acres/Employment }\end{array}\right]$

[^4]
## Trip Generation

Trip generation was estimated using standard transportation planning trip generation rates based on research conducted by the Institute of Transportation Engineers ${ }^{8}$ (ITE) for land use types similar to the proposed land uses within the Coffee Creek project area. The land use alternatives identified for the project area include industrial, service commercial, and residential. The estimated PM peak hour and weekday daily vehicle trip generation is summarized in Table 10. Supporting information is provided in the appendix. Trip generation information is provided for both the area south of Day Road (that is within the UGB) and the area north of Day Road (the conceptual area north of Day Road that is outside the UGB) to differentiate the level of trip generation potential for the project area. The Coffee Creek industrial area is estimated to generate between 17,200 and 19,300 daily vehicles trips depending on the alternative (approximately 13,000 for the area south of Day Road and between 4,300 and 6,300 for the area north of Day Road). The Coffee Creek project area south of Day Road generates approximately 67\% to $75 \%$ of the total project trips based on land use potential in Alternatives 1 and 2 respectively.

Table 10: Coffee Creek Industrial Area Trip Generation

| Coffee Creek Master Plan Area - South of Day Road | Total Trips | In | Out | Weekday <br> Daily |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alternative 1 and $\mathbf{2}^{*}$ | 1,681 | 345 | 1,336 | 12,935 |
| Coffee Creek Conceptual Area - North of Day Road | Total Trips | In | Out | Weekday <br> Daily |
| Alternative 1 | 590 | 119 | 471 | 4,264 |
| Alternative 2 | 631 | 216 | 415 | 6,332 |
| Coffee Creek Total Area- North and South of Day Road | Total PM Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday <br> Daily |
| Total (North Alt. 1+South) | 2,271 | 464 | 1,807 | 17,199 |
| Total (North Alt. 2+South) | 2,312 | 561 | 1,751 | 19,267 |

*Trip Generation for the project area south of Day Road is the same for both alternatives.
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## Coffee Creek Future Travel Demand Forecasts

Future travel demand forecasting for the Coffee Creek study area utilized the latest 2030 model developed by Metro, Washington County, and DKS Associates for the I-5 to 99W Connector Study. As part of the model development for the I-5 to 99W Connector Study, the Wilsonville TSP travel demand model zone structure and network detail was used as a guideline to refine the regional model. The resulting travel demand model provides a forecast of background traffic growth based on the 2030 MetroScope land use, estimation of trip distribution for the Coffee Creek land areas, and assignment of trips to the roadway network based on congestion levels. Future 2030 PM peak hour volumes at study intersections were developed for the No Build and three Coffee Creek land uses scenarios by adjusting the travel demand model trip tables to reflect the trip rates listed in Table 10. These volumes were then used to analyze and determine future impacts from the proposed Coffee Creek industrial area on the planned roadway network. The future 2030 PM peak hour scenarios include:

- 2030 No Build (no development in the Coffee Creek area)
- 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day (Alternative 1)
- 2030 with Coffee Creek Area North and South of Day (Alternative 1)
- 2030 with Coffee Creek Area North and South of Day (Alternative 2)

The 2030 future PM peak hour forecasts for each of the study area scenarios are shown in Figure 5.

## Planned Study Area Roadway Improvements

The City of Wilsonville TSP and the Washington County TSP provide specific information regarding future transportation projects that were identified to meet needs created by future growth within the study area. Table 11 identifies the projects that were recommended specific to the project area. The only projects that have been assumed in the 2030 No Build scenario are those that have already been constructed as well as the Kinsman Road extension. The Kinsman Road project has been assumed for the No Build scenario since this project would be necessary to evaluate the future Kinsman Road study intersections at Day Road and Clutter Road. The remaining projects were not included in any of the future analysis scenarios in order to determine which scenario triggers the specific improvement need.

Figure 5: 2030 PM peak hour traffic volumes

Table 11: Study Area Planned Projects

| TSP Project Number | Location | Description (Project Status) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wilsonville \#W-2 | Boones Ferry Rd. | Widen Boones Ferry Road from $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to Day Road to five lanes (this project has been constructed). |
| Wilsonville \#W-16 | Day Rd. | Widen Day Road to three lanes from Grahams Ferry Road to Boones Ferry Road (this project has been constructed). |
| Wilsonville \#C-7 and \#S-36 | Kinsman Rd. Extension | Construct two-lane extension of Kinsman Road from RxR tracks to Ridder Road. Construct traffic signal at Kinsman Road/Day Road intersection. (these projects have not been constructed) |
| Wilsonville \#C-24 and \#S-18 | Kinsman Rd. Extension | Construct two-lane extension of Kinsman Road from Ridder Road to Day Road. Construct left turn pockets on all approaches and a traffic signal (these projects have not been constructed). |
| Wilsonville \#S-1 | Grahams Ferry Rd/Day Rd Intersection | Install traffic signal (this traffic signal has been constructed). |
| Wilsonville \#S-6 | Boones Ferry Rd/Day Rd Intersection | Install traffic signal and northbound through lane (this project has been constructed). |
| Wilsonville \#S-11 | Boones Ferry Rd./95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave. Intersection | Construct eastbound right turn lane to create dual eastbound right turn lanes, restripe westbound approach for an additional left turn pocket (this project has not been constructed) and widen the Boones Ferry Road for a third eastbound through lane that drops at the I-5 southbound on ramp. (this project has not been constructed). |
| Washington County \#131 | Grahams Ferry Rd | Widen Grahams Ferry Road to three lanes from Tonquin to Cutter Rd and provide sidewalks |
| Washington County \#132 | Day St | Widen Day St. to three lanes from Grahams Ferry Road to Boones Ferry Road and provide sidewalks (this project has been completed) |
| Washington County \#133 | Clutter/Ridder Rd | Widen Clutter/Ridder to three lanes from Grahams Ferry Road to Boones Ferry Road and provide sidewalks (this project has not been completed) |
| Washington County \#138 | Tonquin Rd | Widen and Realign Tonquin Rd from Grahams Ferry to Oregon St and provide sidewalks |

## Future Year Operations Analysis

## 2030 No Build

In order to provide a baseline comparison to the future Coffee Creek alternatives, the 2030 No Build scenario evaluates future traffic volumes assuming the existing geometry and no development of the Coffey Creek project area beyond what currently exists today.

With the addition of 2030 No Build traffic volumes, four of the study area intersections would fail to meet operating standards. These intersections include Boones Ferry Road $/ 95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Boones Ferry Road/Day Road, Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road and Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road. The 2030 No Build intersection operations are summarized in Table 12. Mitigations have been identified in Table 13 to improve the 2030 No Build intersection operations to meet the applicable standards.

Table 12: 2030 No Build Intersection Performance (PM Peak Hour)

|  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Delay | LOS | VIC |
| Signalized |  |  |  |
| I-5 Northbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 12.6 | B | 0.80 |
| I-5 Southbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 26.7 | C | 0.82 |
| Boones Ferry Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | >80 | F | >1.0 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | 14.6 | B | 0.68 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | >80 | F | >1.0 |
| Kinsman Road/Day Road | 26.6 | C | 0.81 |
| Kinsman Road/Ridder Road | 17.3 | B | 0.42 |
| Unsignalized |  |  |  |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | $>50$ | A/F | >1.0 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | $>50$ | A/F | >1.0 |
| Signalized Intersection LOS: <br> LOS = Level of service <br> Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour fo <br> V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio. <br> Unsignalized Intersection LOS: <br> A/A = Major Street left turn level of service/m <br> V/C = Volume-to-capacity ratio provided for the | section <br> vel of ser roach. |  |  |

Table 13: 2030 No Build Mitigations (PM Peak Hour)
Intersection Recommended Mitigation
Tonquin/SW Grahams Ferry
Road

Day Road/Boones Ferry Road

Boones Ferry Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$
Avenue

- Install westbound left turn lane
- Install northbound left turn lane
- Install traffic signal

|  | - Construct an eastbound right turn lane on $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. The eastbound approach would consist of a shared through-left turn lane and dual right turn lanes. |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - Stripe a westbound separate left turn pocket on the private industrial park approach |
| Boones Ferry Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | - Install median on $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to modify the Commerce Circle north approach to $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to right in and right out movements only. The median would provide for improved operation of the intersection and increased storage with the existing center turn lane being available for left and through movements. |
|  | - Construct a second northbound left turn pocket on Boones Ferry Road at $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. Additional widening for two southbound through lanes (a minimum of 500' plus taper) would be required on $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to facilitate the dual left turns. |


|  | - Construct a westbound left turn pocket on Clutter Road |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter <br> Road | -Construct a southbound left turn pocket on Grahams Ferry <br> Road |
|  | -Construct a traffic signal |

With the mitigations identified in Table 13, the intersections were reanalyzed to determine the intersection operations with the identified improvements. With the mitigations, all of the study area intersections would operate at an acceptable level of service "C" or better. The 2030 No Build mitigated intersection performance is summarized in Table 14.

Table 14: 2030 No Build Mitigated Intersection Performance (PM Peak Hour)

| Signalized Intersection | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay | LOS | V/C |
| Boones Ferry Road/95 |  |  |  |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 24.3 | C | 0.75 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | 30.4 | C | 0.84 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | 15.3 | B | 0.79 |

Signalized Intersection LOS:
LOS = Level of service
Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection
V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio.

The operational analysis as previously shown in Tables 12 and 14 is based on an isolated intersection evaluation which means that each study intersection is evaluated independently. In order to evaluate the entire Stafford Road interchange area, the SimTraffic ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ simulation model was utilized to provide a system wide assessment of traffic operating conditions on the Elligsen Road corridor. This simulation is especially important within the Elligsen Road interchange area because of the pre-existing nonconforming intersection spacing on Boones Ferry Road between the I-5 southbound interchange ramp and $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue where queuing from one intersection could affect an adjacent intersection (as occurs today on Boones Ferry Road between the I-5 southbound ramp and $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue during the AM peak period).

Queuing analysis was performed for the future mitigated No Build alternative using SimTraffic ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$, which estimates the 95th percentile queue for each approach movement at signalized intersections. This 95th percentile queue estimates that for any given cycle at a signalized intersection, the queue length calculated is representative of 95 percent of the peak fifteen minute vehicular queues during the peak hour at that intersection.

Under the mitigated No Build alternative, one of the estimated vehicle queues would exceed the available storage that would be provided under this alternative. The northbound left turn lane on Boones Ferry Road would need to be lengthened to provide at least 400 feet of storage under this scenario. Table 15 summarizes the available storage for key movements within the Stafford Road interchange area and summarizes the results of the vehicle queuing analysis.

Table 15: 2030 Mitigated No Build $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queuing Summary (PM Peak Hour)

| Intersection | Movement | Available <br> Storage | $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile <br> Estimated <br> Queue | Exceeds Storage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NB Left | $200^{\prime}$ | $400^{\prime}$ | Yes |
| Boones Ferry | NB Through | $825^{\prime}$ | $250^{\prime}$ | No |
| Road/Day Road | SB Through | $>2,000^{\prime}$ | $1,200^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | EB Left | $>750^{\prime}$ | $500^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | EB Right | $1,500^{\prime}$ | $500^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | EB Left | TBD | $275^{\prime}$ | No |
| Boones Ferry | EB Right | TBD | $525^{\prime}$ | No |
| Road/95 ${ }^{\text {h }}$ Avenue | NB Left | $400^{\prime}$ | $350^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | NB Through | $400^{\prime}$ | $250^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | SB Through | $825^{\prime}$ | $800^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | SB Left | $500^{\prime}$ | $325^{\prime}$ | No |
| Boones Ferry Road/I-5 | SB Right | $500^{\prime}$ | $300^{\prime}$ | No |
| Southbound Ramp | EB Through | $400^{\prime}$ | $350^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | WB Through | $>1,500^{\prime}$ | $425^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | EB Through | $>1,500^{\prime}$ | $425^{\prime}$ | No |
| Elligsen Road/I-5 | WB Through | $425^{\prime}$ | $275^{\prime}$ | No |
| Northbound Ramp | NB Right | $325^{\prime}$ | $250^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | NB Left | $325^{\prime}$ | $200^{\prime}$ | No |

TBD- These future turn lanes would be constructed as part of the mitigated scenario and therefore the pocket lengths could be sized as needed.

## 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day Road (Alternative 1)

The following scenario evaluated project traffic from the Coffee Creek Master Plan area south of Day Road. Based on the forecasted traffic volumes for this scenario, five of the study area intersections would fail to meet operating standards. The 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan area intersection operations are summarized in Table 16. Mitigations have been identified for the five failing intersections in Table 17 to meet the applicable operating standards.

Table 16: 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day Alternative 1 Intersection Performance

|  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Delay | LOS | VIC |
| Signalized |  |  |  |
| I-5 Northbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 12.7 | B | 0.79 |
| I-5 Southbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 26.9 | C | 0.88 |
| Boones Ferry Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | >80 | F | >1.0 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | 23.9 | C | 0.81 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | >80 | F | >1.0 |
| Kinsman Road/Day Road | 64.9 | E | >1.0 |
| Kinsman Road/Ridder Road | 22.0 | C | 0.58 |
| Unsignalized |  |  |  |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | $>50$ | A/F | >1.0 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | >50 | A/F | >1.0 |
| Signalized Intersection LOS: <br> LOS = Level of service <br> Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection <br> V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio. <br> Unsignalized Intersection LOS: <br> A/A = Major Street left turn level of service/minor street level of service <br> V/C = Volume-to-capacity ratio provided for the worst approach. |  |  |  |

Table 17: 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day Road- Alternative 1 Mitigations

| Intersection/Roadway | Recommended Mitigation |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Day Road/Kinsman Road | - | Construct northbound left turn pocket |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day <br> Road | - | Construct dual southbound left turn lanes |
| Boones Ferry Road | Construct a third southbound through lane on Boones Ferry <br> Road from Day Road that would drop at the I-5 southbound <br> on-ramp. The existing southbound right turn lane on Boones <br> Ferry Road at 95 |  |
| third through lane is constructed. |  |  |

It should be noted that the following mitigations are in addition to the improvements identified for the 2030 No Build scenario as shown in Table 13.

With the mitigations identified in Table 17, the intersections were reevaluated to determine the intersection operations with the identified improvements. With the mitigations, all of the study area intersections would operate at an acceptable level of service "C" or better. The 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan area south of Day Road mitigated intersection performance is summarized in Table 18.

Table 18: 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day Road Alternative 1 Mitigated Intersection Performance

| Signalized Intersection | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay | LOS | VIC |
|  | 24.9 | C | 0.74 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 31.4 | C | 0.87 |
| Kinsman Road/Day Road | 34.4 | C | 0.89 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | 16.0 | B | 0.82 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | 38.4 | C | 0.91 |
| Signalized Intersection LOS: <br> LOS = Level of service <br> Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection <br> V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio. |  |  |  |

The future 2030 with the Coffee Creek Master Plan Area south of Day Road was evaluated with SimTraffic ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ to determine if queuing impacts would affect the operations of adjacent intersections based on a system wide evaluation. This evaluation determined that a third southbound through lane would be needed on Boones Ferry Road from Day Road to the I-5 southbound ramp (as discussed in Table 17). The third southbound through lane is consistent with prior findings in the City's TSP. With the mitigations shown in Table 17, all of the vehicular movements would operate within estimated storage with the exception of the northbound left turn movement on Boones Ferry Road at Day Road. This turn pocket would need to be extended to provide adequate storage. There is adequate width on Boones Ferry Road to lengthen the existing turn pocket with striping medications. Table 19 summarizes the available storage for key movements within the Stafford interchange area.

Table 19: 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day Road Alternative 1 Mitigated 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queuing Summary (PM Peak Hour)

| Intersection | Movement | Available <br> Storage | $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile <br> Estimated <br> Queue | Exceeds Storage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

TBD- These future turn lanes would be constructed as part of the mitigated scenario and therefore the pocket lengths could be sized as needed.

## 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North \& South of Day Road (Alternative 1)

The following scenario evaluates project traffic from the Coffee Creek areas north and south of Day Road utilizing the Alternative 1 roadway network. Based on the forecasted traffic volumes for this scenario, the same study area intersections would fail to meet operating standards as was identified in Coffee Creek area south of Day Road. The intersection operations for this scenario are summarized in Table 20. Mitigations have been identified for the failing intersections in Table 21 to meet the applicable operating standards.

Table 20: 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North and South of Day Road Alternative 1 Intersection Performance

|  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Delay | LOS | VIC |
| Signalized |  |  |  |
| I-5 Northbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 12.8 | B | 0.79 |
| I-5 Southbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 27.1 | C | 0.91 |
| Boones Ferry Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | >80 | F | >1.0 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | 26.3 | C | 0.84 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | >80 | F | $>1.0$ |
| Kinsman Road/Day Road | 63.9 | E | >1.0 |
| Kinsman Road/Ridder Road | 23.0 | C | 0.61 |
| Unsignalized |  |  |  |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | $>50$ | A/F | $>1.0$ |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | $>50$ | A/F | >1.0 |
| Signalized Intersection LOS: <br> LOS = Level of service <br> Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection <br> V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio. <br> Unsignalized Intersection LOS: <br> A/A = Major Street left turn level of service/minor street level of service <br> V/C = Volume-to-capacity ratio provided for the worst approach. |  |  |  |

Table 21: 2030 with Coffee Creek North and South of Day Road Alternative 1 Mitigations
Intersection/Roadway Recommended Mitigation

| Day Road/Kinsman Road | - | Construct northbound left turn pocket |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day <br> Road | $\bullet$ | Construct dual southbound left turn lanes |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day <br> Road | $\bullet$ | Construct dual eastbound right turn lanes |
| Boones Ferry Road | -Construct a third southbound through lane on Boones Ferry <br> Road from Day Road that would drop at the I-5 southbound <br> on-ramp. The existing southbound right turn lane on Boones <br> Ferry Road at 95th Avenue could be removed at the time the <br> third through lane is constructed. |  |

It should be noted that the following mitigations are in addition to the improvements identified for the 2030 No Build scenario as shown in Table 13.

With the mitigations identified in Table 21, the intersections were reevaluated to determine the intersection operations with the identified improvements. With the mitigations, all of the study area intersections would operate at an acceptable level of service "C" or better. The 2030 with Coffee Creek areas north and south of Day Road mitigated intersection performance is summarized in Table 22.

Table 22: 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North and South of Day Road Alternative 1 Mitigated Intersection Performance

| Signalized Intersection | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay | LOS | V/C |
|  | 24.3 | C | 0.77 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 33.9 | C | 0.90 |
| Kinsman Road/Day Road | 34.4 | C | 0.89 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | 16.2 | B | 0.82 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | 41.8 | D | 0.93 |
| Signalized Intersection LOS: |  |  |  |
| LOS = Level of service |  |  |  |
| Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection |  |  |  |
| V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio. |  |  |  |$\quad$|  |
| :--- | :--- |

The future 2030 with the Coffee Creek areas north and south of Day Road (Alternative 1) was evaluated with SimTraffic ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ to determine if queuing impacts would affect the operations of adjacent intersections based on a system wide evaluation. With the mitigations shown in Table 17, all of the vehicular movements would operate within estimated storage with the exception of the northbound left turn movement on Boones Ferry Road at Day Road. This turn pocket would need to be extended to provide adequate storage. There is adequate width on Boones Ferry Road to lengthen the existing turn pocket with striping medications. Table 23 summarizes the available storage for key movements within the Stafford interchange area.

Table 23: 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North and South of Day Road Alternative 1 Mitigated $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queuing Summary (PM Peak Hour)

| Intersection | Movement | Available <br> Storage | $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile <br> Estimated <br> Queue | Exceeds Storage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

TBD- These future turn lanes would be constructed as part of the mitigated scenario and therefore the pocket lengths could be sized as needed.

## 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North \& South of Day Road (Alternative 2)

The following scenario evaluates project traffic from the Coffee Creek areas north and south of Day Road with the Alternative 2 roadway network. Based on the forecasted traffic volumes for this scenario, five study area intersections would fail to meet operating standards. The intersection operations for this scenario are summarized in Table 24. Mitigations have been identified for the failing intersections in Table 25 to meet the applicable operating standards.

This alternative includes an extension of Commerce Circle to the future Kinsman Road extension. Based on the traffic forecasts as shown in Figure 5, this roadway project would increase the westbound left turns from Boones Ferry Road to $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue as well as the northbound right turns from $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to Boones Ferry Road. Since this project would be expensive to construct and would not significantly benefit traffic operations, this network connection would not be recommended.

Table 24: 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North and South of Day Road Alternative 2 Intersection Performance

|  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Delay | LOS | VIC |
| Signalized |  |  |  |
| I-5 Northbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 12.9 | B | 0.79 |
| I-5 Southbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 27.6 | C | 0.95 |
| Boones Ferry Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | >80 | F | >1.0 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | 23.2 | C | 0.80 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | >80 | F | >1.0 |
| Kinsman Road/Day Road | 48.0 | D | >1.0 |
| Kinsman Road/Ridder Road | 27.2 | C | 0.77 |
| Unsignalized |  |  |  |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | $>50$ | A/F | >1.0 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | $>50$ | A/F | >1.0 |
| Signalized Intersection LOS: <br> LOS = Level of service <br> Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection <br> V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio. <br> Unsignalized Intersection LOS: <br> A/A = Major Street left turn level of service/minor street level of service <br> V/C = Volume-to-capacity ratio provided for the worst approach. |  |  |  |

Table 25: 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North and South of Day Road Alternative 2 Mitigations
Intersection/Roadway Recommended Mitigation

| Day Road/Kinsman Road | - Construct northbound left turn pocket |
| :---: | :---: |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | Construct dual southbound left turn lanes |
| Commerce Circle Extension | - Extend Commerce Circle to the future Kinsman Road Extension (This improvement is included as part of the Alternative 2 roadway network). |
| Boones Ferry Road | - Construct a third southbound through lane on Boones Ferry Road from Day Road that would drop at the I-5 southbound on-ramp. The existing southbound right turn lane on Boones Ferry Road at $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue could be removed at the time the third through lane is constructed. |

It should be noted that the following mitigations are in addition to the improvements identified for the 2030 No Build scenario as shown in Table 13.

With the mitigations identified in Table 25, the intersections were reevaluated to determine the intersection operations with the identified improvements. With the mitigations, all of the study area intersections would operate at an acceptable level of service "D" or better. The 2030 with Coffee Creek areas north and south of Day Road mitigated intersection performance is summarized in Table 26.

Table 26: 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North and South of Day Road Alternative 2 Mitigated Intersection Performance

| Signalized Intersection | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay | LOS | VIC |
|  | 25.2 | C | 0.79 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 30.2 | C | 0.81 |
| Kinsman Road/Day Road | 31.1 | C | 0.92 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | 28.0 | C | 0.94 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | 43.8 | D | 0.94 |
| Signalized Intersection LOS: |  |  |  |
| LOS = Level of service |  |  |  |
| Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection |  |  |  |
| V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio. |  |  |  |$\quad$|  |
| :--- | :--- |

The future 2030 with the Coffee Creek areas north and south of Day Road (Alternative 2) was evaluated with SimTraffic ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ to determine if queuing impacts would affect the operations of adjacent intersections based on a system wide evaluation. With the mitigations shown in Table 25, all of the vehicular movements would operate within estimated storage with the exception of the northbound left turn movement on Boones Ferry Road at Day Road. This turn pocket would need to be extended to provide adequate storage. There is adequate width on Boones Ferry Road to lengthen the existing turn pocket with striping medications. Table 27 summarizes the available storage for key movements within the Stafford interchange area.

Table 27: 2030 with Coffee Creek North and South of Day Road Alternative 2 Mitigated $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queuing Summary (PM Peak Hour)

| Intersection | Movement | Available <br> Storage | $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile <br> Estimated <br> Queue | Exceeds Storage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

TBD- These future turn lanes would be constructed as part of the mitigated scenario and therefore the pocket lengths could be sized as needed.

## Coffee Creek Safety Improvements

There are several safety related improvements that are needed within the Coffee Creek project area that will be needed to meet current standards. The first improvement is the Grahams Ferry Road grade separated railroad crossing that is located approximately 350 feet south of Clutter Road. This crossing is narrow (approximately 22 feet) and restricts sight distance at the Clutter Road intersection in the southbound direction. Either the railroad crossing needs to be improved to provide safe sight distance and a wider cross section or Clutter Road will need to be realigned further to the north (see alignment shown for Alternative 2. If the railroad crossing is improved, it should be widened consistent with City Minor Arterial standards.

The second safety improvement is the horizontal curve on Boones Ferry Road approximately 400 feet north of Day Road. This segment was identified for widening to a 4-lane section north of Day Road as part of the 2030 No Build scenario. The horizontal curve should be improved as part of the capacity related improvements to Boones Ferry Road north of Day Road that were identified for the 2030 No Build scenario. The safety related improvements are summarized in Table 28.

Table 28: Coffee Creek Safety Improvements
Safety Improvement Recommendation

Grahams Ferry Road Grade
Separated Railroad Crossing

- Reconstruct Grade Separated Railroad Crossing to City of Wilsonville Minor Arterial standards.

Clutter Road/Grahams Ferry Road Intersection Sight Distance

Boones Ferry Road Horizontal Curve

- Realign Clutter Road to the North as shown in Alternative 2.
- As part of the Boones Ferry Road widening, bring horizontal curve up to current standards.


## Summary

The transportation impacts of future traffic associated with the Coffee Creek Industrial Area has been investigated in the preceding report. The primary findings and recommendations are summarized in the following sections.

## Recommended Mitigation Measures

To maintain adequate traffic performance standards within the study area during the PM peak period, mitigation measures are necessary to reduce the negative transportation impacts of future traffic growth.

## Non-Project Oriented Transportation Mitigation (No Build and Safety)

The following measures are related to estimated traffic growth on study area roadways. These mitigations would be necessary whether the Coffee Creek industrial area was developed. Additional safety related mitigations have been identified as well. Non-project oriented mitigations are summarized in Table 28.

Table 28: 2030 No Build and Safety Related Mitigations (PM Peak Hour)

| Intersection | Recommended Mitigation |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tonquin/SW Grahams | - | Install eastbound left turn lane |
| Ferry Road | Install northbound left turn lane |  |
|  | - | Install traffic signal |
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## Coffee Creek Master Plan Area Oriented Transportation Mitigation

The following measures as shown in Table 29 are related to the impacts of the proposed Coffee Creek Master Plan area south of Day Road. The mitigations as shown are in addition to the improvements identified for the 2030 No build scenario.

Table 29: Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day Road Mitigations
Intersection/Roadway Recommended Mitigation

| Day Road/Kinsman Road | - | Construct northbound left turn pocket |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | - | Construct dual southbound left turn lanes |
|  | -Construct a third southbound through lane on Boones Ferry <br> Road from Day Road that would drop at the I-5 southbound <br> on-ramp. The existing southbound right turn lane on Boones <br> Ferry Road at 95 $5^{\text {th }}$ Avenue could be removed at the time the <br> third through lane is constructed. |  |

## Coffee Creek Concept Area Oriented Transportation Mitigation

The following measures as shown in Tables 30 and 31 are related to the impacts of the proposed Coffee Creek conceptual area north of Day Road dependant upon. Table 30 summarizes the mitigation measures for Alternative 1 and Table 31 summarized the mitigation measures for Alternative 2. The main difference between the two alternatives is that Alternative 1 would require dual eastbound right turn lanes on Day Road at Boones Ferry Road and Alternative 2 would require the extension of Commerce Circle to the future Kinsman Road extension. The mitigations as shown are in addition to the improvements identified for the 2030 No build scenario.

Table 30: 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan and Concept Areas (Alternative 1) Mitigations

| Intersection/Roadway | Recommended Mitigation |
| :---: | :---: |
| Day Road/Kinsman Road | - Construct northbound and southbound left turn pockets |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | - Construct dual southbound left turn lanes |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | - Construct dual eastbound right turn lanes |
| Boones Ferry Road | - Construct a third southbound through lane on Boones Ferry Road from Day Road that would drop at the l-5 southbound on-ramp. The existing southbound right turn lane on Boones Ferry Road at $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue could be removed at the time the third through lane is constructed. |

Table 31: 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan and Concept Areas (Alternative 2) Mitigations
Intersection/Roadway Recommended Mitigation

Day Road/Kinsman Road

| Grahams Ferry Road/Day <br> Road | - | Construct dual southbound left turn lanes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | - | Extend Commerce Circle to the future Kinsman Road <br> Extension (This improvement is included as part of the <br> Alternative 2 roadway network). |

- Construct a third southbound through lane on Boones Ferry Road from Day Road that would drop at the I-5 southbound on-ramp. The existing southbound right turn lane on Boones Ferry Road at $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue could be removed at the time the third through lane is constructed.


# MEMORANDUM 

TO: Todd Chase, AICP, OTAK

FROM: Scott Mansur, P.E., DKS Associates
DATE: June 30, 2006

## SUBJECT: Wilsonville Coffee Creek I TGM <br> Transportation Plans and Policies, Goals and Objectives Technical Memo \#1

This is the first in a series of memorandums that presents technical findings and recommendations for the Wilsonville Coffee Creek TGM project. The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) with a summary of key transportation issues specific to the Coffee Creek project area that were addressed in the following past plans:

- 2004 Regional Transportation System Plan
- 1999 Oregon Highway Plan
- City of Wilsonville Transportation System Plan
- City of Wilsonville Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan
- City of Wilsonville Transit Master Plan (Draft)
- Washington County Transportation System Plan


## 2004 Regional Transportation Plan, Metro, July 8, 2004.

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a 20-year blueprint to ensure our ability to get from here to there as the Portland region grows. The RTP establishes transportation policies for all forms of travel motor vehicle, transit, pedestrian, bicycle and freight - and lays out the priority projects for roads and freight movement as well as bicycling, walking and transit. The plan is based on forecasts of growth in population, households, and jobs as well as future travel patterns and analysis of travel conditions. It considers estimates of federal, state and local funding which will be available for transportation improvements. The plan also comes with cost estimates and funding strategies to meet these costs. Local transportation plans are required by state law to be consistent with the RTP.

The following roadway classifications as shown in the table below as defined in the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan. It should be noted that there are no regional trails or greenways shown with the Coffee Creek project area.

Study Area Roadway Classifications as defined in the 2004 RTP:

| Roadway | Motor Vehicle <br> Function Class | Transit | Bike | Pedestrian | Freight |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I-5 | Principal Arterial <br> (Freeway) | ND | ND | ND | Main Roadway <br> Route |
| Boones Ferry <br> Road | Minor Arterial | Regional <br> Bus | Regional <br> Corridor | Transit <br> Mixed Use | Road Connector |
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ND-No Designation
The following table provides the regional performance measures for the study area roadways.
Regional Motor Vehicle Performance Measures as defined in the RTP:

| Roadway | Classification | Preferred Operating Standard |  | Acceptable Operating Standard |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Hour | $1^{\text {st }}$ Hour | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Hour |  |
| I-5 | Principal <br> Arterial | E | D | E | E |
| Boones Ferry <br> Road | Minor <br> Arterial | E | D | E | E |

2004 Regional Transportation Plan, July 8, 2004 (Table 1.2). LOS D defined as demand to capacity ratio of 0.8 to 0.9 , LOS E 0.9 to 1.0, and LOS F 1.0 to 1.1.

## 1999 Oregon Highway Plan, Oregon Department of Transportation, May 1999.

The Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) is a specific element of the Oregon Transportation Plan. The plan has three main elements: the Vision, the Policy Element and the System Element. The Vision portion of the plan considers what Oregon's highway system should look like, considering an anticipated 1.2 million new residents over the next 20 years, as well as projections for economic, demographic and technology forecasts. The Policy Element contains policies and actions under goals for System Definition, System Management, Access Management, Travel Alternatives, and Environmental and Scenic Resources. The System Element begins with an analysis of 20-year state highway needs and lays out investment strategies to meet these needs. This element also lays out an implementation plan for the goals, policies and actions identified in the Policy Element.

Currently, I-5 is classified as an Interstate Highway and Boones Ferry Road is classified as a District Highway within the Coffee Creek study area.

These policies apply to the following study area roadways:

| Highway | V/C Standard* |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1^{\text {st }}$ Hour | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Hour |
|  |  | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| I-5 | Interstate Highway | 0.99 | 0.99 |

*Based on the December 13, 2000 Amendment to the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan.

## Transportation System Plan (TSP), City of Wilsonville, June 2003.

The City of Wilsonville TSP provides specific information regarding transportation needs to guide future transportation investment in the City and determine how land use and transportation decisions can be brought together beneficially for the City. The TSP also addressed current problem areas and looked into the future (20 years) to identify needs created by growth. The table below identifies the projects that were recommended specific to the project area.
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Several projects have been listed in the TSP within the project area.

| Number | Location | Description (Project Status) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| W-2 | Boones Ferry Road | Widen Boones Ferry Road from 95 <br> th <br> Day Road to five lanes(this project has been to <br> constructed). |
| W-16 | Day Road | Widen Day Road to three lanes from Grahams <br> Ferry Road to Boones Ferry Road (this project has <br> been constructed). |
| C-7 | Kinsman Road Extension | Construct two-lane extension of Kinsman Road <br> from RxR tracks to Ridder Road (this project has <br> not been constructed). |
| C-24 | Kinsman Road Extension | Construct two-lane extension of Kinsman Road <br> from Ridder Road to Day Road (this project has <br> not been constructed). |
| S-1 | Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road <br> Intersection | Install traffic signal (this traffic signal has been <br> constructed). |
| S-6 | Boones Ferry Road/Day Road <br> Intersection | Install traffic signal and northbound through lane <br> (this project has been constructed). |

All of the public street intersections within the City of Wilsonville are required to meet a level of service "D" standard.

## Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, City of Wilsonville, March 2006 (Draft).

The City of Wilsonville Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan was recently updated and provides information regarding bicycle and pedestrian needs and identified improvements within the Coffee Creek study area and are summarized in the following table.

The following bicycle and pedestrian projects were identified within the project area.

| Number | Location | Description (Priority) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| C14 | Commerce Circle <br> (west of 95 | Commerce Circle serves north Wilsonville as a transit route, and <br> major portions of the roadway lacks sidewalks on one or both <br> sides. (11+ years) |
| C35 | Area 42 Trail <br> (Kinsman to Day <br> Road) | This trail was outlined in the Preliminary Urban Reserve Plan <br> Area 42 and North Wilsonville Industrial Area Proposed Concept <br> Plan providing a connection to the BPA powerline easement. <br> Provides an off-street connection through the industrial lands. (6- <br> 10 years) |
| C36 | BPA Powerline Trail <br> (Day Road to <br> Tonquin Trail | This trail connects bicyclists and pedestrians along Day Rd with <br> the Tonquin Trail. Provides Tonquin trail users access to the <br> northern industrial area of Wilsonville. (6-10 years) |
| C37 | Cahalin Road <br> (Kinsman Road to <br> Tonquin Trail) | Provides a safe connection through the northern industrial area of <br> Wilsonville. May provide additional connection to the Tonquin <br> Trail. (6-10 years) |
| C38 | Clutter Road (Garden <br> Acres Road to <br> Grahams Ferry Road) | Provides a safe connection through the northern industrial area of <br> Wilsonville. (6-10 years) |
| C39 | Grahams Ferry Road <br> (Day Road to Tooze <br> Road) | A major north south access road into Wilsonville that currently has <br> no provisions for bicyclists or pedestrians. Providing dedicated <br> facilities provides additional choices for bicycle commuters. (1-5 <br> years) |

## Transit Master Plan, City of Wilsonville, Draft May 2006.

The draft Transit Master Plan provides strategies for reducing the demand on roads and parking as well as improved transit service. The draft plan proposes a future transit route (Route \#203) that would provide service to the Coffee Creek project area via Day Road including a stop at the Coffee Creek Correctional Facility. This revised route was intended to serve the future annexation of industrial lands.

## Transportation System Plan (TSP), Washington County, October 2002

The Washington County 2020 Transportation System Plan is one of the several elements that comprise the Washington County Comprehensive Plan. The TSP contains the accumulation of recommended system and service improvements and programs that will be needed to serve long-term growth to 2020 and addresses transportation and safety issues related to motor vehicles, transit, pedestrian, bicycle, freight and other modes of transportation. The major work elements of the TSP are policies and strategies, data collection, existing travel conditions and future needs, travel mode alternatives, cost estimates and preparation of draft transportation plan.

The following table provides the Washington County motor vehicle performance measures for the study area roadways.

| Roadway | Classification | Target Performance <br> Measures |  | Acceptable performance <br> Measures |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | First Hour | Second <br> Hour | First Hour | Second <br> Hour |
| SW Boones <br> Ferry Road | Arterial | D | D | E | D |
| SW Grahams <br> Ferry Road | Arterial - North of Day St. <br> Collector - South of Day St. | D | D | E | D |
| SW Day St | Arterial | D | D | E | D |

Washington County 2020 TSP, October 29, 2002 (Table 5) LOS D defined as demand to capacity ratio of 0.81 to 0.9 , LOS E 0.91 to 0.99 .

The table below shows the capacity enhancement projects that were listed in the Washington County 2020 TSP technical appendix within the project area.

| Number | Location | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 131 | Grahams Ferry Rd | Widen Grahams Ferry Road to three lanes from Tonquin to Cutter Rd and <br> provide sidewalks |
| 132 | Day St | Widen Day St. to three lanes from Grahams Ferry Road to Boones Ferry <br> Road and provide sidewalks |
| 133 | Clutter/Ridder Rd | Widen Clutter/Ridder to three lanes from Grahams Ferry Road to Boones <br> Ferry Road and provide sidewalks |
| 138 | Tonquin Rd | Widen and Realign Tonquin Rd from Grahams Ferry to Oregon St and <br> provide sidewalks |

Washington County 2020 TSP, Technical Appendix B-2, C-4 May 3, 2002

## MEMORANDUM

DATE:
May 2, 2007
TO:

Todd Chase, OTAK<br>Sandy Young, City of Wilsonville

FROM: Scott Mansur, PE
SUBJECT: Coffee Creek Transportation Technical Memorandum \#2

This memorandum provides a summary of the transportation analysis performed for the Coffee Creek industrial area located west of the I-5/Stafford Road interchange in the City of Wilsonville, Oregon. This study focuses on the existing and future traffic conditions related to the Coffee Creek land use planning efforts.

## Project Description

In 2002, the Coffee Creek area (Urban Reserve Area 42) was annexed into the City of Wilsonville's urban growth boundary (UGB) and was designated as a Regionally Significant Industrial Area (RSIA) by Metro. A prior Urban Reserve study by OTAK ${ }^{1}$ identified the need for industrial, complementary commercial, and office uses within Coffee Creek boundaries. At this time, the City of Wilsonville is seeking Master Plan approval for the portion of land south of Day Road, which is consistent with the land that was annexed into the City. The land north of Day Road is being considered for conceptual purposes with the likelihood that it could be master planned in the future.

## Existing Conditions

The following sections summarize the current traffic and transportation conditions in the study area. The following nine intersections (seven existing and two future) were chosen for analysis:

- 1-5 Northbound Ramp Terminal @ Boons Ferry Road-Elligsen Road
- 1-5 Southbound Ramp Terminal @ Boons Ferry Road-Elligsen Road
- Boons Ferry Road @ Day Road
- Boons Ferry Road @ Commerce Circle/ $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue
- Grahams Ferry Road @ Clutter/Ridder
- Graham's Ferry Road @ Day Road
- Grahams Ferry Road @ Tonquin Rd
- Day Road @ Kinsman Road (future)
- Kidder Road @ Kinsman Road (future)

The study area is shown in Figure 1.
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## Traffic Counts

Traffic counts were conducted at the seven existing intersections within the Coffee Creek study area. Peak period (7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM) weekday turning movement counts were conducted to provide information regarding traffic volume, capacity, pedestrian movements, bicycle movements, truck activity and transit flow. Figure 2 summarizes the existing turn movement counts in the study area. These counts were used to establish existing operating conditions, which will serve as a baseline for analyzing future development options for the Coffee Creek area.

## Functional Classification

Table 1 summarizes the various functional classifications for streets in the study area based on the City of Wilsonville Transportation System Plan (TSP) ${ }^{2}$ adopted in June 2003 and the Washington County TSP ${ }^{3}$ adopted in October 2002. Roadway classifications form the basis for street design considerations, particularly relating to access management and mobility.

Table 1: Study Area Roadway Network

| Roadway | Classification <br> (Wilsonville TSP) | Classification <br> (Washington Co.) | Cross <br> Section | Posted <br> Speed | Existing <br> Sidewalks |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| I-5 | Principal Arterial | Principal Arterial | 6 lanes | 65 | None |
| Boones Ferry | Major Arterial | Arterial | 5 lanes | 35 | Partial |
| Elligsen Road | Major Arterial | Arterial | 6 lanes | 35 | Partial |
| Day Road | Major Collector | Arterial | 3 lanes | 35 | South Side |
| Commerce <br> Circle | Local Street | Local | 2 lanes | 25 | Partial |
| $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Minor Arterial | Local | 3 lanes | 35 | Yes |
| Grahams Ferry <br> Road | Minor Arterial | Arterial N of <br> Day/Collector S of <br> Clutter Road | Major Collector | 2 lanes | 45 |
| Collector | Partial |  |  |  |  |
| Ridder Road | Minor Arterial | Collector | 3 lanes <br> w/CTL | 35 | None |
| Tonquin Road | Minor Arterial | Arterial | 2 lanes | 45 | Partial |

## Access Management

Table 2 summarizes the access spacing standards for the roadways in the study area adjacent to the proposed development site as adopted in the City's TSP ${ }^{4}$. In general, the speed, level of mobility and the relative safety of a roadway is related to the number of accesses and the traffic volume it carries. It is in the City's best interest to control the number and spacing of accesses along its major roadways. The minimum and desirable access spacing standards vary depending on roadway type. In the City of Wilsonville, minor arterial roadways require a minimum access spacing of 600 feet, whereas major collectors only require 100 feet of spacing between accesses. An access is any point along a roadway where vehicles may enter the traffic stream, including other roads or driveways.
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Table 2: Access Spacing for Roadways Adjacent to Proposed Development Site

| Roadway | Classification <br> (Wilsonville TSP) | Posted <br> Speed | Minimum <br> Access <br> Spacing (ft) | Desirable <br> Access <br> Spacing |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grahams Ferry Road | Minor Arterial | $35-50$ | 600 | 1 mile |
| Day Road | Major Collector | $25-40$ | 100 | $1 / 2$ mile |
| Ridder Road | Minor Arterial | $35-50$ | 600 | 1 mile |
| Clutter Road | Major Collector | $25-40$ | 100 | $1 / 2$ mile |
| Tonquin Road | Minor Arterial | $35-50$ | 600 | 1 mile |

Source: City of Wilsonville Transportation System Plan, Adopted June 2, 2003. Table 4.0.

## Vehicle Traffic Operation

The concept of level of service has been developed to correlate traffic volume data to subjective descriptions of traffic performance at intersections. Level of service (LOS) is used as a measure of effectiveness for intersection operation. It is similar to a "report card" rating based upon average vehicle delay. Level of service A, B, and C indicate conditions where vehicles can move freely. Level of service D and E are progressively worse. Level of service F represents conditions where traffic volumes exceed the capacity of a specific movement, in the case of unsignalized intersections, or an entire intersection, in the case of a signal control, resulting in long queues and delays. Level of service D or better is generally desirable for signalized intersections.

Unsignalized intersections provide levels of service for major and minor street turning movements. For this reason, LOS E and even LOS F can be acceptable under conditions where signalization is not warranted or would adversely affect intersection operation as a whole. A summary of descriptions of level of service for signalized and unsignalized intersections has been attached in the Appendix.

Traffic operation standards for this project are based on the City of Wilsonville, Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) for the study area roadways. All of the applicable standards are based on HCM methodology ${ }^{5}$. The City of Wilsonville has a minimum performance standard of LOS D for its arterial and collector street network ${ }^{6}$. The RTP standards for level of service are shown in Table 3, the OHP standards for volume to capacity ratio are listed in Table 4 and the Washington County standards are summarized in Table 5.

Table 3: Regional AM/PM Peak Hour Performance Standards - RTP

| Roadway | Classification | Preferred Operating <br> Standard |  | Acceptable Operating <br> Standard |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{1 1}^{\text {st }}$ Hour | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Hour | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Hour | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Hour |
| I-5 | Principal Arterial | E | D | E | E |
| Boones Ferry | Minor Arterial (ODOT) | E | D | E | E |

2004 Regional Transportation Plan, July 8, 2004 (Table 1.2). LOS D defined as demand to capacity ratio of 0.8 to 0.9 , LOS E 0.9 to 1.0 , and LOS F 1.0 to 1.1.
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| Highway | Classification | VIC Standard* $^{\text {st }}$ Hour | 2 $^{\text {nd }}$ Hour |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| I-5 Boones Ferry | Interstate Highway | 0.99 | 0.99 |

*Based on the December 13, 2000 Amendment to the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan. V/C is volume-to-capacity ratio.
Table 5: Washington County Peak Hour Performance Standards - TSP

| Roadway | Classification | Preferred Operating <br> Standard |  | Acceptable Operating <br> Standard |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Hour | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Hour | $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Hour | $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Hour |
| Boones Ferry <br> Road | Arterial | D | D | E | D |
| Grahams Ferry <br> Road | Arterial - N. of Day Rd. <br> Collector - S. of Day Rd. <br> Day Road | D | D | E | D |

Washington County 2020 TSP, October 29, 2002 (Table 5) LOS D defined as demand to capacity ratio of 0.81 to 0.9 , LOS E 0.91 to 0.99 .

Existing transportation conditions have been evaluated to provide a baseline scenario to compare with future scenarios and to determine existing deficiencies. Analysis of the existing traffic conditions was conducted in the morning and evening peak hours when traffic volumes are greatest. The existing study intersection operations are shown in Table 6.

All of the study intersections currently operate at a level of service and volume to capacity ratio that comply with City, County, State and Regional guidelines. The intersection of Boones Ferry Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue currently operates at LOS D during both the AM and PM peak hours, while all remaining study intersections currently operate at LOS C or better during both the AM and PM peak hours.

Table 6: AM and PM Peak Hour Existing Intersection Performance

|  | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Delay | LOS | V/C | Delay | LOS | VIC |
| Signalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I-5 Northbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 9.0 | A | 0.55 | 8.8 | A | 0.70 |
| I-5 Southbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 17.4 | B | 0.75 | 15.5 | B | 0.48 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Commerce Cir -95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| th Ave | 38.3 | D | 0.82 | 45.9 | D | 0.80 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | 11.4 | B | 0.62 | 12.8 | B | 0.41 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 16.3 | B | 0.55 | 24.8 | C | 0.62 |
| Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | 14.0 | A/B | 0.22 | 12.9 | A/B | 0.39 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin | 15.1 | A/C | 0.52 | 19.1 | A/C | 0.56 |

Signalized Intersection LOS:
LOS = Level of service
Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection
V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio.
Unsignalized Intersection LOS:
A/A = Major street left turn level of service/minor street left turn level of service V/C = Volume-to-capacity ratio for the worst approach.
Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for worst approach

## Field Observations/Queuing

Field observations were conducted at study area intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak periods ${ }^{7}$. The AM peak hour observations showed a high volume of northbound left turns on Boones Ferry Road at $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. Traffic counts indicated that more than 600 vehicles make this movement in the AM peak hour with only one 400 ' left turn pocket. The vehicle queues were observed to spill back to the I-5 southbound ramp terminal thus impacting normal operations at the I-5 southbound off ramp.

During the PM peak period, there were several notable queues that were observed. At the intersection of $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Boones Ferry Road, queues extended back along $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue from Boones Ferry Road to Ridder Road from approximately $4: 10$ to $4: 30 \mathrm{pm}$. The excessive queues on $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue only occurred for about a 20 minute duration. After this short peak, queues and this approach ranged from approximately $400^{\prime}$ to $500^{\prime}$.

At the intersection of Boones Ferry Road/Day Road, the northbound left turn queues routinely exceeded the 200 feet of available storage. It is recommended that this turn lane be extended to provide adequate storage of vehicles and reduce queuing into the northbound through travel lanes. This extension could be done by re-striping the back to back northbound and southbound left turn lanes at the intersections of Day Road and SW Pioneer Court. With this, the northbound left turn pocket at Day Road could be extended to 500 -feet with 100 feet of this storage area being a two-way left turn pocket to be shared with the Pioneer Court access. The southbound left turns on Boones Ferry Road at Pioneer Court is relatively low in the PM peak hour (less than 10 left turns). Striping modifications would be necessary to modify the left turn pockets on Boones Ferry Road between Day Road and Pioneer Court.
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## Collision Data

Collision data was obtained within the study area from ODOT for a three year period (2003-2005). Table 8 displays the number of collisions and associated collision rate for the study intersections. The data was analyzed and revealed that none of the study intersections currently have collision rates higher than 1.0. Typically, a collision rate equal to or greater than 1.0 collisions per Million Entering Vehicles (MEV) would indicate that there could possibly be a safety problem. The highest crash rate observed ( 0.51 crashes per MEV) was at the I-5 Southbound Ramp Terminal/Boones Ferry Road intersection. Of the 29 crashes reported in the study area, none of the collisions had fatalities or involved pedestrians or bicycles.

Table 7: Study Area Collision Summary (2003-2005)

| Intersection | Collisions | Collision Rate/MEV |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I-5 Northbound Ramp Terminal @ Boones Ferry Road - | 9 | 0.28 |
| Elligsen Road |  |  |
| I-5 Southbound Ramp Terminal/Boones Ferry Road - Elligsen | 15 | 0.51 |
| Road | 0 | 0.00 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 5 | 0.18 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Commerce Circle - 95th Avenue | 0 | 0.00 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | 0 | 0.00 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | 0 | 0.00 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road |  |  |

Note: MEV-Million Entering Vehicles

## Future Conditions

The following sections describe the future impacts of the proposed Coffee Creek industrial area on the study area transportation system. The future conditions evaluation includes trip generation, trip distribution and assignment, motor vehicle intersection capacity analysis, queuing and internal circulation.

## Coffee Creek Alternatives

Two land use alternatives have been developed by the project team for the Coffee Creek project area, including comments from the Coffee Creek Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The Coffee Creek area is generally bounded by properties just north of Day Road, the existing railroad tracks to the west, the BPA power lines to the east, and Ridder Road/Clutter Road to the south. Both alternatives have similar roadway networks with two exceptions. Alternative 2 shows an extension of Commerce Circle South to the future extension of Kinsman Road. This connection would provide an east/west connection to Kinsman Road between Day Road and Ridder Road. The second network change is a realignment of Clutter Road and Grahams Ferry Road intersection. This realignment would provide safe intersection sight distance caused by the existing Grahams Ferry Road grade separated crossing. The Coffee Creek alternatives that depict the proposed roadways, pedestrian connections and zoning are shown in Figures 3 and 4.



## Coffee Creek Master Plan Area - South of Day Road

The area south of Day Road that is within the Wilsonville UGB is considered a Regionally Significant Industrial Area (RSIA). A RSIA is defined by Metro as an area that is near the region's most significant transportation facilities for the movement of freight and other areas most suitable for movement and storage of goods. The area south of Day Road includes approximately 193 total acres with 164 gross build able acres. This area is projected to generate approximately 1,480 new jobs. The land use for the project area south of Day Road is summarized in Table 8. It should be noted that there are no differences in proposed land uses between Alternatives 1 and 2 for the master plan area south of Day Road.

Table 8: Coffee Creek Area South of Day Road Land Use Summary

| Coffee Creek Area | Public <br> Facilities* | Industrial | Service <br> Commercial | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Acres/Employment |  |  |

## Coffee Creek Conceptual Area - North of Day Road

The Coffee Creek project area North of Day contains a portion of RSIA and therefore contains Industrial, as well as service commercial zoning. The project area north of Day Road encompasses approximately 74 total acres with approximately 55 build able acres under Alternative 1 and 65 build able acres under Alternative 2. Alternative 2 assumes approximately 10 additional acres could be developed compared to Alternative 1 because of a residential component of the project just west of Boones Ferry Road that has topography that would be conducive to residential development as compared to industrial. The area north of Day Road would produce between 260 and 420 jobs depending on the alternative. Table 9 compares the number of jobs and build able acres between each alternative.

Table 9: Coffee Creek Area North of Day Road Land Use Summary
$\left.\begin{array}{cccccc}\hline \text { Coffee Creek Area } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Public } \\ \text { Facilities* }\end{array} & \text { Industrial } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Service } \\ \text { Commercial }\end{array} & \text { Residential } & \text { Total } \\ \hline & & & \text { Acres/Employment }\end{array}\right]$
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## Trip Generation/Distribution

Trip generation was estimated using standard transportation planning trip generation rates based on research conducted by the Institute of Transportation Engineers ${ }^{8}$ (ITE) for land use types similar to the proposed land uses within the Coffee Creek project area. The land use alternatives identified for the project area include industrial, service commercial, and residential. The estimated PM peak hour and weekday daily vehicle trip generation is summarized in Table 10. Trip generation information is provided for both the area south of Day Road (that is within the UGB) and the area north of Day Road (the conceptual area north of Day Road that is outside the UGB) to differentiate the level of trip generation potential for the project area. The Coffee Creek industrial area is estimated to generate between 17,200 and 19,300 daily vehicle trips depending on the alternative (approximately 13,000 for the area south of Day Road and between 4,300 and 6,300 for the area north of Day Road). The Coffee Creek project area south of Day Road generates approximately $67 \%$ to $75 \%$ of the total project trips based on land use potential in Alternatives 1 and 2 respectively.

Table 10: Coffee Creek Industrial Area Trip Generation

| Coffee Creek Master Plan Area - South of <br> Day Road | Total <br> Trips | PM Peak Hour <br> In | Out | Daily |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alternative 1 and 2* | 1,681 | 345 | 1,336 | 12,935 |
| Coffee Creek Conceptual Area - North of <br> Day Road | Total <br> Trips | PM Peak Hour <br> In | Out | Daily |
| Alternative 1 | 590 | 119 | 471 | 4,264 |
| Alternative 2 | 631 | 216 | 415 | 6,332 |
| Coffee Creek Total Area- North and South <br> of Day Road | Total <br> Trips | PM Peak Hour |  | Weekday |
| Total (North Alt. 1+South) | 2,271 | 464 | 1,807 | 17,199 |
| Total (North Alt. 2+South) | 2,312 | 561 | 1,751 | 19,267 |

*Trip Generation for the project area south of Day Road is the same for both alternatives.
Vehicle trip distribution for the trips generated, as indicated in Table 10, to and from the potential Coffee Creek project area along the surrounding roadway network is summarized in Figure 5. The trip distribution was estimated using the 2030 PM peak hour travel demand model developed for the I-5 to 99W Connector Study. This particular model will be discussed more in detail in the following section (see Coffee Creek Future Travel Demand Forecasts). As illustrated, the majority of potential vehicle trips to the project area would originate and be destined north on I-5 as well as Kinsman Road (proposed Kinsman Road extension).
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## Coffee Creek Future Travel Demand Forecasts

Future travel demand forecasting for the Coffee Creek study area utilized the latest 2030 model developed by Metro, Washington County, and DKS Associates for the I-5 to 99W Connector Study. As part of the model development for the I-5 to 99W Connector Study, the Wilsonville TSP travel demand model zone structure and network detail was used as a guideline to refine the regional model. The resulting travel demand model provides a forecast of background traffic growth based on the 2030 MetroScope land use, estimation of trip distribution as previously mentioned for the Coffee Creek land areas, and assignment of trips to the roadway network based on congestion levels. Future 2030 PM peak hour volumes at study intersections were developed for the No Build and three Coffee Creek land uses scenarios by adjusting the travel demand model trip tables to reflect the trip rates listed in Table 10. These volumes were then used to analyze and determine future impacts from the proposed Coffee Creek industrial area on the planned roadway network. The future 2030 PM peak hour scenarios include:

- 2030 No Build (no development in the Coffee Creek area)
- 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day (Alternative 1)
- 2030 with Coffee Creek Area North and South of Day (Alternative 1)
- 2030 with Coffee Creek Area North and South of Day (Alternative 2)

The 2030 future PM peak hour forecasts for each of the study area scenarios are shown in Figure 6.

## Planned Study Area Roadway Improvements

The City of Wilsonville TSP and the Washington County TSP provide specific information regarding future transportation projects that were identified to meet needs created by future growth within the study area. Table 11 identifies the projects that were recommended specific to the project area. The only projects that have been assumed in the 2030 No Build scenario are those that have already been constructed as well as the Kinsman Road extension. The Kinsman Road project has been assumed for the No Build scenario since this project would be necessary to evaluate the future Kinsman Road study intersections at Day Road and Clutter Road. The remaining projects were not included in any of the future analysis scenarios in order to determine which scenario triggers the specific improvement need.


Table 11: Study Area Planned Projects

| TSP Project Number | Location | Description (Project Status) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wilsonville \#W-2 | Boones Ferry Rd. | Widen Boones Ferry Road from $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to Day Road to five lanes (this project has been constructed). |
| Wilsonville \#W-16 | Day Rd. | Widen Day Road to three lanes from Grahams Ferry Road to Boones Ferry Road (this project has been constructed). |
| Wilsonville \#C-7 and \#S-36 | Kinsman Rd. Extension | Construct two-lane extension of Kinsman Road from RxR tracks to Ridder Road. Construct traffic signal at Kinsman Road/Day Road intersection. (these projects have not been constructed). |
| Wilsonville \#C-24 and \#S-18 | Kinsman Rd. Extension | Construct two-lane extension of Kinsman Road from Ridder Road to Day Road. Construct left turn pockets on all approaches and a traffic signal (these projects have not been constructed). |
| Wilsonville \#S-1 | Grahams Ferry Rd/Day Rd Intersection | Install traffic signal (this traffic signal has been constructed). |
| Wilsonville \#S-6 | Boones Ferry Rd/Day Rd Intersection | Install traffic signal and northbound through lane (this project has been constructed). |
| Wilsonville \#S-11 | Boones Ferry Rd./95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave. Intersection | Construct eastbound right turn lane to create dual eastbound right turn lanes, restripe westbound approach for an additional left turn pocket (this project has not been constructed) and widen the Boones Ferry Road for a third eastbound through lane that drops at the I-5 southbound on ramp. (this project has not been constructed). |
| Washington County \#131 | Grahams Ferry Rd | Widen Grahams Ferry Road to three lanes from Tonquin to Cutter Rd and provide sidewalks (this project has not been constructed). |
| Washington County \#132 | Day St | Widen Day St. to three lanes from Grahams Ferry Road to Boones Ferry Road and provide sidewalks (this project has been completed). |
| Washington County \#133 | Clutter/Ridder Rd | Widen Clutter/Ridder to three lanes from Grahams Ferry Road to Boones Ferry Road and provide sidewalks (this project has not been completed). |
| Washington County \#138 | Tonquin Rd | Widen and Realign Tonquin Rd from Grahams Ferry to Oregon St and provide sidewalks (this project has not been constructed). |
| Sources: Washington County Transportation System Plan, October 29, 2002City of Wilsonville Transportation System Plan, Adopted June 2, 2003. |  |  |

## Future Year Operations Analysis

## 2030 No Build

In order to provide a baseline comparison to the future Coffee Creek alternatives, the 2030 No Build scenario evaluates future traffic volumes assuming the existing geometry and no development of the Coffee Creek project area beyond what currently exists today.

With the addition of 2030 No Build traffic volumes, four of the study area intersections would fail to meet operating standards. These intersections include Boones Ferry Road $/ 95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Boones Ferry Road/Day Road, Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road and Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road. The 2030 No Build intersection operations are summarized in Table 12. Mitigations have been identified in Table 13 to improve the 2030 No Build intersection operations to meet the applicable standards.

Table 12: 2030 No Build Intersection Performance (PM Peak Hour)

|  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Delay | LOS | VIC |
| Signalized |  |  |  |
| I-5 Northbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 12.6 | B | 0.80 |
| I-5 Southbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 26.7 | C | 0.82 |
| Boones Ferry Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | >80 | F | >1.0 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | 14.6 | B | 0.68 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | >80 | F | >1.0 |
| Kinsman Road/Day Road | 26.6 | C | 0.81 |
| Kinsman Road/Ridder Road | 17.3 | B | 0.42 |
| Unsignalized |  |  |  |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | $>50$ | A/F | >1.0 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | $>50$ | A/F | >1.0 |
| Signalized Intersection LOS: <br> LOS = Level of service <br> Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection <br> V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio. <br> Unsignalized Intersection LOS: <br> A/A = Major street left turn level of service/minor street left turn level of service <br> V/C = Volume-to-capacity ratio for the worst approach. <br> Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for worst approach |  |  |  |

Table 13: 2030 No Build Mitigations (PM Peak Hour)
Intersection Recommended Mitigation

```
Tonquin/SW Grahams Ferry Road
```

- Install eastbound left turn lane
- Install northbound left turn lane
- Install traffic signal


## Day Road/Boones Ferry Road

- Construct a four lane roadway on Boones Ferry Road north of Day Road.
- Restripe the northbound left turn pocket on Boones Ferry Road to provide additional storage.
- Construct an eastbound right turn lane on $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. The eastbound approach would consist of a shared through-left turn lane and dual right turn lanes. The multiple turn lanes shall conform to the requirements for multiple turn lanes on state facilities as specified in OAR 734-020-0140.
- Stripe a westbound separate left turn pocket on the private industrial park approach
- Install median on $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to modify the Commerce Circle north approach to $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to right in and right out movements only. The median would provide for improved operation of the intersection and increased storage with the existing center turn lane being available for left and through movements.

Boones Ferry Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue

- Construct a second northbound left turn pocket on Boones Ferry Road at $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. Additional widening for two southbound receiving lanes would be required on $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to facilitate the dual left turns. The inside southbound through lane on $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue would utilize the existing shared center turn lane approximately 300 feet south of $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. The roadway geometry within the vicinity of the Holiday Inn driveway would consist of one southbound though lane in addition to a through/left turn lane and one northbound through lane. Just south of this access (approximately 830' south of Boones Ferry Road), the two southbound lanes would merge into a single southbound through lane prior to the intersection at SW Commerce Circle. The multiple turn lanes shall conform to the requirements for multiple turn lanes on state facilities as specified in OAR 734-020-0140.
- Construct a westbound left turn pocket on Clutter Road

Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road

- Construct a southbound left turn pocket on Grahams Ferry Road
- Construct a traffic signal

With the mitigations identified in Table 13, the intersections were reanalyzed to determine the intersection operations with the identified improvements. With the mitigations, all of the study area intersections would operate at an acceptable level of service "C" or better during the weekday PM peak hour. The 2030 No Build mitigated intersection performance is summarized in Table 14.

Table 14: 2030 No Build Mitigated Intersection Performance (PM Peak Hour)

| Signalized Intersection | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay | LOS | VIC |
| Boones Ferry Road/95 |  |  |  |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 24.3 | C | 0.75 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | 30.4 | C | 0.84 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | 15.2 | B | 0.79 |

Signalized Intersection LOS:
LOS = Level of service
Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection
V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio.

The operational analysis as previously shown in Tables 12 and 14 is based on an isolated intersection evaluation which means that each study intersection was evaluated independently. In order to evaluate the entire Stafford Road interchange area, the SimTraffic ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ simulation model was utilized to provide a system wide assessment of traffic operating conditions on the Elligsen Road corridor. This simulation is especially important within the Elligsen Road interchange area because of the pre-existing nonconforming intersection spacing on Boones Ferry Road between the I-5 southbound interchange ramp and $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue where queuing from one intersection could affect an adjacent intersection (as occurs today on Boones Ferry Road between the I-5 southbound ramp and $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue during the AM peak period).

Queuing analysis was performed for the future mitigated No Build alternative using SimTraffic ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$, which estimates the 95th percentile queue for each approach movement at signalized intersections. This 95th percentile queue estimates that for any given cycle at a signalized intersection, the queue length calculated is representative of 95 percent of the peak fifteen minute vehicular queues during the peak hour at that intersection.

Under the mitigated No Build alternative, one of the estimated vehicle queues would exceed the available storage that would be provided under this alternative. The northbound left turn lane on Boones Ferry Road at Day Road would need to be lengthened to provide at least 400 feet of storage under this scenario in order to prevent queues from spilling back into downstream intersections. Table 15 summarizes the available storage for key intersection movements within the Stafford Road interchange area compared to the results of the vehicle queuing analysis.

Table 15: 2030 Mitigated No Build $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queuing Summary (PM Peak Hour)

| Intersection | Movement | Available <br> Storage | $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile <br> Estimated <br> Queue | Exceeds Storage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NB Left | $200^{\prime}$ | $400^{\prime}$ | Yes |
| Boones Ferry | NB Through | $825^{\prime}$ | $250^{\prime}$ | No |
| Road/Day Road | SB Through | $>2,000^{\prime}$ | $1,200^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | EB Left | $>750^{\prime}$ | $500^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | EB Right | $1,500^{\prime}$ | $500^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | EB Left | TBD | $275^{\prime}$ | No |
| Boones Ferry | EB Right | TBD | $525^{\prime}$ | No |
| Road/95 ${ }^{\prime}$ Avenue | NB Left | $400^{\prime}$ | $350^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | NB Through | $400^{\prime}$ | $250^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | SB Through | $825^{\prime}$ | $800^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | SB Left | $500^{\prime}$ | $325^{\prime}$ | No |
| Boones Ferry Road/I-5 | SB Right | $500^{\prime}$ | $300^{\prime}$ | No |
| Southbound Ramp | EB Through | $400^{\prime}$ | $350^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | WB Through | $>1,500^{\prime}$ | $425^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | EB Through | $>1,500^{\prime}$ | $425^{\prime}$ | No |
| Elligsen Road/I-5 | WB Through | $425^{\prime}$ | $275^{\prime}$ | No |
| Northbound Ramp | NB Right | $325^{\prime}$ | $250^{\prime}$ | No |
|  | NB Left | $325^{\prime}$ | $200^{\prime}$ | No |

TBD- These future turn lanes would be constructed as part of the mitigated scenario and therefore the pocket lengths could be sized as needed.

## 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day Road (Alternative 1)

The following scenario evaluated project traffic from the Coffee Creek Master Plan area south of Day Road. Based on the forecasted traffic volumes for this scenario, five of the study area intersections would fail to meet operating standards. The future 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan area intersection operations are summarized in Table 16. Mitigations have been identified for the five failing intersections in Table 17 which would be needed in order to meet the applicable operating standards.

Table 16: 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day Road Alternative 1 Intersection Performance

|  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Delay | LOS | VIC |
| Signalized |  |  |  |
| I-5 Northbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 12.6 | B | 0.79 |
| I-5 Southbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 26.8 | C | 0.88 |
| Boones Ferry Road/95 |  |  |  |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | $>80$ | F | $\mathbf{> 1 . 0}$ |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 23.9 | C | 0.81 |
| Kinsman Road/Day Road | $>80$ | F | $\mathbf{> 1 . 0}$ |
| Kinsman Road/Ridder Road | 64.4 | E | $\mathbf{> 1 . 0}$ |
| Unsignalized | 22.0 | C | $\mathbf{0 . 5 8}$ |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road |  |  | A50 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | $>50$ | A/F | $\mathbf{> 1 . 0}$ |

## Signalized Intersection LOS:

LOS = Level of service
Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection
V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio.
Unsignalized Intersection LOS:
$\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{A}=$ Major street left turn level of service/minor street left turn level of service
V/C = Volume-to-capacity ratio for the worst approach.
Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for worst approach

Table 17: 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day Road- Alternative 1 Mitigations
Intersection/Roadway Recommended Mitigation

| Day Road/Kinsman Road | $\bullet$ | Construct northbound left turn pocket |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day <br> Road | $\bullet$ | Construct dual southbound left turn lanes. The multiple turn <br> lanes shall conform to the requirements for multiple turn lanes <br> on state facilities as specified in OAR 734-020-0140. |
| Boones Ferry Road | -Construct a third southbound through lane on Boones Ferry <br> Road from Day Road that would drop at the I-5 southbound <br> on-ramp. The existing southbound right turn lane on Boones <br> Ferry Road at 95 |  |
| third through lane is constructed. |  |  |

[^12]With the mitigations identified in Table 17, the intersections were reevaluated to determine the intersection operations with the identified improvements in place. With the indicated mitigations, all of the study area intersections would operate at an acceptable level of service "C" or better and have capacity for future growth. The 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan area south of Day Road mitigated intersection performance is summarized in Table 18.

Table 18: 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day Road Alternative 1 Mitigated Intersection Performance

| Signalized Intersection | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay | LOS | VIC |
|  | 22.2 | C | 0.75 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 31.4 | C | 0.87 |
| Kinsman Road/Day Road | 34.7 | C | 0.89 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | 16.0 | B | 0.82 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | 38.4 | C | 0.91 |
| Signalized Intersection LOS: |  |  |  |
| LOS = Level of service <br> Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection <br> V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio. |  |  |  |

The future 2030 with the Coffee Creek Master Plan Area south of Day Road Alternative 1 was evaluated with SimTraffic ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ to determine if queuing impacts would affect the operations of adjacent intersections based on a system wide evaluation. This evaluation determined that a third southbound through lane would be needed on Boones Ferry Road from Day Road to the I-5 southbound ramp (as discussed in Table 17). The third southbound through lane is consistent with prior findings in the City's TSP. With the mitigations shown in Table 17, all of the vehicular movements would operate within estimated storage with the exception of the northbound left turn movement on Boones Ferry Road at Day Road. This turn pocket would need to be extended to provide adequate storage for this movement during the PM peak hour (see Field Observation/Queuing section on page 7 for mitigation recommendations). Table 19 summarizes the available storage as compared to $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths for key intersection movements within the Stafford Road interchange area.

Table 19: 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day Road Alternative 1 Mitigated 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queuing Summary (PM Peak Hour)

| Intersection | Movement | Available <br> Storage | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$Percentile <br> Estimated <br> Queue | Exceeds Storage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

TBD- These future turn lanes would be constructed as part of the mitigated scenario and therefore the pocket lengths could be sized as needed.

## 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North \& South of Day Road (Alternative 1)

The following scenario evaluates project traffic with respect to the Coffee Creek areas north and south of Day Road utilizing the Alternative 1 roadway network. Based on the forecasted traffic volumes for this scenario, the same study area intersections would fail to meet operating standards as were identified for the analysis of the Coffee Creek area south of Day Road. The intersection operations for this scenario are summarized in Table 20. Mitigations have been identified for the failing intersections in Table 21 that would be needed in order for them to meet the applicable operating standards.

Table 20: 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North and South of Day Road Alternative 1 Intersection Performance

|  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Delay | LOS | VIC |
| Signalized |  |  |  |
| I-5 Northbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 12.7 | B | 0.79 |
| I-5 Southbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 27.1 | C | 0.91 |
| Boones Ferry Road/95 |  |  |  |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | $>80$ | F | $\mathbf{> 1 . 0}$ |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 26.3 | C | 0.84 |
| Kinsman Road/Day Road | $>80$ | F | $\mathbf{> 1 . 0}$ |
| Kinsman Road/Ridder Road | 63.9 | E | $\mathbf{> 1 . 0}$ |
| Unsignalized | 23.0 | C | 0.61 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road |  |  | A/F |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | $>50$ | A/F | $\mathbf{> 1 . 0}$ |

Signalized Intersection LOS:
LOS = Level of service
Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection
V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio.
Unsignalized Intersection LOS:
$\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{A}=$ Major street left turn level of service/minor street left turn level of service
V/C = Volume-to-capacity ratio for the worst approach.
Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for worst approach
Table 21: 2030 with Coffee Creek North and South of Day Road Alternative 1 Mitigations

| Intersection/Roadway | Recommended Mitigation |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Day Road/Kinsman Road | - | Construct northbound left turn pocket | | Grahams Ferry Road/Day <br> Road | - | Construct dual southbound left turn lanes. The multiple turn <br> lanes shall conform to the requirements for multiple turn lanes <br> on state facilities as specified in OAR 734-020-0140. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day <br> Road | - | Construct dual eastbound right turn lanes. The multiple turn <br> lanes shall conform to the requirements for multiple turn lanes <br> on state facilities as specified in OAR 734-020-0140. |
| Boones Ferry Road | -Construct a third southbound through lane on Boones Ferry <br> Road from Day Road that would drop at the I-5 southbound <br> on-ramp. The existing southbound right turn lane on Boones <br> Ferry Road at 95 |  |
| third Avenue could be removed at the time the |  |  |

It should be noted that the following mitigations are in addition to the improvements identified for the 2030 No Build scenario as shown in Table 13.

With the mitigations identified in Table 21, the intersections were reevaluated to determine the intersection operations with the identified improvements. With the mitigations in place, all of the study area intersections would operate at an acceptable level of service "C" or better during the PM peak hour. The 2030 with Coffee Creek areas north and south of Day Road mitigated intersection performance is summarized in Table 22.

Table 22: 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North and South of Day Road Alternative 1 Mitigated Intersection Performance

| Signalized Intersection | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay | LOS | VIC |
|  | 25.7 | C | 0.77 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 26.6 | C | 0.80 |
| Kinsman Road/Day Road | 31.0 | C | 0.91 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | 16.2 | B | 0.82 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | 41.8 | D | 0.93 |

Signalized Intersection LOS:
LOS = Level of service
Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection
V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio.

The future 2030 with the Coffee Creek areas north and south of Day Road (Alternative 1) was evaluated with SimTraffic ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ to determine if queuing impacts would affect the operations of adjacent intersections based on a system wide evaluation. With the mitigations outlined in Table 17, the majority of vehicular movements would operate within estimated storage with the exception of three critical movements at three study intersections. At the intersection of Boones Ferry Road/Day Road the northbound left turn queue would continue to exceed the available storage for this movement. As noted previously, the northbound left turn pocket could be extended by removing the reverse curve along Boones Ferry Road between the left turn lanes at the intersections of Day Road and $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and connecting the left turn lanes with shared left turn lane striping.

Additionally, queuing would spill back along Boones Ferry Road from the intersection of Boones Ferry Road/I-5 southbound ramp to $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Day Road, thus impacting normal operations at these intersections. Table 23 summarizes the available storage as compared to $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths for key movements within the Stafford interchange area. No additional mitigations would be feasible on Boones Ferry Road between the I-5 southbound ramp and Day Road to improve the queuing since three southbound through lanes were already considered in this analysis. Additional city-wide or regional improvements would be needed to provide sufficient capacity to support the concept area north of Day Road.

Table 23: 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North and South of Day Road Alternative 1 Mitigated $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queuing Summary (PM Peak Hour)

| Intersection | Movement | Available Storage | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Estimated Queue | Exceeds Storage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | NB Left | 200' | >200 | Yes |
|  | NB Through | 825' | 400' | No |
|  | SB Through | >2,000, | 1,700' | No |
|  | EB Left | >750' | 575' | No |
|  | EB Right | 1,500' | 600’ | No |
| Boones Ferry <br> Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | EB Left | TBD | 250 ' | No |
|  | EB Right | TBD | 425' | No |
|  | NB Left | 400' | 350' | No |
|  | NB Through | 400' | 250' | No |
|  | SB Through | 825' | >825' | Yes |
| Boones Ferry Road/I-5 Southbound Ramp | SB Left | 500 | 425’ | No |
|  | SB Right | 500 | 350' | No |
|  | EB Through | 400' | >400' | Yes |
|  | WB Through | $>1,500$ ' | 275' | No |
| Elligsen Road/I-5 <br> Northbound Ramp | EB Through | >1,500' | 550’ | No |
|  | WB Through | 425' | 275' | No |
|  | NB Right | 325' | 275' | No |
|  | NB Left | 325' | 225' | No |

TBD- These future turn lanes would be constructed as part of the mitigated scenario and therefore the pocket lengths could be sized as needed.

## 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North \& South of Day Road (Alternative 2)

The following scenario evaluates project traffic from the Coffee Creek areas north and south of Day Road with the Alternative 2 roadway network. Based on the forecasted traffic volumes for this scenario, five study area intersections would fail to meet operating standards. The intersection operations for this scenario are summarized in Table 24. Mitigations have been identified for the failing intersections in Table 25 to meet the applicable operating standards.

This alternative includes an extension of Commerce Circle to the future Kinsman Road extension. Based on the traffic forecasts as shown in Figure 5, this roadway project would increase the westbound left turns from Boones Ferry Road to $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue as well as the northbound right turns from $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to Boones Ferry Road. Since this project would be expensive to construct and would not significantly benefit traffic operations, this network connection would not be recommended.

Table 24: 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North and South of Day Road Alternative 2 Intersection Performance

|  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Delay | LOS | V/C |
| Signalized |  |  |  |
| I-5 Northbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 12.6 | B | 0.78 |
| I-5 Southbound Ramp/Boones Ferry-Elligsen | 27.6 | C | 0.94 |
| Boones Ferry Road/95 |  |  |  |

Table 25: 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North and South of Day Road Alternative 2 Mitigations

| Intersection/Roadway | Recommended Mitigation |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Day Road/Kinsman Road | $\bullet$ | Construct northbound left turn pocket |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Day <br> Road | $\bullet$ | Construct dual southbound left turn lanes. The multiple turn <br> lanes shall conform to the requirements for multiple turn lanes <br> on state facilities as specified in OAR 734-020-0140. |
| Commerce Circle Extension | $\bullet$ | Extend Commerce Circle to the future Kinsman Road <br> Extension (This improvement is included as part of the <br> Alternative 2 roadway network and is not recommended). |
| Boones Ferry Road | $\bullet$Construct a third southbound through lane on Boones Ferry <br> Road from Day Road that would drop at the I-5 southbound <br> on-ramp. The existing southbound right turn lane on Boones <br> Ferry Road at 95th Avenue could be removed at the time the <br> third through lane is constructed. |  |

It should be noted that the following mitigations are in addition to the improvements identified for the 2030 No Build scenario as shown in Table 13.

With the mitigations identified in Table 25, the intersections were reevaluated to determine the intersection operations with the identified improvements. With the mitigations, all of the study area intersections would operate at an acceptable level of service "D" or better. The 2030 with Coffee Creek areas north and south of Day Road mitigated intersection performance is summarized in Table 26.

Table 26: 2030 with Coffee Creek Areas North and South of Day Road Alternative 2 Mitigated Intersection Performance

| Signalized Intersection | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay | LOS | VIC |
|  | 25.2 | C | 0.79 |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | 30.2 | C | 0.81 |
| Kinsman Road/Day Road | 31.1 | C | 0.92 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road | 28.0 | C | 0.94 |
| Grahams Ferry Road/Tonquin Road | 43.8 | D | 0.94 |
| Signalized Intersection LOS: <br> LOS = Level of service <br> Delay = Average vehicle delay in peak hour for entire intersection <br> V/C = Demand or Volume-to-capacity ratio. |  |  |  |

The future 2030 with the Coffee Creek areas north and south of Day Road (Alternative 2) were evaluated with SimTraffic ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ to determine if queuing impacts would affect the operations of adjacent intersections based on a system wide evaluation. With the mitigations shown in Table 25, extensive queuing would continue to spill back along Boones Ferry Road from the intersection of Boones Ferry Road/I-5 southbound ramp through $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, and back to Day Road. This queuing along southbound Boones Ferry Road would also create large queues along the eastbound and southbound approaches at the intersection of Boones Ferry Road/Day Road. No additional mitigations would be feasible on Boones Ferry Road between the I-5 southbound ramp and Day Road to improve the queuing since three southbound through lanes were already considered in this analysis. Additional city-wide or regional improvements would be needed to provide sufficient capacity to support the concept area north of Day Road.

Furthermore, the northbound left turn movement at the intersection of Boones Ferry Road/Day Road would continue to extend beyond the available storage. The I-5 southbound ramp would have queuing that exceeds the available storage pockets but would not impact the I-5 mainline freeway. Table 27 summarizes the available storage for key movements within the Stafford interchange area.

Table 27: 2030 with Coffee Creek North and South of Day Road Alternative 2 Mitigated $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queuing Summary (PM Peak Hour)

| Intersection | Movement | Available Storage | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Estimated Queue | Exceeds Storage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boones Ferry Road/Day Road | NB Left | 200’ | >200' | Yes |
|  | NB Through | 825 ' | 225' | No |
|  | SB Through | >2,000 ${ }^{\prime}$ | 1,450' | No |
|  | EB Left | >750' | >750' | Yes |
|  | EB Right | 1,500' | >1500 | Yes |
| Boones Ferry <br> Road $/ 95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | EB Left | TBD | 300' | No |
|  | EB Right | TBD | 650' | No |
|  | NB Left | 400' | >400' | Yes |
|  | NB Through | 400' | 400' | No |
|  | SB Through | 825' | >825' | Yes |
| Boones Ferry Road/I-5 Southbound Ramp | SB Left | 500 | >500' | Yes |
|  | SB Right | 500' | 450' | No |
|  | EB Through | 400' | >400' | Yes |
|  | WB Through | >1,500' | 275' | No |
| Elligsen Road/I-5 <br> Northbound Ramp | EB Through | >1,500' | 600' | No |
|  | WB Through | 425' | 425' | No |
|  | NB Right | 325' | 275' | No |
|  | NB Left | 325’ | 225’ | No |

TBD- These future turn lanes would be constructed as part of the mitigated scenario and therefore the pocket lengths could be sized as needed.

## Coffee Creek Safety Improvements

There are several safety related improvements that are needed within the Coffee Creek project area that will be needed to meet current standards. The first improvement is the Grahams Ferry Road grade separated railroad crossing that is located approximately 350 feet south of Clutter Road. This crossing is narrow (approximately 22 feet) and restricts sight distance at the Clutter Road intersection in the southbound direction. Either the railroad crossing needs to be improved to provide safe sight distance and a wider cross section or Clutter Road will need to be realigned further to the north (see alignment shown for Alternative 2. If the railroad crossing is improved, it should be widened consistent with City Minor Arterial standards.

The second safety improvement is the horizontal curve on Boones Ferry Road approximately 400 feet north of Day Road. This segment was identified for widening to a 4-lane section north of Day Road as part of the 2030 No Build scenario. The horizontal curve should be improved as part of the capacity related improvements to Boones Ferry Road north of Day Road that were identified for the 2030 No Build scenario. The safety related improvements are summarized in Table 28.

Table 28: Coffee Creek Safety Improvements
Safety Improvement Recommendation

Grahams Ferry Road Grade
Separated Railroad Crossing
Clutter Road/Grahams Ferry Road Intersection Sight Distance

Boones Ferry Road Horizontal Curve

- Reconstruct Grade Separated Railroad Crossing to City of Wilsonville Minor Arterial standards.
- Realign Clutter Road to the North as shown in Alternative 2.
- As part of the Boones Ferry Road widening, bring horizontal curve up to current standards.


## Summary

The transportation impacts of future traffic associated with the Coffee Creek Industrial Area has been investigated in the preceding report. The primary findings and recommendations are summarized in the following sections.

## Recommended Mitigation Measures

To maintain adequate traffic performance standards within the study area during the PM peak period, mitigation measures are necessary to reduce the negative transportation impacts of future traffic growth.

## Non-Project Oriented Transportation Mitigation (No Build and Safety)

The following measures are related to estimated traffic growth on study area roadways. These mitigations would be necessary even without development of the Coffee Creek industrial area. Additional traffic safety related mitigations have been identified as well within the study area. Non-project oriented mitigations are summarized in Table 29.

Table 29: 2030 No Build and Safety Related Mitigations (PM Peak Hour)
Intersection Recommended Mitigation

|  | $\bullet$ | Install eastbound left turn lane |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tonquin/SW Grahams <br> Ferry Road | $\bullet$ | Install northbound left turn lane |
|  | $\bullet$ | Install traffic signal |

- Construct two-lane extension of Kinsman Road from RxR tracks to Day Road.

Kinsman Rd. Extension

Boones Ferry Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue

- Construct traffic signals at Kinsman Road/Day Road and Kinsman Road/Ridder Road intersections.
- Construct left turn pockets on all approaches at the Kinsman Road/Ridder Road intersection.
- Construct an eastbound right turn lane on $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. The eastbound approach would consist of a shared through-left turn lane and dual right turn lanes. The multiple turn lanes shall conform to the requirements for multiple turn lanes on state facilities as specified in OAR 734-020-0140.
- Stripe a westbound separate left turn pocket on the private industrial park approach
- Install median on $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to modify the Commerce Circle north approach to $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to right in and right out movements only. The median would provide for improved operation of the intersection and increased storage with the existing center turn lane being available for left and through movements.
- Construct a second northbound left turn pocket on Boones Ferry Road at $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. Additional widening for two southbound receiving lanes would be required on $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to facilitate the dual left turns. The inside southbound through lane on $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue would utilize the existing shared center turn lane approximately 300 feet south of $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. The roadway geometry within the vicinity of the Holiday Inn driveway would consist of one southbound though lane in addition to a through/left turn lane and one northbound through lane. Just south of this access (approximately 830' south of Boones Ferry Road), the two southbound lanes would merge into a single southbound through lane prior to the intersection at SW Commerce Circle. The multiple turn lanes shall conform to the requirements for multiple turn lanes on state facilities as specified in OAR 734-020-0140.

|  | $\bullet$ | Construct a westbound left turn pocket on Clutter Road |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grahams Ferry <br> Road/Clutter Road | $\bullet$ | Construct a southbound left turn pocket on Grahams Ferry Road |
| Safety Improvement | Recommendation |  |
| Grahams Ferry Road <br> Grade Separated <br> Railroad Crossing | - | Reconstruct a traffic signal |
| Clutter Road/Grahams <br> Ferry Road Intersection <br> Sight Distance | - | Realign Clutter Road to the North as shown in Alternative 2. |

## Coffee Creek Master Plan Area Oriented Transportation Mitigation

The following measures as shown in Table 30 are related to the impacts of the proposed Coffee Creek Master Plan area south of Day Road. The mitigations as shown are in addition to the improvements identified for the 2030 No build scenario.

Table 30: Coffee Creek Master Plan Area South of Day Road Mitigations
Intersection/Roadway Recommended Mitigation

Day Road/Kinsman Road

| Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road | Construct dual southbound left turn lanes. The multiple turn <br> lanes shall conform to the requirements for multiple turn lanes <br> on state facilities as specified in OAR 734-020-0140. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Boones Ferry Road | Construct a third southbound through lane on Boones Ferry <br> Road from Day Road that would drop at the I-5 southbound <br> on-ramp. The existing southbound right turn lane on Boones <br> Ferry Road at 95 |
| third through lane is constructed. |  |

## Coffee Creek Concept Area Oriented Transportation Mitigation

The following measures as shown in Tables 31 and 32 are related to the impacts of the proposed Coffee Creek conceptual area north of Day Road dependant upon. Table 31 summarizes the mitigation measures for Alternative 1 and Table 32 summarized the mitigation measures for Alternative 2. The main difference between the two alternatives is that Alternative 1 would require dual eastbound right turn lanes on Day Road at Boones Ferry Road and Alternative 2 would require the extension of Commerce Circle to the future Kinsman Road extension. The mitigations as shown are in addition to the improvements identified for the 2030 No build scenario.

Although the mitigation measures outlined in Tables 31 and 32 would improve intersection operations to meet operational requirements based on isolated intersection capacity analysis, the additional project
traffic from the Coffee Creek concept area north of Day Road would cause significant queuing along Boones Ferry Road between the I-5 southbound ramp and Day Road. No additional mitigations would be feasible on Boones Ferry Road between the I-5 southbound ramp and Day Road to improve the queuing since three southbound through lanes were already considered in this analysis. Additional city-wide or regional improvements would be needed to provide sufficient capacity for the concept area north of Day Road to be developed.

Table 31: 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan and Concept Areas (Alternative 1) Mitigations
Intersection/Roadway Recommended Mitigation

Day Road/Kinsman Road

Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road

- Construct southbound and southbound left turn pockets
- Construct dual southbound left turn lanes. The multiple turn lanes shall conform to the requirements for multiple turn lanes on state facilities as specified in OAR 734-020-0140.
- Construct dual eastbound right turn lanes. The multiple turn lanes shall conform to the requirements for multiple turn lanes on state facilities as specified in OAR 734-020-0140.
- Construct a third southbound through lane on Boones Ferry Road from Day Road that would drop at the I-5 southbound on-ramp. The existing southbound right turn lane on Boones Ferry Road at $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue could be removed at the time the third through lane is constructed.

Table 32: 2030 with Coffee Creek Master Plan and Concept Areas (Alternative 2) Mitigations Intersection/Roadway Recommended Mitigation

Day Road/Kinsman Road - Construct southbound and southbound left turn pockets

| Grahams Ferry Road/Day <br> Road | Construct dual southbound left turn lanes. The multiple turn <br> lanes shall conform to the requirements for multiple turn lanes <br> on state facilities as specified in OAR 734-020-0140. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Commerce Circle Extension | -Extend Commerce Circle to the future Kinsman Road <br> Extension (This improvement is included as part of the <br> Alternative 2 roadway network). |
| Boones Ferry Road | Construct a third southbound through lane on Boones Ferry <br> Road from Day Road that would drop at the I-5 southbound <br> on-ramp. The existing southbound right turn lane on Boones <br> Ferry Road at 95th Avenue could be removed at the time the <br> third through lane is constructed. |

## Continued Analysis

It should be noted that this Coffee Creek industrial area analysis considered only Future 2030 PM peak hour operating conditions within the study area. As discussed in the field observation/queuing section, queuing from the Boones Ferry Road $/ 95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection routinely spills back to the I-5 southbound ramp and can occasionally back up to the I-5 mainline freeway during the AM peak period. In order to ensure adequate system wide operations within the study area with the mitigation measures outlined for PM peak hour, analysis of AM peak hour operating conditions should be considered This AM analysis could be done as part of a future TSP amendment or could be completed as part of the design of future improvements that are currently being evaluated at the intersection of $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Boones Ferry Road by the City and ODOT.

## DKS Associates

Appendix

## DKS Associates

## LOS Description

## TRAFFIC LEVELS OF SERVICE

Analysis of traffic volumes is useful in understanding the general nature of traffic in an area, but by itself indicates neither the ability of the street network to carry additional traffic nor the quality of service afforded by the street facilities. For this, the concept of level of service (LOS) has been developed to subjectively describe traffic performance. Level of service can be measured at intersections and along key roadway segments.

Level of service categories are similar to report card ratings for traffic performance. Intersections are typically the controlling bottlenecks of traffic flow and the ability of a roadway system to carry traffic efficiently is generally diminished in their vicinities. Levels of Service A, B and C indicate conditions where traffic moves without significant delays over periods of peak travel demand. Level of service D and E are progressively worse peak hour operating conditions and F conditions represent where demand exceeds the capacity of an intersection. Most urban communities set level of service $D$ as the minimum acceptable level of service for peak hour operation and plan for level of service C or better for all other times of the day. The Highway Capacity Manual provides level of service calculation methodology for both intersections and arterials ${ }^{1}$. The following sections provide interpretations of the analysis approaches.

[^13]
## Unsignalized Intersections (All-Way Stop Controlled)

Unsignalized intersections and all-way stop controlled intersections are each subject to a separate capacity analysis methodology. All-way stop controlled intersection operations are reported by leg of the intersection.

This method calculates a delay value for each approach to the intersection. The 2000 Highway Capacity Manual 2000 describes the detailed methodology. The following table describes the amount of delay associated with each level of service.

| Level of Service | Delay (seconds) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $0-10$ |
| B | $>10-15$ |
| C | $>15-25$ |
| D | $>25-35$ |
| E | $>35-50$ |
| F | $>50$ |

Source: Highway Capacity Manual 2000, Exhibit 17-22

## Unsignalized Intersections (Two-Way Stop Controlled)

Unsignalized intersection level of service is reported for the major street and minor street (generally, left turn movements). The method assesses available and critical gaps in the traffic stream which make it possible for side street traffic to enter the main street flow. The Highway Capacity Manual 2000 describes the detailed methodology. It is not unusual for an intersection to experience level of service E or F conditions for the minor street left turn movement. It should be understood that, often, a poor level of service is experienced by only a few vehicles and the intersection as a whole operates acceptably.

Unsignalized intersection levels of service are described in the following table.

| Level of Service | Delay (sec/veh) | Expected Delay |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| A | $0-10$ | Little or no delay |
| B | $>10-15$ | Short traffic delays |
| C | $>15-25$ | Average traffic delays |
| D | $>25-35$ | Long traffic delays |
| E | $>35-50$ | Very long traffic delays |
| F | $>50$ | Extreme delays potentially affecting other |
|  |  | traffic movements in the intersection |

Source: Highway Capacity Manual 2000, Exhibit 17-2

## Signalized Intersections

For signalized intersections, level of service is evaluated based upon average vehicle delay experienced by vehicles entering an intersection. Control delay (or signal delay) includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. In previous versions of this chapter of the HCM (1994 and earlier), delay included only stopped delay. As delay increases, the level of service decreases. Calculations for signalized and unsignalized intersections are different due to the variation in traffic control. The Highway Capacity Manual 2000 provides the basis for these calculations.

| Level of <br> Service | Delay <br> (sec/veh) | $0-10$ |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| A | Free Flow/Insignificant Delays: No approach phase is fully utilized by <br> traffic and no vehicle waits longer than one red indication. Most vehicles do <br> not stop at all. Progression is extremely favorable and most vehicles arrive <br> during the green phase. <br> Stable Operation/Minimal Delays: An occasional approach phase is fully <br> Btilized. Many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within platoons of <br> vehicles. This level generally occurs with good progression, short cycle |  |
| lengths, or both. |  |  |

[^14]
## DKS Associates

## LOS Calculations


c Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个4 | F |  | 性 | F |  |  |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 |  |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 3139 | 1352 |  | 3343 |  |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1455 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 3139 | 1352 |  | 3343 |  |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1455 |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 695 | 212 | 0 | 564 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 727 | 0 | 873 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 790 | 241 | 0 | 641 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 826 | 0 | 992 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 790 | 241 | 0 | 641 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 413 | 413 | 992 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 15\% | 17\% | 0\% | 8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 11\% |
| Turn Type |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |  | Split |  | Free |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |  |  |  | Free |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 60.0 | 95.0 |  | 60.0 |  |  |  |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 95.0 |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 61.0 | 95.0 |  | 61.0 |  |  |  |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 95.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.64 | 1.00 |  | 0.64 |  |  |  |  | 0.27 | 0.27 | 1.00 |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 2016 | 1352 |  | 2147 |  |  |  |  | 451 | 451 | 1455 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Prot |  | 0.25 |  |  | 0.19 |  |  |  |  | c0.25 | 0.25 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | c0.68 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.39 | 0.18 |  | 0.30 |  |  |  |  | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.68 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 8.1 | 0.0 |  | 7.5 |  |  |  |  | 33.4 | 33.4 | 0.0 |
| Progression Factor |  | 0.42 | 1.00 |  | 1.77 |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 0.2 | 0.1 |  | 0.3 |  |  |  |  | 23.1 | 23.1 | 2.6 |
| Delay (s) |  | 3.6 | 0.1 |  | 13.6 |  |  |  |  | 56.5 | 56.5 | 2.6 |
| Level of Service |  | A | A |  | B |  |  |  |  | E | E | A |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 2.8 |  |  | 13.6 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 27.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 17.4 |  | HCM Le | vel of Servir | rvice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 95.0 |  | Sum of | st time |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | lization |  | 46.0\% |  | ICU Lev | of Ser | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | 「 |  | 个4 | 「 | ${ }^{7 \times 1}$ |  | 「 |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor |  | 0.95 |  |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Frpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Flpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 |  | 0.85 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） |  | 3406 |  |  | 3282 | 1482 | 3273 |  | 1553 |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） |  | 3406 |  |  | 3282 | 1482 | 3273 |  | 1553 |  |  |  |
| Volume（vph） | 0 | 1191 | 0 | 0 | 281 | 359 | 399 | 0 | 257 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 0 | 1267 | 0 | 0 | 299 | 382 | 424 | 0 | 273 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 1267 | 0 | 0 | 299 | 382 | 424 | 0 | 273 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 0\％ | 6\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 10\％ | 9\％ | 7\％ | 0\％ | 4\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Turn Type |  |  | Free |  |  | Free | Prot |  | Free |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green，G（s） |  | 68.9 |  |  | 68.9 | 95.0 | 17.1 |  | 95.0 |  |  |  |
| Effective Green，g（s） |  | 69.9 |  |  | 69.9 | 95.0 | 17.1 |  | 95.0 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.74 |  |  | 0.74 | 1.00 | 0.18 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Clearance Time（s） |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension（s） |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） |  | 2506 |  |  | 2415 | 1482 | 589 |  | 1553 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Prot |  | c0．37 |  |  | 0.09 |  | c0．13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  | 0.26 |  |  | 0.18 |  |  |  |
| v／c Ratio |  | 0.51 |  |  | 0.12 | 0.26 | 0.72 |  | 0.18 |  |  |  |
| Uniform Delay，d1 |  | 5.3 |  |  | 3.6 | 0.0 | 36.7 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 0.66 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay，d2 |  | 0.5 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.4 | 4.2 |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| Delay（s） |  | 4.0 |  |  | 3.7 | 0.4 | 40.9 |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  | A |  |  | A | A | D |  | A |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 4.0 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 9.0 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | rvice |  | A |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 95.0 |  | Sum of los | st time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 51．0\％ |  | ICU Leve | of Se | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 4 | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 46 | 365 | 238 | 112 | 124 | 17 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 55 | 440 | 287 | 135 | 149 | 20 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 868 | 160 | 170 |  |  |  |  |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 868 | 160 | 170 |  |  |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 6.5 | 6.4 | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.6 | 3.5 | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 77 | 48 | 77 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 239 | 841 | 1231 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 55 | 440 | 422 | 170 |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 55 | 0 | 287 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 440 | 0 | 20 |  |  |  |
| cSH | 239 | 841 | 1231 | 1700 |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.23 | 0.52 | 0.23 | 0.10 |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 22 | 78 | 23 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 24.6 | 13.9 | 6.7 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | C | B | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 15.1 |  | 6.7 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 9.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 40.0\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1891 | 1580 |  | 1729 | 1404 | 1805 | 1346 |  | 1517 | 1597 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.88 | 1.00 | 0.63 | 1.00 |  | 0.61 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1856 | 1580 |  | 1550 | 1404 | 1203 | 1346 |  | 977 | 1597 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 1 | 8 | 3 | 42 | 67 | 226 | 1 | 134 | 60 | 355 | 154 | 8 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 1 | 10 | 4 | 51 | 82 | 276 | 1 | 163 | 73 | 433 | 188 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 227 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 133 | 49 | 1 | 214 | 0 | 433 | 195 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 17\% | 2\% | 15\% | 0\% | 42\% | 18\% | 19\% | 19\% | 0\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  | 8 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 10.0 | 10.0 |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 37.8 | 37.8 |  | 37.8 | 37.8 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 10.0 | 10.0 |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 37.8 | 37.8 |  | 37.8 | 37.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.18 | 0.18 |  | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.68 | 0.68 |  | 0.68 | 0.68 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 333 | 283 |  | 278 | 252 | 815 | 912 |  | 662 | 1082 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.16 |  |  | 0.12 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  | 0.01 | 0.00 |  | c0.09 | 0.04 | 0.00 |  |  | c0.44 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.03 | 0.00 |  | 0.48 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.24 |  | 0.65 | 0.18 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 18.9 | 18.8 |  | 20.6 | 19.5 | 2.9 | 3.5 |  | 5.2 | 3.3 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 1.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 |  | 5.0 | 0.4 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 18.9 | 18.8 |  | 21.9 | 19.9 | 2.9 | 4.1 |  | 10.2 | 3.7 |  |
| Level of Service |  | B | B |  | C | B | A | A |  | B | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 18.9 |  |  | 20.5 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 8.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 11.4 |  | HCM Le | el of S | rvice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 55.8 |  | Sum of | st time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 52.9\% |  | CU Lev | of Se | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 |  |  | ¢ |  |  | * |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 2 | 62 | 0 | 120 | 144 | 141 | 56 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 28 | 3 | 79 | 0 | 154 | 185 | 181 | 72 | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC, conflicting volume | 760 | 772 | 72 | 681 | 679 | 246 | 72 |  |  | 338 |  |  |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 760 | 772 | 72 | 681 | 679 | 246 | 72 |  |  | 338 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.2 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.3 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 3.7 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.3 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 91 | 99 | 89 | 100 |  |  | 84 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 251 | 280 | 996 | 305 | 269 | 694 | 1541 |  |  | 1147 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 3 | 110 | 338 | 253 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 28 | 0 | 181 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 1 | 79 | 185 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 437 | 509 | 1541 | 1147 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 20 | 0 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 13.3 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | B |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 13.3 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 47.7\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




Ansis Period (min)
c Critical Lane Group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | F |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | 性 |  | \% | 性 | F |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |  | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.96 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1719 | 1650 |  |  | 1811 |  | 1400 | 3000 |  | 1805 | 3200 | 1464 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.74 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.20 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1333 | 1650 |  |  | 383 |  | 1400 | 3000 |  | 1805 | 3200 | 1464 |
| Volume (vph) | 160 | 7 | 637 | 63 | 9 | 4 | 295 | 653 | 10 | 2 | 789 | 104 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 174 | 8 | 692 | 68 | 10 | 4 | 321 | 710 | 11 | 2 | 858 | 113 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 414 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 174 | 286 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 321 | 720 | 0 | 2 | 858 | 70 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 13\% | 7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 20\% | 8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% | 8\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  | Prot |  |  | Prot |  | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  |  | 18.0 |  | 37.5 | 73.8 |  | 1.2 | 37.5 | 37.5 |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  |  | 18.0 |  | 37.5 | 73.8 |  | 1.2 | 37.5 | 37.5 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.17 | 0.17 |  |  | 0.17 |  | 0.36 | 0.70 |  | 0.01 | 0.36 | 0.36 |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 229 | 283 |  |  | 66 |  | 500 | 2109 |  | 21 | 1143 | 523 |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  | c0.23 | 0.24 |  | 0.00 | c0.27 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.13 |  |  |  | c0.21 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.76 | 1.01 |  |  | 1.22 |  | 0.64 | 0.34 |  | 0.10 | 0.75 | 0.13 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 41.4 | 43.5 |  |  | 43.5 |  | 28.2 | 6.1 |  | 51.4 | 29.6 | 22.8 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 0.91 | 0.55 |  | 1.28 | 0.85 | 1.06 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 13.5 | 56.0 |  |  | 180.5 |  | 5.7 | 0.4 |  | 1.3 | 1.8 | 0.1 |
| Delay (s) | 54.9 | 99.5 |  |  | 224.0 |  | 31.3 | 3.7 |  | 66.8 | 27.1 | 24.1 |
| Level of Service | D | F |  |  | F |  | C | A |  | E | C | C |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 90.6 |  |  | 224.0 |  |  | 12.2 |  |  | 26.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  | 45.9 |  | HCM Level of Service |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 0.80 | HCMLevel or Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 105.0 | Sum of lost time (s) |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 96.0\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 性 | F |  | 个4 | $\stackrel{7}{ }$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 3471 | 1521 |  | 3312 | 1582 |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1369 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 3471 | 1521 |  | 3312 | 1582 |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1369 |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 946 | 605 | 0 | 556 | 479 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 | 0 | 369 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 985 | 630 | 0 | 579 | 499 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 453 | 0 | 384 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 204 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 985 | 630 | 0 | 579 | 499 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 227 | 226 | 180 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 4\% | 4\% | 0\% | 9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 18\% |
| Turn Type |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |  | Split |  | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 76.8 | 105.0 |  | 76.8 | 105.0 |  |  |  | 19.2 | 19.2 | 19.2 |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 77.8 | 105.0 |  | 77.8 | 105.0 |  |  |  | 19.2 | 19.2 | 19.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.74 | 1.00 |  | 0.74 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 2572 | 1521 |  | 2454 | 1582 |  |  |  | 302 | 302 | 250 |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.28 |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  | c0.14 | 0.14 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  | c0.41 |  |  | 0.32 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.13 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.38 | 0.41 |  | 0.24 | 0.32 |  |  |  | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.72 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 4.9 | 0.0 |  | 4.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 40.6 | 40.6 | 40.4 |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.68 | 1.00 |  | 1.47 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 0.2 | 0.4 |  | 0.2 | 0.5 |  |  |  | 10.1 | 9.7 | 9.5 |
| Delay (s) |  | 8.5 | 0.4 |  | 6.5 | 0.5 |  |  |  | 50.7 | 50.3 | 49.8 |
| Level of Service |  | A | A |  | A | A |  |  |  | D | D | D |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 5.3 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 50.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | D |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 15.5 |  | HCM Lev | vel of Sersin | rvice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of los | st time |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 44.9\% |  | ICU Leve | ef Ser | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


c Critical Lane Group


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{4}$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{}$ |  | \% | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1896 | 1615 |  | 1536 | 1468 | 1805 | 1783 |  | 1703 | 1759 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.80 | 1.00 | 0.68 | 1.00 |  | 0.53 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1882 | 1615 |  | 1269 | 1468 | 1289 | 1783 |  | 958 | 1759 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 2 | 48 | 2 | 34 | 25 | 277 | 1 | 171 | 47 | 321 | 112 | 0 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 2 | 52 | 2 | 37 | 27 | 301 | 1 | 186 | 51 | 349 | 122 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 260 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 41 | 1 | 230 | 0 | 349 | 122 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 35\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 6\% | 8\% | 0\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  | Perm | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  | 8 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 8.7 | 8.7 |  | 8.7 | 8.7 | 34.2 | 33.3 |  | 47.4 | 42.5 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 8.7 | 8.7 |  | 8.7 | 8.7 | 34.2 | 33.3 |  | 47.4 | 42.5 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.14 | 0.14 |  | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.53 | 0.52 |  | 0.74 | 0.66 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 255 | 219 |  | 172 | 199 | 695 | 926 |  | 826 | 1166 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.13 |  | c0.07 | 0.07 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  | 0.03 | 0.00 |  | c0.05 | 0.03 | 0.00 |  |  | c0.25 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.21 | 0.00 |  | 0.37 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.25 |  | 0.42 | 0.10 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 24.6 | 23.9 |  | 25.2 | 24.6 | 7.0 | 8.5 |  | 3.0 | 3.9 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 0.4 | 0.0 |  | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 |  | 0.4 | 0.2 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 25.1 | 23.9 |  | 26.6 | 25.1 | 7.0 | 9.1 |  | 3.3 | 4.1 |  |
| Level of Service |  | C | C |  | C | C | A | A |  | A | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 25.0 |  |  | 25.4 |  |  | 9.1 |  |  | 3.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM Average Control Delay | 12.8 | HCM Level of Service | B |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.41 |  | 8.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 64.1 | Sum of lost time (s) | A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $49.5 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |

C Critical Lane Group


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\stackrel{7}{ }$ |  | ¢ |  | \% | 个 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1612 | 1538 |  |  |  | 1597 | 3505 |  |  | 1758 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.76 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1285 | 1538 |  |  |  | 1597 | 3505 |  |  | 1758 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 280 | 0 | 460 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 430 | 720 | 0 | 0 | 830 | 210 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 286 | 0 | 469 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 439 | 735 | 0 | 0 | 847 | 214 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 393 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 286 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 439 | 735 | 0 | 0 | 1052 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 12\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 13\% | 3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% | 12\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  |  | Prot |  |  | Prot |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | , | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  |  |  | 35.0 | 82.0 |  |  | 43.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  |  |  | 35.0 | 83.0 |  |  | 44.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.13 | 0.13 |  |  |  | 0.33 | 0.79 |  |  | 0.42 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  | 4.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 171 | 205 |  |  |  | 532 | 2771 |  |  | 737 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  | c0.27 | 0.21 |  |  | c0.60 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  | c0.22 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 1.67 | 0.37 |  |  |  | 0.83 | 0.27 |  |  | 1.43 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 45.5 | 41.5 |  |  |  | 32.2 | 2.9 |  |  | 30.5 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.94 | 1.15 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 326.9 | 1.1 |  |  |  | 12.0 | 0.2 |  |  | 200.3 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 372.4 | 42.6 |  |  |  | 42.3 | 3.6 |  |  | 230.8 |  |
| Level of Service |  | F | D |  |  |  | D | A |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 167.5 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 230.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 131.3 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | rvice |  | F |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratioActuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 1.24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of lost time (s) |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  | 105.8\% |  | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  | G |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

c Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个4 | $\stackrel{7}{ }$ |  | 个4 | F |  |  |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 3471 | 1521 |  | 3312 | 1582 |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1369 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 3471 | 1521 |  | 3312 | 1582 |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1369 |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 1420 | 730 | 0 | 930 | 480 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1040 | 0 | 520 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 1449 | 745 | 0 | 949 | 490 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1061 | 0 | 531 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1449 | 745 | 0 | 949 | 490 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 531 | 530 | 471 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 4\% | 4\% | 0\% | 9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 18\% |
| Turn Type |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |  | Split |  | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 57.6 | 105.0 |  | 57.6 | 105.0 |  |  |  | 38.4 | 38.4 | 38.4 |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 58.6 | 105.0 |  | 58.6 | 105.0 |  |  |  | 38.4 | 38.4 | 38.4 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.56 | 1.00 |  | 0.56 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 1937 | 1521 |  | 1848 | 1582 |  |  |  | 603 | 603 | 501 |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | c0.42 |  |  | 0.29 |  |  |  |  | 0.32 | 0.32 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.49 |  |  | 0.31 |  |  |  |  |  | c0.34 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.75 | 0.49 |  | 0.51 | 0.31 |  |  |  | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.94 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 17.6 | 0.0 |  | 14.4 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 31.2 | 31.1 | 32.2 |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.64 | 1.00 |  | 1.29 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 0.2 | 0.1 |  | 0.9 | 0.5 |  |  |  | 14.1 | 13.7 | 26.1 |
| Delay (s) |  | 29.1 | 0.1 |  | 19.4 | 0.5 |  |  |  | 45.2 | 44.8 | 58.3 |
| Level of Service |  | C | A |  | B | A |  |  |  | D | D | E |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 19.2 |  |  | 13.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 49.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | D |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 26.7 |  | HCM Lev | vel of Servir | rvice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.82 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of los | st time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 74.7\% |  | ICU Leve | of Ser | vice |  | D |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


c Critical Lane Group



|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 0.92 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1711 |  | 1770 | 1779 |  | 1770 | 1830 |  | 1770 | 1790 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 |  | 0.40 | 1.00 |  | 0.50 | 1.00 |  | 0.60 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1711 |  | 741 | 1779 |  | 922 | 1830 |  | 1109 | 1790 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 100 | 120 | 10 | 280 | 120 | 100 | 230 | 30 | 40 | 170 | 60 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 102 | 122 | 10 | 286 | 122 | 102 | 235 | 31 | 41 | 173 | 61 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 169 | 0 | 10 | 390 | 0 | 102 | 262 | 0 | 41 | 223 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 16.2 |  | 21.3 | 21.3 |  | 37.6 | 31.2 |  | 29.4 | 27.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 16.2 |  | 21.3 | 21.3 |  | 37.6 | 31.2 |  | 29.4 | 27.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.24 |  | 0.32 | 0.32 |  | 0.56 | 0.47 |  | 0.44 | 0.40 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 414 |  | 253 | 566 |  | 602 | 853 |  | 511 | 722 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.10 |  | 0.00 | c0.22 |  | c0.02 | c0.14 |  | 0.00 | 0.12 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  | 0.01 |  |  | 0.08 |  |  | 0.03 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.41 |  | 0.04 | 0.69 |  | 0.17 | 0.31 |  | 0.08 | 0.31 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 21.3 |  | 16.0 | 19.9 |  | 7.1 | 11.1 |  | 10.8 | 13.6 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 0.7 |  | 0.1 | 3.5 |  | 0.1 | 0.2 |  | 0.1 | 1.1 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 22.0 |  | 16.1 | 23.4 |  | 7.2 | 11.3 |  | 10.8 | 14.7 |  |
| Level of Service |  | C |  | B | C |  | A | B |  | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 22.0 |  |  | 23.2 |  |  | 10.2 |  |  | 14.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 17.3 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | ervice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 66.9 |  | Sum of los | st time | (s) |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 50.2\% |  | ICU Leve | of Se | rvice |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | ¢ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ |  | 「 |  |  |  | ${ }_{1}$ | 个 $\uparrow$ |  |  | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |  | 0.95 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 |  | 0.85 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1800 |  | 1538 |  |  |  | 1597 | 3505 |  |  | 3340 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1800 |  | 1538 |  |  |  | 1597 | 3505 |  |  | 3340 |  |
| Volume（vph） | 280 | 0 | 460 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 430 | 720 | 0 | 0 | 830 | 210 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 286 | 0 | 469 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 439 | 735 | 0 | 0 | 847 | 214 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 286 | 0 | 457 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 439 | 735 | 0 | 0 | 1041 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 12\％ | 0\％ | 5\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 13\％ | 3\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 3\％ | 12\％ |
| Turn Type | Prot |  | ustom |  |  |  | Prot |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 8 |  | 18 |  |  |  | 1 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 23.0 |  | 58.8 |  |  |  | 31.8 | 73.0 |  |  | 37.2 |  |
| Effective Green，g（s） | 23.0 |  | 58.8 |  |  |  | 31.8 | 74.0 |  |  | 38.2 |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.22 |  | 0.56 |  |  |  | 0.30 | 0.70 |  |  | 0.36 |  |
| Clearance Time（s） | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 394 |  | 861 |  |  |  | 484 | 2470 |  |  | 1215 |  |
| v／s Ratio Prot | c0．16 |  | 0.30 |  |  |  | c0．27 | 0.21 |  |  | c0．31 |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v／c Ratio | 0.73 |  | 0.53 |  |  |  | 0.91 | 0.30 |  |  | 0.86 |  |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 38.1 |  | 14.5 |  |  |  | 35.2 | 5.8 |  |  | 30.9 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.19 | 0.74 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 6.5 |  | 0.6 |  |  |  | 18.7 | 0.3 |  |  | 7.9 |  |
| Delay（s） | 44.6 |  | 15.1 |  |  |  | 60.6 | 4.6 |  |  | 38.8 |  |
| Level of Service | D |  | B |  |  |  | E | A |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 26.3 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 25.5 |  |  | 38.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 30.4 | HCM Level of Service |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratioActuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 0.84 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 105.0 | Sum of lost time（s） |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 79．0\％ | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

|  | 4 |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 | 「「 | \％ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  | ${ }^{7} 1$ | 性 |  | ＊ | 个4 | F |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util．Factor |  | 1.00 | 0.88 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| Flpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.93 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） |  | 1721 | 2656 | 1805 | 1746 |  | 2918 | 3340 |  | 1805 | 3505 | 1477 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.72 | 1.00 | 0.39 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（perm） |  | 1301 | 2656 | 740 | 1746 |  | 2918 | 3340 |  | 1805 | 3505 | 1477 |
| Volume（vph） | 200 | 10 | 980 | 50 | 10 | 10 | 480 | 940 | 10 | 10 | 1130 | 150 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 204 | 10 | 1000 | 51 | 10 | 10 | 490 | 959 | 10 | 10 | 1153 | 153 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 214 | 955 | 51 | 12 | 0 | 490 | 969 | 0 | 10 | 1153 | 142 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 5\％ | 13\％ | 7\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 20\％ | 8\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 3\％ | 8\％ |
| Turn Type | Perm |  | pm＋ov | Perm |  |  | Prot |  |  | Prot |  | ustom |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 | 1 |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28 |
| Actuated Green，G（s） |  | 19.9 | 40.9 | 19.9 | 19.9 |  | 21.0 | 71.6 |  | 1.5 | 52.1 | 76.0 |
| Effective Green，g（s） |  | 19.9 | 40.9 | 19.9 | 19.9 |  | 21.0 | 71.6 |  | 1.5 | 52.1 | 76.0 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.19 | 0.39 | 0.19 | 0.19 |  | 0.20 | 0.68 |  | 0.01 | 0.50 | 0.72 |
| Clearance Time（s） |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension（s） |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） |  | 247 | 1136 | 140 | 331 |  | 584 | 2278 |  | 26 | 1739 | 1069 |
| v／s Ratio Prot |  |  | c0．17 |  | 0.01 |  | 0.17 | 0.29 |  | 0.01 | c0．33 |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  | 0.16 | 0.19 | 0.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.10 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.36 | 0.04 |  | 0.84 | 0.43 |  | 0.38 | 0.66 | 0.13 |
| Uniform Delay，d1 |  | 41.3 | 29.1 | 37.0 | 34.7 |  | 40.4 | 7.5 |  | 51.3 | 19.9 | 4.4 |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.11 | 0.64 |  | 0.94 | 0.60 | 0.23 |
| Incremental Delay，d2 |  | 25.7 | 5.8 | 1.6 | 0.0 |  | 7.9 | 0.4 |  | 6.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 |
| Delay（s） |  | 67.0 | 34.8 | 38.7 | 34.8 |  | 52.8 | 5.3 |  | 54.0 | 13.1 | 1.1 |
| Level of Service |  | E | C | D | C |  | D | A |  | D | B | A |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 40.5 |  |  | 37.6 |  |  | 21.2 |  |  | 12.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 24.3 |  | HCM Lev | vel of S | rvice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of los | ost time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 79．4\％ |  | ICU Leve | of Ser | vice |  | D |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


c Critical Lane Group


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\stackrel{7}{ }$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1612 | 1538 |  |  |  | 1597 | 3505 |  |  | 1754 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.76 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1285 | 1538 |  |  |  | 1597 | 3505 |  |  | 1754 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 310 | 0 | 710 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 430 | 740 | 0 | 0 | 780 | 210 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 316 | 0 | 724 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 439 | 755 | 0 | 0 | 796 | 214 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 481 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 316 | 243 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 439 | 755 | 0 | 0 | 1001 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 12\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 13\% | 3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% | 12\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  |  | Prot |  |  | Prot |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  |  |  | 35.0 | 82.0 |  |  | 43.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  |  |  | 35.0 | 83.0 |  |  | 44.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.13 | 0.13 |  |  |  | 0.33 | 0.79 |  |  | 0.42 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  | 4.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 171 | 205 |  |  |  | 532 | 2771 |  |  | 735 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  | c0.27 | 0.22 |  |  | c0.57 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  | c0.25 | 0.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 1.85 | 1.19 |  |  |  | 0.83 | 0.27 |  |  | 1.36 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 45.5 | 45.5 |  |  |  | 32.2 | 2.9 |  |  | 30.5 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.93 | 1.13 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 403.3 | 121.9 |  |  |  | 12.0 | 0.2 |  |  | 171.4 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 448.8 | 167.4 |  |  |  | 42.1 | 3.5 |  |  | 201.9 |  |
| Level of Service |  | F | F |  |  |  | D | A |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 252.9 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 17.7 |  |  | 201.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 150.4 |  | HCM Lev | vel of S | ervice |  | F |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratioActuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 1.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of lost time (s) |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 104.8\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  | G |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

c Critical Lane Group

c Critical Lane Group

c Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | 7 | F |  | 7 | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.99 |  |  | 0.96 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1885 |  |  | 1375 | 1468 | 1805 | 1783 |  | 1703 | 1756 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.95 |  |  | 0.70 | 1.00 | 0.53 | 1.00 |  | 0.18 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1802 |  |  | 1006 | 1468 | 1002 | 1783 |  | 314 | 1756 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 10 | 50 | 0 | 110 | 10 | 510 | 10 | 400 | 110 | 600 | 380 | 10 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 10 | 51 | 0 | 112 | 10 | 520 | 10 | 408 | 112 | 612 | 388 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 439 | 10 | 510 | 0 | 612 | 397 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 35\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 6\% | 8\% | 0\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  | pm+ov | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 | , | 5 | 2 |  | , | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  | 8 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 12.3 |  |  | 12.3 | 38.7 | 29.9 | 28.8 |  | 59.2 | 54.1 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 12.3 |  |  | 12.3 | 38.7 | 29.9 | 28.8 |  | 59.2 | 54.1 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.15 |  |  | 0.15 | 0.49 | 0.38 | 0.36 |  | 0.74 | 0.68 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 279 |  |  | 156 | 788 | 388 | 646 |  | 695 | 1195 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  | c0.18 | 0.00 | 0.29 |  | c0.29 | 0.23 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  | 0.03 |  |  | c0.12 | 0.11 | 0.01 |  |  | c0.36 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.22 |  |  | 0.78 | 0.56 | 0.03 | 0.79 |  | 0.88 | 0.33 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 29.4 |  |  | 32.3 | 14.4 | 15.6 | 22.6 |  | 16.8 | 5.2 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 0.4 |  |  | 22.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 9.5 |  | 12.5 | 0.7 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 29.8 |  |  | 54.4 | 15.2 | 15.7 | 32.2 |  | 29.3 | 6.0 |  |
| Level of Service |  | C |  |  | D | B | B | C |  | C | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 29.8 |  |  | 22.7 |  |  | 31.9 |  |  | 20.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 23.9 |  | HCM Le | vel of S | rvice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 79.5 |  | Sum of lost time (s) |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 84.3\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | \% |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1764 |  | 1770 | 1772 |  | 1770 | 1854 |  | 1770 | 1855 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.23 | 1.00 |  | 0.28 | 1.00 |  | 0.39 | 1.00 |  | 0.49 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 427 | 1764 |  | 514 | 1772 |  | 731 | 1854 |  | 910 | 1855 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 10 | 240 | 130 | 10 | 270 | 130 | 100 | 290 | 10 | 140 | 350 | 10 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 10 | 245 | 133 | 10 | 276 | 133 | 102 | 296 | 10 | 143 | 357 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 10 | 354 | 0 | 10 | 388 | 0 | 102 | 305 | 0 | 143 | 366 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 32.6 | 26.3 |  | 31.4 | 25.7 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 32.6 | 26.3 |  | 31.4 | 25.7 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.29 | 0.27 |  | 0.29 | 0.27 |  | 0.48 | 0.39 |  | 0.47 | 0.38 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 141 | 484 |  | 165 | 486 |  | 451 | 723 |  | 497 | 707 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.00 | 0.20 |  | 0.00 | c0.22 |  | 0.02 | 0.16 |  | c0.02 | c0.20 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.02 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.09 |  |  | 0.11 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.07 | 0.73 |  | 0.06 | 0.80 |  | 0.23 | 0.42 |  | 0.29 | 0.52 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 18.0 | 22.2 |  | 17.8 | 22.7 |  | 10.0 | 15.0 |  | 10.6 | 16.1 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.2 | 5.6 |  | 0.2 | 8.9 |  | 0.3 | 0.4 |  | 0.3 | 2.7 |  |
| Delay (s) | 18.2 | 27.8 |  | 18.0 | 31.6 |  | 10.2 | 15.4 |  | 10.9 | 18.8 |  |
| Level of Service | B | C |  | B | C |  | B | B |  | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 27.6 |  |  | 31.3 |  |  | 14.1 |  |  | 16.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 22.0 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | ervice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 67.4 |  | Sum of lo | ost time | (s) |  | 16.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 56.7\% |  | ICU Leve | of Se | rvice |  | B |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | F |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.91 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.95 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1826 |  | 1770 | 1856 |  |  | 1673 |  |  | 1770 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 |  | 0.10 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.89 |  |  | 0.35 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1826 |  | 187 | 1856 |  |  | 1510 |  |  | 648 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 660 | 100 | 220 | 420 | 10 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 673 | 102 | 224 | 429 | 10 | 204 | 20 | 408 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 768 | 0 | 224 | 438 | 0 | 0 | 563 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 35.9 |  | 44.0 | 44.0 |  |  | 24.4 |  |  | 24.4 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 35.9 |  | 44.0 | 44.0 |  |  | 24.4 |  |  | 24.4 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.47 |  | 0.58 | 0.58 |  |  | 0.32 |  |  | 0.32 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 858 |  | 193 | 1069 |  |  | 482 |  |  | 207 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Prot |  | 0.42 |  | c0.06 | 0.24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Perm |  |  |  | c0.61 |  |  |  | c0.37 |  |  | 0.02 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.89 |  | 1.16 | 0.41 |  |  | 1.17 |  |  | 0.05 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 18.5 |  | 16.4 | 9.0 |  |  | 26.0 |  |  | 18.0 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 11.8 |  | 114.7 | 0.3 |  |  | 95.7 |  |  | 0.1 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 30.3 |  | 131.1 | 9.2 |  |  | 121.7 |  |  | 18.1 |  |
| Level of Service |  | C |  | F | A |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 30.3 |  |  | 50.4 |  |  | 121.7 |  |  | 18.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 64.4 |  | HCM Le | vel of S | rvice |  | E |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 1.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 76.4 |  | Sum of | st time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 96.1\% |  | ICU Lev | of Se | vice |  | F |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


c Critical Lane Group

c Critical Lane Group

c Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $>$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个4 | 「 |  | 个4 | 「 | \％${ }^{1 / 1}$ |  | 「 |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Frpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |  |  |  |
| Flpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 |  | 0.85 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） |  | 3505 | 1615 |  | 3574 | 1599 | 3072 |  | 1571 |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） |  | 3505 | 1615 |  | 3574 | 1599 | 3072 |  | 1571 |  |  |  |
| Volume（vph） | 0 | 1620 | 1000 | 0 | 990 | 1170 | 390 | 0 | 420 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 0 | 1653 | 1020 | 0 | 1010 | 1194 | 398 | 0 | 429 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 1653 | 1020 | 0 | 1010 | 1194 | 398 | 0 | 412 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  | 7 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 0\％ | 3\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 1\％ | 1\％ | 14\％ | 0\％ | 1\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Turn Type |  |  | Free |  |  | Free | Prot |  | ustom |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green，G（s） |  | 65.3 | 105.0 |  | 65.3 | 105.0 | 30.7 |  | 30.7 |  |  |  |
| Effective Green，g（s） |  | 66.3 | 105.0 |  | 66.3 | 105.0 | 30.7 |  | 30.7 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.63 | 1.00 |  | 0.63 | 1.00 | 0.29 |  | 0.29 |  |  |  |
| Clearance Time（s） |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension（s） |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） |  | 2213 | 1615 |  | 2257 | 1599 | 898 |  | 459 |  |  |  |
| v／s Ratio Prot |  | 0.47 |  |  | 0.28 |  | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.63 |  |  | c0．75 |  |  | c0．26 |  |  |  |
| v／c Ratio |  | 0.75 | 0.63 |  | 0.45 | 0.75 | 0.44 |  | 0.90 |  |  |  |
| Uniform Delay，d1 |  | 13.5 | 0.0 |  | 9.9 | 0.0 | 30.2 |  | 35.6 |  |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 0.58 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay，d2 |  | 1.2 | 0.9 |  | 0.6 | 3.2 | 0.4 |  | 19.8 |  |  |  |
| Delay（s） |  | 8.9 | 0.9 |  | 10.6 | 3.2 | 30.6 |  | 55.5 |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  | A | A |  | B | A | C |  | E |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 5.9 |  |  | 6.6 |  |  | 43.5 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | D |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 11.6 |  | HCM Le | vel of S | rvice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.79 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of | ost time |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 77．5\％ |  | ICU Lev | of Ser | vice |  | D |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

c Critical Lane Group


Anlysical 15
c Critical Lane Group

|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  | \% | F |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.86 |  |  | 0.92 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.98 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1785 |  | 1770 | 1457 |  |  | 1656 |  |  | 1785 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.90 |  | 0.74 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.85 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1638 |  | 1374 | 1457 |  |  | 1656 |  |  | 1540 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 400 | 10 | 250 | 0 | 120 | 170 | 130 | 430 | 10 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 408 | 10 | 255 | 0 | 122 | 173 | 133 | 439 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 24 | 0 | 408 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 203 | 0 | 0 | 580 | 0 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0\% | 12\% | 0\% | 6\% | 3\% | 12\% | 3\% | 0\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 16.3 |  | 16.3 | 16.3 |  |  | 21.5 |  |  | 21.5 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 16.3 |  | 16.3 | 16.3 |  |  | 21.5 |  |  | 21.5 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.36 |  | 0.36 | 0.36 |  |  | 0.47 |  |  | 0.47 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 583 |  | 489 | 519 |  |  | 777 |  |  | 723 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  | 0.07 |  |  | 0.12 |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  | 0.01 |  | c0.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | c0.38 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.04 |  | 0.83 | 0.19 |  |  | 0.26 |  |  | 0.80 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 9.6 |  | 13.5 | 10.2 |  |  | 7.3 |  |  | 10.3 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 0.0 |  | 11.7 | 0.2 |  |  | 0.2 |  |  | 6.4 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 9.7 |  | 25.2 | 10.4 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 16.8 |  |
| Level of Service |  | A |  | C | B |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 9.7 |  |  | 19.4 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 16.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 16.0 |  | HCM Le | el of S | rvice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.82 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 45.8 |  | Sum of | ost time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 86.0\% |  | CU Lev | of Se | vice |  | E |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | F |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1764 |  | 1770 | 1772 |  | 1770 | 1854 |  | 1770 | 1855 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.23 | 1.00 |  | 0.28 | 1.00 |  | 0.39 | 1.00 |  | 0.49 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 427 | 1764 |  | 514 | 1772 |  | 731 | 1854 |  | 910 | 1855 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 10 | 240 | 130 | 10 | 270 | 130 | 100 | 290 | 10 | 140 | 350 | 10 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 10 | 245 | 133 | 10 | 276 | 133 | 102 | 296 | 10 | 143 | 357 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 10 | 354 | 0 | 10 | 388 | 0 | 102 | 305 | 0 | 143 | 366 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 32.6 | 26.3 |  | 31.4 | 25.7 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 32.6 | 26.3 |  | 31.4 | 25.7 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.29 | 0.27 |  | 0.29 | 0.27 |  | 0.48 | 0.39 |  | 0.47 | 0.38 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 141 | 484 |  | 165 | 486 |  | 451 | 723 |  | 497 | 707 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.00 | 0.20 |  | 0.00 | c0.22 |  | 0.02 | 0.16 |  | c0.02 | c0.20 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.02 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.09 |  |  | 0.11 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.07 | 0.73 |  | 0.06 | 0.80 |  | 0.23 | 0.42 |  | 0.29 | 0.52 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 18.0 | 22.2 |  | 17.8 | 22.7 |  | 10.0 | 15.0 |  | 10.6 | 16.1 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.2 | 5.6 |  | 0.2 | 8.9 |  | 0.3 | 0.4 |  | 0.3 | 2.7 |  |
| Delay (s) | 18.2 | 27.8 |  | 18.0 | 31.6 |  | 10.2 | 15.4 |  | 10.9 | 18.8 |  |
| Level of Service | B | C |  | B | C |  | B | B |  | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 27.6 |  |  | 31.3 |  |  | 14.1 |  |  | 16.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 22.0 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | ervice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 67.4 |  | Sum of los | st time | (s) |  | 16.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 56.7\% |  | ICU Leve | of Se | rvice |  | B |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{4}$ |  | 7 | F |  | \% | F |  | 7 | 个 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| Frt |  | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.86 |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1826 |  | 1770 | 1856 |  | 1770 | 1596 |  | 1770 |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 |  | 0.10 | 1.00 |  | 0.76 | 1.00 |  | 0.26 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1826 |  | 187 | 1856 |  | 1410 | 1596 |  | 477 |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 660 | 100 | 220 | 420 | 10 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 673 | 102 | 224 | 429 | 10 | 204 | 20 | 408 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 768 | 0 | 224 | 438 | 0 | 204 | 234 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 35.9 |  | 44.0 | 44.0 |  | 24.4 | 24.4 |  | 24.4 |  |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 35.9 |  | 44.0 | 44.0 |  | 24.4 | 24.4 |  | 24.4 |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.47 |  | 0.58 | 0.58 |  | 0.32 | 0.32 |  | 0.32 |  |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 858 |  | 193 | 1069 |  | 450 | 510 |  | 152 |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.42 |  | c0.06 | 0.24 |  |  | c0.15 |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  | c0.61 |  |  | 0.14 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.89 |  | 1.16 | 0.41 |  | 0.45 | 0.46 |  | 0.07 |  |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 18.5 |  | 16.4 | 9.0 |  | 20.7 | 20.7 |  | 18.1 |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 11.8 |  | 114.7 | 0.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.0 |  | 0.2 |  |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 30.3 |  | 131.1 | 9.2 |  | 24.0 | 23.7 |  | 18.3 |  |  |
| Level of Service |  | C |  | F | A |  | C | C |  | B |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 30.3 |  |  | 50.4 |  |  | 23.8 |  |  | 18.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 34.7 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | rvice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 76.4 |  | Sum of los | ost time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 88.8\% |  | ICU Leve | of Se | vice |  | E |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\stackrel{7}{ }$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.96 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1612 | 1538 |  |  |  | 1597 | 3505 |  |  | 1735 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.76 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1285 | 1538 |  |  |  | 1597 | 3505 |  |  | 1735 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 240 | 0 | 830 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 440 | 740 | 0 | 0 | 730 | 250 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 245 | 0 | 847 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 449 | 755 | 0 | 0 | 745 | 255 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 488 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 245 | 359 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 449 | 755 | 0 | 0 | 988 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 12\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 13\% | 3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% | 12\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  |  | Prot |  |  | Prot |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  |  |  | 35.0 | 82.0 |  |  | 43.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  |  |  | 35.0 | 83.0 |  |  | 44.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.13 | 0.13 |  |  |  | 0.33 | 0.79 |  |  | 0.42 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  | 4.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 171 | 205 |  |  |  | 532 | 2771 |  |  | 727 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  | c0.28 | 0.22 |  |  | c0.57 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  | 0.19 | c0.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 1.43 | 1.75 |  |  |  | 0.84 | 0.27 |  |  | 1.36 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 45.5 | 45.5 |  |  |  | 32.5 | 2.9 |  |  | 30.5 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.94 | 1.12 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 224.9 | 357.6 |  |  |  | 13.1 | 0.2 |  |  | 170.7 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 270.4 | 403.1 |  |  |  | 43.6 | 3.5 |  |  | 201.2 |  |
| Level of Service |  | F | F |  |  |  | D | A |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 373.3 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 18.4 |  |  | 201.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 191.4 |  | HCM Lev | vel of S | ervice |  | F |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratioActuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 1.22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of lost time (s) |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 111.7\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  | H |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

c Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个 4 | $\stackrel{7}{ }$ |  | ¢4 | F |  |  |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 3471 | 1521 |  | 3312 | 1582 |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1369 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 3471 | 1521 |  | 3312 | 1582 |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1369 |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 1670 | 780 | 0 | 910 | 470 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1010 | 0 | 530 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 1704 | 796 | 0 | 929 | 480 | 0 | 0 | - | 1031 | 0 | 541 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1704 | 796 | 0 | 929 | 480 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 516 | 515 | 479 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 4\% | 4\% | 0\% | 9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 18\% |
| Turn Type |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |  | Split |  | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 57.2 | 105.0 |  | 57.2 | 105.0 |  |  |  | 38.8 | 38.8 | 38.8 |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 58.2 | 105.0 |  | 58.2 | 105.0 |  |  |  | 38.8 | 38.8 | 38.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.55 | 1.00 |  | 0.55 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 1924 | 1521 |  | 1836 | 1582 |  |  |  | 609 | 609 | 506 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Prot |  | c0.49 |  |  | 0.28 |  |  |  |  | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.52 |  |  | 0.30 |  |  |  |  |  | c0.35 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.89 | 0.52 |  | 0.51 | 0.30 |  |  |  | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.95 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 20.5 | 0.0 |  | 14.5 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 30.4 | 30.4 | 32.1 |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.60 | 1.00 |  | 1.23 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 0.6 | 0.1 |  | 0.9 | 0.4 |  |  |  | 10.6 | 10.5 | 26.8 |
| Delay (s) |  | 33.3 | 0.1 |  | 18.8 | 0.4 |  |  |  | 41.0 | 40.8 | 58.8 |
| Level of Service |  | C | A |  | B | A |  |  |  | D | D | E |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 22.8 |  |  | 12.5 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 47.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | D |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 27.1 |  | HCM Lev | el of Sersir | rvice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.91 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of los | st time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 80.8\% |  | ICU Leve | of Ser | vice |  | D |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $>$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | F |  | 个4 | 「 | \％${ }^{1 *}$ |  | 「 |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Frpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |  |  |  |
| Flpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 |  | 0.85 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） |  | 3505 | 1615 |  | 3574 | 1599 | 3072 |  | 1571 |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） |  | 3505 | 1615 |  | 3574 | 1599 | 3072 |  | 1571 |  |  |  |
| Volume（vph） | 0 | 1630 | 1040 | 0 | 1000 | 1160 | 400 | 0 | 420 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 0 | 1663 | 1061 | 0 | 1020 | 1184 | 408 | 0 | 429 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 1663 | 1061 | 0 | 1020 | 1184 | 408 | 0 | 412 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  | 7 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 0\％ | 3\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 1\％ | 1\％ | 14\％ | 0\％ | 1\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Turn Type |  |  | Free |  |  | Free | Prot |  | ustom |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green，G（s） |  | 65.3 | 105.0 |  | 65.3 | 105.0 | 30.7 |  | 30.7 |  |  |  |
| Effective Green，g（s） |  | 66.3 | 105.0 |  | 66.3 | 105.0 | 30.7 |  | 30.7 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.63 | 1.00 |  | 0.63 | 1.00 | 0.29 |  | 0.29 |  |  |  |
| Clearance Time（s） |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension（s） |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） |  | 2213 | 1615 |  | 2257 | 1599 | 898 |  | 459 |  |  |  |
| v／s Ratio Prot |  | 0.47 |  |  | 0.29 |  | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.66 |  |  | c0．74 |  |  | c0． 26 |  |  |  |
| v／c Ratio |  | 0.75 | 0.66 |  | 0.45 | 0.74 | 0.45 |  | 0.90 |  |  |  |
| Uniform Delay，d1 |  | 13.6 | 0.0 |  | 10.0 | 0.0 | 30.3 |  | 35.6 |  |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 0.86 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay，d2 |  | 1.2 | 0.9 |  | 0.7 | 3.1 | 0.4 |  | 19.8 |  |  |  |
| Delay（s） |  | 12.8 | 0.9 |  | 10.6 | 3.1 | 30.7 |  | 55.5 |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  | B | A |  | B | A | C |  | E |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 8.2 |  |  | 6.6 |  |  | 43.4 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | D |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 12.7 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | rvice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.79 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of lost time（s） |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 77．7\％ | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | F |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.99 |  |  | 0.96 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1885 |  |  | 1370 | 1468 | 1805 | 1783 |  | 1703 | 1756 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.95 |  |  | 0.70 | 1.00 | 0.52 | 1.00 |  | 0.17 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1803 |  |  | 999 | 1468 | 993 | 1783 |  | 297 | 1756 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 10 | 50 | 0 | 130 | 10 | 540 | 10 | 400 | 110 | 600 | 390 | 10 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 10 | 51 | 0 | 133 | 10 | 551 | 10 | 408 | 112 | 612 | 398 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 472 | 10 | 510 | 0 | 612 | 407 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 35\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 6\% | 8\% | 0\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  | pm+ov | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 | 1 | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  | 8 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 14.0 |  |  | 14.0 | 40.5 | 30.0 | 28.9 |  | 59.4 | 54.3 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 14.0 |  |  | 14.0 | 40.5 | 30.0 | 28.9 |  | 59.4 | 54.3 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.17 |  |  | 0.17 | 0.50 | 0.37 | 0.36 |  | 0.73 | 0.67 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 310 |  |  | 172 | 803 | 377 | 633 |  | 674 | 1171 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  | c0.19 | 0.00 | 0.29 |  | c0.30 | 0.23 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  | 0.03 |  |  | c0.14 | 0.13 | 0.01 |  |  | c0.37 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.20 |  |  | 0.83 | 0.59 | 0.03 | 0.81 |  | 0.91 | 0.35 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 28.9 |  |  | 32.6 | 14.5 | 16.4 | 23.7 |  | 18.3 | 5.9 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 0.3 |  |  | 27.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 10.6 |  | 16.0 | 0.8 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 29.2 |  |  | 60.1 | 15.6 | 16.4 | 34.3 |  | 34.3 | 6.7 |  |
| Level of Service |  | C |  |  | E | B | B | C |  | C | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 29.2 |  |  | 24.8 |  |  | 33.9 |  |  | 23.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 26.3 |  | HCM Level of Service |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.84 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 81.4 |  | Sum of lost time (s) |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 85.4\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | F |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1765 |  | 1770 | 1779 |  | 1770 | 1854 |  | 1770 | 1856 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.23 | 1.00 |  | 0.23 | 1.00 |  | 0.35 | 1.00 |  | 0.49 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 431 | 1765 |  | 431 | 1779 |  | 648 | 1854 |  | 905 | 1856 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 10 | 260 | 140 | 10 | 280 | 120 | 100 | 290 | 10 | 160 | 390 | 10 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 10 | 265 | 143 | 10 | 286 | 122 | 102 | 296 | 10 | 163 | 398 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 10 | 384 | 0 | 10 | 389 | 0 | 102 | 305 | 0 | 163 | 407 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 32.4 | 26.1 |  | 31.4 | 25.6 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 32.4 | 26.1 |  | 31.4 | 25.6 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.29 | 0.27 |  | 0.29 | 0.27 |  | 0.48 | 0.39 |  | 0.47 | 0.38 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 142 | 485 |  | 142 | 489 |  | 417 | 719 |  | 497 | 706 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.00 | 0.22 |  | 0.00 | c0.22 |  | 0.02 | 0.16 |  | c0.03 | c0.22 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.02 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.09 |  |  | 0.12 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.07 | 0.79 |  | 0.07 | 0.80 |  | 0.24 | 0.42 |  | 0.33 | 0.58 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 17.9 | 22.6 |  | 17.9 | 22.6 |  | 10.2 | 15.1 |  | 10.7 | 16.6 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.2 | 8.6 |  | 0.2 | 8.7 |  | 0.3 | 0.4 |  | 0.4 | 3.4 |  |
| Delay (s) | 18.2 | 31.2 |  | 18.2 | 31.4 |  | 10.5 | 15.5 |  | 11.1 | 20.0 |  |
| Level of Service | B | C |  | B | C |  | B | B |  | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 30.9 |  |  | 31.1 |  |  | 14.3 |  |  | 17.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 23.0 |  | HCM Le | el of S | ervice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 67.3 |  | Sum of | st time | (s) |  | 16.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 58.9\% |  | CU Lev | of Se | rvice |  | B |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $>$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个 |  | \% | $\hat{}$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |  | 0.91 |  |  | 0.98 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1821 |  | 1770 | 1833 |  |  | 1673 |  |  | 1776 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.40 | 1.00 |  | 0.11 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.87 |  |  | 0.64 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 739 | 1821 |  | 214 | 1833 |  |  | 1487 |  |  | 1162 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 20 | 630 | 110 | 220 | 420 | 50 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 40 | 20 | 10 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 20 | 643 | 112 | 224 | 429 | 51 | 204 | 20 | 408 | 41 | 20 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 20 | 747 | 0 | 224 | 475 | 0 | 0 | 562 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 38.8 | 37.4 |  | 44.2 | 40.1 |  |  | 24.4 |  |  | 24.4 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 38.8 | 37.4 |  | 44.2 | 40.1 |  |  | 24.4 |  |  | 24.4 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.50 | 0.48 |  | 0.57 | 0.51 |  |  | 0.31 |  |  | 0.31 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 387 | 874 |  | 203 | 944 |  |  | 466 |  |  | 364 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.00 | 0.41 |  | c0.06 | 0.26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.02 |  |  | c0.57 |  |  |  | c0.38 |  |  | 0.06 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.05 | 0.85 |  | 1.10 | 0.50 |  |  | 1.21 |  |  | 0.18 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 10.3 | 17.8 |  | 16.3 | 12.4 |  |  | 26.8 |  |  | 19.5 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.1 | 8.2 |  | 93.6 | 0.4 |  |  | 111.5 |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| Delay (s) | 10.3 | 26.0 |  | 109.9 | 12.8 |  |  | 138.2 |  |  | 19.7 |  |
| Level of Service | B | C |  | F | B |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 25.6 |  |  | 43.7 |  |  | 138.2 |  |  | 19.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 63.9 |  | HCM Le | vel of S | rvice |  | E |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 1.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 77.9 |  | Sum of | st time |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 00.9\% |  | CU Lev | of Se | vice |  | G |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


c Critical Lane Group

|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | F' | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \% | 㙟 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 | 0.88 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.91 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.92 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1721 | 2656 | 1805 | 1746 |  | 2918 | 3340 |  | 1805 | 4940 |  |
| FIt Permitted |  | 0.72 | 1.00 | 0.40 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1300 | 2656 | 756 | 1746 |  | 2918 | 3340 |  | 1805 | 4940 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 210 | 10 | 1020 | 50 | 10 | 10 | 490 | 970 | 10 | 10 | 1410 | 140 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 214 | 10 | 1041 | 51 | 10 | 10 | 500 | 990 | 10 | 10 | 1439 | 143 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 224 | 1035 | 51 | 12 | 0 | 500 | 1000 | 0 | 10 | 1572 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 13\% | 7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 20\% | 8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% | 8\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  | pm+ov | Perm |  |  | Prot |  |  | Prot |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 | 1 |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 21.9 | 46.7 | 21.9 | 21.9 |  | 24.8 | 69.6 |  | 1.5 | 46.3 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 21.9 | 46.7 | 21.9 | 21.9 |  | 24.8 | 69.6 |  | 1.5 | 46.3 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.21 | 0.44 | 0.21 | 0.21 |  | 0.24 | 0.66 |  | 0.01 | 0.44 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 271 | 1282 | 158 | 364 |  | 689 | 2214 |  | 26 | 2178 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  | c0.19 |  | 0.01 |  | 0.17 | 0.30 |  | 0.01 | c0.32 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.83 | 0.81 | 0.32 | 0.03 |  | 0.73 | 0.45 |  | 0.38 | 0.72 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 39.7 | 25.3 | 35.3 | 33.1 |  | 37.0 | 8.5 |  | 51.3 | 24.1 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.12 | 0.67 |  | 0.93 | 0.96 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 18.3 | 3.8 | 1.2 | 0.0 |  | 2.9 | 0.5 |  | 6.8 | 1.6 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 58.0 | 29.1 | 36.4 | 33.2 |  | 44.3 | 6.2 |  | 54.4 | 24.7 |  |
| Level of Service |  | E | C | D | C |  | D | A |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 34.2 |  |  | 35.5 |  |  | 18.9 |  |  | 24.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 25.7 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | rvice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratioActuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 0.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of los | st time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 79.9\% |  | CU Leve | of Se | vice |  | D |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个 $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | 个4 | F＇ |  |  |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util．Factor |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） |  | 3471 | 1521 |  | 3312 | 1582 |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1369 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（perm） |  | 3471 | 1521 |  | 3312 | 1582 |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1369 |
| Volume（vph） | 0 | 1670 | 780 | 0 | 910 | 470 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1010 | 0 | 530 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 0 | 1704 | 796 | 0 | 929 | 480 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1031 | 0 | 541 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 1704 | 796 | 0 | 929 | 480 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 516 | 515 | 488 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 0\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 0\％ | 9\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 4\％ | 0\％ | 18\％ |


| Turn Type |  | Free |  | Free | Split |  | Perm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Protected Phases | 2 |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | Free |  | Free |  |  | 4 |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 56.3 | 105.0 | 56.3 | 105.0 | 39.7 | 39.7 | 39.7 |
| Effective Green，g（s） | 57.3 | 105.0 | 57.3 | 105.0 | 39.7 | 39.7 | 39.7 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.55 | 1.00 | 0.55 | 1.00 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| Clearance Time（s） | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 1894 | 1521 | 1807 | 1582 | 623 | 623 | 518 |
| v／s Ratio Prot | c0．49 |  | 0.28 |  | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  | 0.52 |  | 0.30 |  |  | c0．36 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.90 | 0.52 | 0.51 | 0.30 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.94 |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 29.6 | 29.5 | 31.5 |
| Progression Factor | 0.80 | 1.00 | 0.79 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 8.9 | 8.8 | 25.8 |
| Delay（s） | 22.0 | 0.8 | 12.9 | 0.4 | 38.5 | 38.4 | 57.3 |
| Level of Service | C | A | B | A | D | D | E |
| Approach Delay（s） | 15.3 |  | 8.6 |  |  | 44.9 |  |

Approach LOS
B

| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM Average Control Delay | 22.1 | HCM Level of Service | C |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.92 |  | 8.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） | 105.0 | Sum of lost time（s） | 8.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $80.8 \%$ | ICU Level of Service | D |
| Analysis Period（min） | 15 |  |  |

Analysis Period（min）
15
c Critical Lane Group

|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ 4 | ${ }^{7}$ |  | 个个 | F | \％${ }^{1 / 1}$ |  | 「 |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Frpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |  |  |  |
| Flpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 |  | 0.85 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） |  | 3505 | 1615 |  | 3574 | 1599 | 3072 |  | 1571 |  |  |  |
| FIt Permitted |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） |  | 3505 | 1615 |  | 3574 | 1599 | 3072 |  | 1571 |  |  |  |
| Volume（vph） | 0 | 1630 | 1040 | 0 | 1000 | 1160 | 400 | 0 | 420 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 0 | 1663 | 1061 | 0 | 1020 | 1184 | 408 | 0 | 429 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 1663 | 1061 | 0 | 1020 | 1184 | 408 | 0 | 412 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  | 7 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 0\％ | 3\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 1\％ | 1\％ | 14\％ | 0\％ | 1\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Turn Type |  |  | Free |  |  | Free | Prot |  | ustom |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green，G（s） |  | 65.3 | 105.0 |  | 65.3 | 105.0 | 30.7 |  | 30.7 |  |  |  |
| Effective Green，g（s） |  | 66.3 | 105.0 |  | 66.3 | 105.0 | 30.7 |  | 30.7 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.63 | 1.00 |  | 0.63 | 1.00 | 0.29 |  | 0.29 |  |  |  |
| Clearance Time（s） |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension（s） |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） |  | 2213 | 1615 |  | 2257 | 1599 | 898 |  | 459 |  |  |  |
| v／s Ratio Prot |  | 0.47 |  |  | 0.29 |  | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.66 |  |  | c0．74 |  |  | c0．26 |  |  |  |
| v／c Ratio |  | 0.75 | 0.66 |  | 0.45 | 0.74 | 0.45 |  | 0.90 |  |  |  |
| Uniform Delay，d1 |  | 13.6 | 0.0 |  | 10.0 | 0.0 | 30.3 |  | 35.6 |  |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 0.57 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay，d2 |  | 1.2 | 0.9 |  | 0.7 | 3.1 | 0.4 |  | 19.8 |  |  |  |
| Delay（s） |  | 9.0 | 0.9 |  | 10.6 | 3.1 | 30.7 |  | 55.5 |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  | A | A |  | B | A | C |  | E |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 5.8 |  |  | 6.6 |  |  | 43.4 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | D |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 11.6 |  | HCM Lev | vel of S | rvice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.79 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of los | ost time |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 77．7\％ |  | ICU Leve | el of Servi | vice |  | D |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


c Critical Lane Group


C Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | \% | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.86 |  |  | 0.92 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.98 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1785 |  | 1770 | 1456 |  |  | 1660 |  |  | 1786 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.90 |  | 0.74 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.86 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1632 |  | 1374 | 1456 |  |  | 1660 |  |  | 1549 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 400 | 10 | 270 | 0 | 120 | 160 | 130 | 440 | 10 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 408 | 10 | 276 | 0 | 122 | 163 | 133 | 449 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 24 | 0 | 408 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 590 | 0 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |


| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Turn Type | Perm |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  |  |


| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 8 | 2 | 6 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 8 |  | 2 |  | 6 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 16.4 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 21.5 | 21.5 |  |  |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 16.4 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 21.5 | 21.5 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.47 | 0.47 |  |  |  |


| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 583 | 491 | 520 | 778 | 726 |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  | 0.07 | 0.12 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.01 | c0.30 |  |  | c0.38 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.04 | 0.83 | 0.21 | 0.25 | 0.81 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 9.6 | 13.5 | 10.2 | 7.4 | 10.5 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 6.9 |
| Delay (s) | 9.6 | 24.9 | 10.4 | 7.5 | 17.4 |
| Level of Service | A | C | B | A | B |
| Approach Delay (s) | 9.6 |  | 18.9 | 7.5 | 17.4 |


| Approach LOS A B B | A |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM Average Control Delay | 16.2 | HCM Level of Service | B |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.82 |  | 8.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 45.9 | Sum of lost time (s) | E |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $85.9 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |

C Critical Lane Group

|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | \% |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1765 |  | 1770 | 1779 |  | 1770 | 1854 |  | 1770 | 1856 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.23 | 1.00 |  | 0.23 | 1.00 |  | 0.35 | 1.00 |  | 0.49 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 431 | 1765 |  | 431 | 1779 |  | 648 | 1854 |  | 905 | 1856 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 10 | 260 | 140 | 10 | 280 | 120 | 100 | 290 | 10 | 160 | 390 | 10 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 10 | 265 | 143 | 10 | 286 | 122 | 102 | 296 | 10 | 163 | 398 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 10 | 384 | 0 | 10 | 389 | 0 | 102 | 305 | 0 | 163 | 407 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 32.4 | 26.1 |  | 31.4 | 25.6 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 19.4 | 18.5 |  | 32.4 | 26.1 |  | 31.4 | 25.6 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.29 | 0.27 |  | 0.29 | 0.27 |  | 0.48 | 0.39 |  | 0.47 | 0.38 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 142 | 485 |  | 142 | 489 |  | 417 | 719 |  | 497 | 706 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.00 | 0.22 |  | 0.00 | c0.22 |  | 0.02 | 0.16 |  | c0.03 | c0.22 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.02 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.09 |  |  | 0.12 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.07 | 0.79 |  | 0.07 | 0.80 |  | 0.24 | 0.42 |  | 0.33 | 0.58 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 17.9 | 22.6 |  | 17.9 | 22.6 |  | 10.2 | 15.1 |  | 10.7 | 16.6 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.2 | 8.6 |  | 0.2 | 8.7 |  | 0.3 | 0.4 |  | 0.4 | 3.4 |  |
| Delay (s) | 18.2 | 31.2 |  | 18.2 | 31.4 |  | 10.5 | 15.5 |  | 11.1 | 20.0 |  |
| Level of Service | B | C |  | B | C |  | B | B |  | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 30.9 |  |  | 31.1 |  |  | 14.3 |  |  | 17.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 23.0 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | ervice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 67.3 |  | Sum of lo | ost time | (s) |  | 16.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 58.9\% |  | ICU Leve | of Se | rvice |  | B |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | F |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.86 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1821 |  | 1770 | 1833 |  | 1770 | 1596 |  | 1770 | 1770 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.40 | 1.00 |  | 0.11 | 1.00 |  | 0.74 | 1.00 |  | 0.25 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 739 | 1821 |  | 214 | 1833 |  | 1374 | 1596 |  | 459 | 1770 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 20 | 630 | 110 | 220 | 420 | 50 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 40 | 20 | 10 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 20 | 643 | 112 | 224 | 429 | 51 | 204 | 20 | 408 | 41 | 20 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 20 | 747 | 0 | 224 | 475 | 0 | 204 | 222 | 0 | 41 | 23 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 38.8 | 37.4 |  | 44.2 | 40.1 |  | 24.4 | 24.4 |  | 24.4 | 24.4 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 38.8 | 37.4 |  | 44.2 | 40.1 |  | 24.4 | 24.4 |  | 24.4 | 24.4 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.50 | 0.48 |  | 0.57 | 0.51 |  | 0.31 | 0.31 |  | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 387 | 874 |  | 203 | 944 |  | 430 | 500 |  | 144 | 554 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.00 | 0.41 |  | c0.06 | 0.26 |  |  | 0.14 |  |  | 0.01 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.02 |  |  | c0.57 |  |  | c0.15 |  |  | 0.09 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.05 | 0.85 |  | 1.10 | 0.50 |  | 0.47 | 0.44 |  | 0.28 | 0.04 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 10.3 | 17.8 |  | 16.3 | 12.4 |  | 21.6 | 21.3 |  | 20.2 | 18.6 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.1 | 8.2 |  | 93.6 | 0.4 |  | 3.7 | 2.8 |  | 1.1 | 0.0 |  |
| Delay (s) | 10.3 | 26.0 |  | 109.9 | 12.8 |  | 25.3 | 24.2 |  | 21.3 | 18.6 |  |
| Level of Service | B | C |  | F | B |  | C | C |  | C | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 25.6 |  |  | 43.7 |  |  | 24.5 |  |  | 20.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 31.0 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | ervice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.91 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 77.9 |  | Sum of los | st time |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 94.5\% |  | ICU Leve | of Se | vice |  | F |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

S:|Projects\2006\P06097-201 (ODOT WV Industrial Lands Master Plan)\Synchro\Alt 2 (n of Day)\2030 Nc 2: SW Day St \& Boones Ferry Road HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis


C Critical Lane Group

S:|Projects\2006\P06097-201 (ODOT WV Industrial Lands Master Plan)\Synchro\Alt 2 (n of Day)\2030 Nc 3: 95th Avenue \& Boones Ferry Road HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | * | $\hat{\square}$ |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | 性 |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 个4 | F |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |  | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.97 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1719 | 1511 |  |  | 1796 |  | 1697 | 3340 |  | 1805 | 3505 | 1464 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.74 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.25 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1331 | 1511 |  |  | 457 |  | 1697 | 3340 |  | 1805 | 3505 | 1464 |
| Volume (vph) | 200 | 10 | 1160 | 50 | 10 | 10 | 590 | 890 | 10 | 10 | 1290 | 110 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 204 | 10 | 1184 | 51 | 10 | 10 | 602 | 908 | 10 | 10 | 1316 | 112 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 433 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 204 | 761 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 602 | 917 | 0 | 10 | 1316 | 85 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 13\% | 7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 20\% | 8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% | 8\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  | Prot |  |  | Prot |  | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 14.0 | 14.0 |  |  | 14.0 |  | 41.0 | 77.5 |  | 1.5 | 38.0 | 38.0 |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 14.0 | 14.0 |  |  | 14.0 |  | 41.0 | 77.5 |  | 1.5 | 38.0 | 38.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.13 | 0.13 |  |  | 0.13 |  | 0.39 | 0.74 |  | 0.01 | 0.36 | 0.36 |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 177 | 201 |  |  | 61 |  | 663 | 2465 |  | 26 | 1268 | 530 |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | c0.50 |  |  |  |  | c0.35 | 0.27 |  | 0.01 | c0.38 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.15 |  |  |  | 0.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.06 |
| v/c Ratio | 1.15 | 3.78 |  |  | 1.08 |  | 0.91 | 0.37 |  | 0.38 | 1.04 | 0.16 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 45.5 | 45.5 |  |  | 45.5 |  | 30.2 | 5.0 |  | 51.3 | 33.5 | 22.7 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 0.55 | 0.47 |  | 1.25 | 1.18 | 1.46 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 114.6 | 1265.0 |  |  | 138.7 |  | 14.0 | 0.3 |  | 0.9 | 20.0 | 0.0 |
| Delay (s) | 160.11 | 1310.5 |  |  | 184.2 |  | 30.7 | 2.6 |  | 64.8 | 59.4 | 33.2 |
| Level of Service | F | F |  |  | F |  | C | A |  | E | E | C |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 1142.7 |  |  | 184.2 |  |  | 13.7 |  |  | 57.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 387.2 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | rvice |  | F |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 1.39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of los | st time |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 150.7\% |  | ICU Leve | of Se | vice |  | H |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

S：\Projects\2006\P06097－201（ODOT WV Industrial Lands Master Plan）\Synchro\Alt 2 （n of Day）\2030 Nc 6：Boones Ferry Road \＆I－5 SB Off Ramp HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个4 | ${ }^{7}$ |  | 个个 | ${ }^{7}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{4}$ | 4 | F |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util．Factor |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） |  | 3471 | 1521 |  | 3312 | 1582 |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1369 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（perm） |  | 3471 | 1521 |  | 3312 | 1582 |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1369 |
| Volume（vph） | 0 | 1670 | 780 | 0 | 940 | 470 | 0 | 0 | ， | 1000 | 0 | 560 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 0 | 1704 | 796 | 0 | 959 | 480 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1020 | 0 | 571 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 1704 | 796 | 0 | 959 | 480 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 510 | 510 | 516 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 0\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 0\％ | 9\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 4\％ | 0\％ | 18\％ |
| Turn Type |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |  | Split |  | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Actuated Green，G（s） |  | 54.9 | 105.0 |  | 54.9 | 105.0 |  |  |  | 41.1 | 41.1 | 41.1 |
| Effective Green，g（s） |  | 55.9 | 105.0 |  | 55.9 | 105.0 |  |  |  | 41.1 | 41.1 | 41.1 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.53 | 1.00 |  | 0.53 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 |
| Clearance Time（s） |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Vehicle Extension（s） |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） |  | 1848 | 1521 |  | 1763 | 1582 |  |  |  | 645 | 645 | 536 |
| v／s Ratio Prot |  | c0．49 |  |  | 0.29 |  |  |  |  | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.52 |  |  | 0.30 |  |  |  |  |  | c0．38 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.92 | 0.52 |  | 0.54 | 0.30 |  |  |  | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.96 |
| Uniform Delay，d1 |  | 22.5 | 0.0 |  | 16.2 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 28.2 | 28.2 | 31.2 |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.56 | 1.00 |  | 1.27 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay，d2 |  | 1.0 | 0.1 |  | 1.1 | 0.5 |  |  |  | 6.6 | 6.6 | 29.3 |
| Delay（s） |  | 36.3 | 0.1 |  | 21.6 | 0.5 |  |  |  | 34.7 | 34.7 | 60.5 |
| Level of Service |  | D | A |  | C | A |  |  |  | C | C | E |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 24.8 |  |  | 14.5 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 44.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | D |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 27.6 |  | HCM Lev | vel of Sersin | rvice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of los | st time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 80．5\％ |  | ICU Leve | ef Ser |  |  | D |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

S:\Projects\2006\P06097-201 (ODOT WV Industrial Lands Master Plan)\Synchro\Alt 2 (n of Day)\2030 Nc 9: Boones Ferry Road \& I-5 NB Ramp HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

S:|Projects\2006\P06097-201 (ODOT WV Industrial Lands Master Plan)\Synchro\Alt 2 (n of Day)\2030 Nc 15: Tonquin \& SW Grahams Ferry Rd HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

|  | $\rangle$ |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 210 | 530 | 540 | 420 | 420 | 200 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 214 | 541 | 551 | 429 | 429 | 204 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 2061 | 531 | 633 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 2061 | 531 | 633 |  |  |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.3 | 4.2 |  |  |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.4 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 0 | 0 | 40 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 24 | 535 | 913 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 755 | 980 | 633 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 214 | 551 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 541 | 0 | 204 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 75 | 913 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 10.04 | 0.60 | 0.37 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | Err | 105 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | Err | 13.5 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | F | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | Err | 13.5 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average DelayIntersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 3194.9 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 40.5\% |  | CU Leve | of Service | H |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

S:|Projects\2006\P06097-201 (ODOT WV Industrial Lands Master Plan)\Synchro\Alt 2 (n of Day)\2030 Nc 25: SW Day St \& Grahams Ferry Rd

c Critical Lane Group

S:\Projects\2006\P06097-201 (ODOT WV Industrial Lands Master Plan)\Synchro\Alt 2 ( n of Day)\2030 Nc 30: Clutter Rd \& Grahams Ferry Rd HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis


S:|Projects\2006\P06097-201 (ODOT WV Industrial Lands Master Plan)\Synchro\Alt 2 (n of Day)\2030 Nc 31: Clutter Rd \& Kinsman

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | 4 | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\square}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\dagger$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.94 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1768 |  | 1770 | 1757 |  | 1770 | 1853 |  | 1770 | 1783 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 0.30 | 1.00 |  | 0.25 | 1.00 |  | 0.28 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 583 | 1768 |  | 563 | 1757 |  | 458 | 1853 |  | 530 | 1783 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 130 | 290 | 150 | 10 | 180 | 110 | 120 | 270 | 10 | 30 | 400 | 160 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 133 | 296 | 153 | 10 | 184 | 112 | 122 | 276 | 10 | 31 | 408 | 163 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 133 | 430 | 0 | 10 | 272 | 0 | 122 | 284 | 0 | 31 | 558 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 30.4 | 25.5 |  | 21.3 | 20.4 |  | 24.4 | 17.9 |  | 39.0 | 28.5 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 30.4 | 25.5 |  | 21.3 | 20.4 |  | 24.4 | 17.9 |  | 39.0 | 28.5 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.39 | 0.33 |  | 0.28 | 0.26 |  | 0.32 | 0.23 |  | 0.50 | 0.37 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 321 | 582 |  | 169 | 463 |  | 255 | 429 |  | 541 | 657 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.03 | c0.24 |  | 0.00 | 0.15 |  | c0.04 | 0.15 |  | 0.01 | c0.31 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.13 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.11 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.41 | 0.74 |  | 0.06 | 0.59 |  | 0.48 | 0.66 |  | 0.06 | 0.85 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 16.4 | 23.0 |  | 20.9 | 24.8 |  | 20.0 | 27.0 |  | 10.5 | 22.5 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.9 | 4.9 |  | 0.1 | 1.9 |  | 1.4 | 3.8 |  | 0.2 | 13.0 |  |
| Delay (s) | 17.2 | 27.9 |  | 21.0 | 26.7 |  | 21.4 | 30.8 |  | 10.7 | 35.5 |  |
| Level of Service | B | C |  | C | C |  | C | C |  | B | D |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 25.5 |  |  | 26.5 |  |  | 28.0 |  |  | 34.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 29.0 |  | HCM Lev | vel of S | ervice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 77.4 |  | Sum of los | st time |  |  | 16.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 78.5\% |  | ICU Leve | of Ser | rvice |  | D |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

S:\Projects\2006\P06097-201 (ODOT WV Industrial Lands Master Plan)\Synchro\Alt 2 ( n of Day)\2030 Nc 36: SW Day St \& Kinsman HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\hat{1}$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  |  | 0.92 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1834 |  | 1770 | 1851 |  |  | 1689 |  |  | 1813 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 |  | 0.10 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.85 |  |  | 0.63 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1834 |  | 184 | 1851 |  |  | 1463 |  |  | 1178 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 690 | 80 | 210 | 430 | 20 | 180 | 40 | 300 | 60 | 50 | 0 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 704 | 82 | 214 | 439 | 20 | 184 | 41 | 306 | 61 | 51 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 781 | 0 | 214 | 457 | 0 | 0 | 479 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 36.6 |  | 44.7 | 44.7 |  |  | 24.4 |  |  | 24.4 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 36.6 |  | 44.7 | 44.7 |  |  | 24.4 |  |  | 24.4 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.47 |  | 0.58 | 0.58 |  |  | 0.32 |  |  | 0.32 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 871 |  | 191 | 1073 |  |  | 463 |  |  | 373 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.43 |  | c0.06 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  | c0.59 |  |  |  | c0.33 |  |  | 0.10 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.90 |  | 1.12 | 0.43 |  |  | 1.03 |  |  | 0.30 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 18.5 |  | 16.7 | 9.0 |  |  | 26.4 |  |  | 19.9 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 11.8 |  | 101.2 | 0.3 |  |  | 51.1 |  |  | 0.5 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 30.3 |  | 117.9 | 9.3 |  |  | 77.4 |  |  | 20.4 |  |
| Level of Service |  | C |  | F | A |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 30.3 |  |  | 43.8 |  |  | 77.4 |  |  | 20.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 46.0 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | rvice |  | D |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 1.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 77.1 |  | Sum of lo | st time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 96.0\% |  | ICU Leve | of Se | vice |  | F |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


c Critical Lane Group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

c Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个4 | ${ }^{+}$ |  | 个4 | ${ }^{7}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 3471 | 1521 |  | 3312 | 1582 |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1369 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 3471 | 1521 |  | 3312 | 1582 |  |  |  | 1649 | 1649 | 1369 |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 1690 | 810 | 0 | 940 | 470 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1000 | 0 | 560 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 1724 | 827 | 0 | 959 | 480 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1020 | 0 | 571 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1724 | 827 | 0 | 959 | 480 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 510 | 510 | 524 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 4\% | 4\% | 0\% | 9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 18\% |
| Turn Type |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |  | Split |  | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 53.7 | 105.0 |  | 53.7 | 105.0 |  |  |  | 42.3 | 42.3 | 42.3 |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 54.7 | 105.0 |  | 54.7 | 105.0 |  |  |  | 42.3 | 42.3 | 42.3 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.52 | 1.00 |  | 0.52 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 1808 | 1521 |  | 1725 | 1582 |  |  |  | 664 | 664 | 552 |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | c0.50 |  |  | 0.29 |  |  |  |  | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.54 |  |  | 0.30 |  |  |  |  |  | c0.38 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.95 | 0.54 |  | 0.56 | 0.30 |  |  |  | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.95 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 23.9 | 0.0 |  | 17.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 27.1 | 27.1 | 30.3 |
| Progression Factor |  | 0.75 | 1.00 |  | 0.79 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 8.8 | 0.9 |  | 1.2 | 0.5 |  |  |  | 5.3 | 5.3 | 26.3 |
| Delay (s) |  | 26.8 | 0.9 |  | 14.6 | 0.5 |  |  |  | 32.4 | 32.4 | 56.6 |
| Level of Service |  | C | A |  | B | A |  |  |  | C | C | E |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 18.4 |  |  | 9.9 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 41.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | D |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 22.7 |  | HCM Lev | el of Sersir | rvice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of los | st time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 81.1\% |  | ICU Leve | ef Ser | vice |  | D |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个4 | F |  | 革 | F | \％${ }^{*}$ |  | 「 |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Frpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |  |  |  |
| Flpb，ped／bikes |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 |  | 0.85 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） |  | 3505 | 1615 |  | 3574 | 1599 | 3072 |  | 1571 |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） |  | 3505 | 1615 |  | 3574 | 1599 | 3072 |  | 1571 |  |  |  |
| Volume（vph） | 0 | 1640 | 1050 | 0 | 980 | 1160 | 410 | 0 | 420 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 0 | 1673 | 1071 | 0 | 1000 | 1184 | 418 | 0 | 429 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 1673 | 1071 | 0 | 1000 | 1184 | 418 | 0 | 413 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  | 7 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 0\％ | 3\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 1\％ | 1\％ | 14\％ | 0\％ | 1\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ |
| Turn Type |  |  | Free |  |  | Free | Prot |  | ustom |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green，G（s） |  | 65.2 | 105.0 |  | 65.2 | 105.0 | 30.8 |  | 30.8 |  |  |  |
| Effective Green，g（s） |  | 66.2 | 105.0 |  | 66.2 | 105.0 | 30.8 |  | 30.8 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.63 | 1.00 |  | 0.63 | 1.00 | 0.29 |  | 0.29 |  |  |  |
| Clearance Time（s） |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension（s） |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） |  | 2210 | 1615 |  | 2253 | 1599 | 901 |  | 461 |  |  |  |
| v／s Ratio Prot |  | 0.48 |  |  | 0.28 |  | 0.14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.66 |  |  | c0．74 |  |  | c0．26 |  |  |  |
| v／c Ratio |  | 0.76 | 0.66 |  | 0.44 | 0.74 | 0.46 |  | 0.90 |  |  |  |
| Uniform Delay，d1 |  | 13.7 | 0.0 |  | 10.0 | 0.0 | 30.3 |  | 35.6 |  |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 0.58 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay，d2 |  | 1.3 | 0.7 |  | 0.6 | 3.1 | 0.4 |  | 19.5 |  |  |  |
| Delay（s） |  | 9.2 | 0.7 |  | 10.6 | 3.1 | 30.7 |  | 55.0 |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  | A | A |  | B | A | C |  | E |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 5.9 |  |  | 6.5 |  |  | 43.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | D |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 11.6 |  | HCM Le | vel of S | rvice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.79 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 105.0 |  | Sum of | ost time |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 78．0\％ |  | ICU Lev | of Ser | vice |  | D |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


c Critical Lane Group

|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1885 | 1615 |  | 1382 | 1468 | 1805 | 1780 |  | 1703 | 1756 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.70 | 1.00 | 0.52 | 1.00 |  | 0.16 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1801 | 1615 |  | 1016 | 1468 | 993 | 1780 |  | 295 | 1756 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 10 | 50 | 10 | 90 | 10 | 530 | 10 | 410 | 120 | 600 | 390 | 10 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 10 | 51 | 10 | 92 | 10 | 541 | 10 | 418 | 122 | 612 | 398 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 61 | 1 | 0 | 102 | 463 | 10 | 530 | 0 | 612 | 407 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 35\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 6\% | 8\% | 0\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  | pm+ov | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 | , | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  | 8 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 10.8 | 10.8 |  | 10.8 | 37.2 | 29.8 | 28.7 |  | 59.1 | 54.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 10.8 | 10.8 |  | 10.8 | 37.2 | 29.8 | 28.7 |  | 59.1 | 54.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.14 | 0.14 |  | 0.14 | 0.48 | 0.38 | 0.37 |  | 0.76 | 0.69 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 250 | 224 |  | 141 | 776 | 391 | 656 |  | 701 | 1217 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  | c0.20 | 0.00 | 0.30 |  | c0.30 | 0.23 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  | 0.03 | 0.00 |  | c0.10 | 0.11 | 0.01 |  |  | c0.37 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.24 | 0.01 |  | 0.72 | 0.60 | 0.03 | 0.81 |  | 0.87 | 0.33 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 29.9 | 28.9 |  | 32.1 | 14.9 | 15.0 | 22.1 |  | 16.7 | 4.8 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 0.5 | 0.0 |  | 16.7 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 10.3 |  | 11.6 | 0.7 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 30.4 | 28.9 |  | 48.8 | 16.1 | 15.0 | 32.4 |  | 28.3 | 5.5 |  |
| Level of Service |  | C | C |  | D | B | B | C |  | C | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 30.2 |  |  | 21.3 |  |  | 32.1 |  |  | 19.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 23.2 |  | HCM Le | vel of S | rvice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 77.9 |  | Sum of | ost time |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 84.3\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  | ${ }_{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |  | 0.95 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.99 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1792 |  | 1770 | 1454 |  |  | 1704 |  |  | 1738 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.95 |  | 0.70 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.76 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1711 |  | 1311 | 1454 |  |  | 1670 |  |  | 1350 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 10 | 40 | 30 | 400 | 10 | 330 | 10 | 150 | 100 | 270 | 350 | 10 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 10 | 41 | 31 | 408 | 10 | 337 | 10 | 153 | 102 | 276 | 357 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 61 | 0 | 408 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 642 | 0 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0\% | 12\% | 0\% | 6\% | 3\% | 12\% | 3\% | 0\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 15.4 |  | 15.4 | 15.4 |  |  | 26.5 |  |  | 26.5 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 15.4 |  | 15.4 | 15.4 |  |  | 26.5 |  |  | 26.5 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.31 |  | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |  | 0.53 |  |  | 0.53 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 528 |  | 405 | 449 |  |  | 887 |  |  | 717 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  | 0.04 |  | c0.31 |  |  |  | 0.13 |  |  | c0.48 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.11 |  | 1.01 | 0.25 |  |  | 0.25 |  |  | 0.90 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 12.4 |  | 17.2 | 12.9 |  |  | 6.3 |  |  | 10.5 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 0.1 |  | 46.6 | 0.3 |  |  | 0.1 |  |  | 13.7 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 12.5 |  | 63.8 | 13.2 |  |  | 6.5 |  |  | 24.2 |  |
| Level of Service |  | B |  | E | B |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 12.5 |  |  | 40.6 |  |  | 6.5 |  |  | 24.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 28.0 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | rvice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 49.9 |  | Sum of los | ost time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 87.3\% |  | ICU Leve | of Se | vice |  | E |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | \% |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.94 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1768 |  | 1770 | 1757 |  | 1770 | 1853 |  | 1770 | 1783 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 0.30 | 1.00 |  | 0.13 | 1.00 |  | 0.58 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 580 | 1768 |  | 551 | 1757 |  | 237 | 1853 |  | 1089 | 1783 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 130 | 290 | 150 | 10 | 180 | 110 | 120 | 270 | 10 | 30 | 400 | 160 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 133 | 296 | 153 | 10 | 184 | 112 | 122 | 276 | 10 | 31 | 408 | 163 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 133 | 427 | 0 | 10 | 269 | 0 | 122 | 285 | 0 | 31 | 558 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 30.0 | 25.0 |  | 21.1 | 20.1 |  | 38.7 | 32.3 |  | 29.9 | 27.5 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 30.0 | 25.0 |  | 21.1 | 20.1 |  | 38.7 | 32.3 |  | 29.9 | 27.5 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.39 | 0.33 |  | 0.28 | 0.26 |  | 0.50 | 0.42 |  | 0.39 | 0.36 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 318 | 576 |  | 167 | 460 |  | 263 | 780 |  | 446 | 639 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.03 | c0.24 |  | 0.00 | 0.15 |  | c0.04 | 0.15 |  | 0.00 | c0.31 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.13 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.19 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.42 | 0.74 |  | 0.06 | 0.58 |  | 0.46 | 0.37 |  | 0.07 | 0.87 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 16.3 | 23.0 |  | 20.7 | 24.7 |  | 14.1 | 15.2 |  | 14.5 | 23.0 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.9 | 5.1 |  | 0.2 | 1.9 |  | 1.3 | 0.3 |  | 0.1 | 15.3 |  |
| Delay (s) | 17.2 | 28.1 |  | 20.9 | 26.6 |  | 15.4 | 15.5 |  | 14.6 | 38.3 |  |
| Level of Service | B | C |  | C | C |  | B | B |  | B | D |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 25.6 |  |  | 26.4 |  |  | 15.4 |  |  | 37.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | D |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 27.2 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | ervice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 76.7 |  | Sum of lo | ost time | (s) |  | 16.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 78.5\% |  | CU Leve | of Se | rvice |  | D |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | * | $\hat{}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 个 |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.87 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1834 |  | 1770 | 1828 |  | 1770 | 1616 |  | 1770 | 1817 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.39 | 1.00 |  | 0.10 | 1.00 |  | 0.72 | 1.00 |  | 0.34 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 731 | 1834 |  | 192 | 1828 |  | 1336 | 1616 |  | 642 | 1817 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 20 | 690 | 80 | 210 | 420 | 60 | 180 | 40 | 300 | 60 | 50 | 10 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 20 | 704 | 82 | 214 | 429 | 61 | 184 | 41 | 306 | 61 | 51 | 10 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 20 | 781 | 0 | 214 | 484 | 0 | 184 | 160 | 0 | 61 | 54 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt |  |  | pm+pt |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 40.5 | 39.1 |  | 45.9 | 41.8 |  | 24.4 | 24.4 |  | 24.4 | 24.4 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 40.5 | 39.1 |  | 45.9 | 41.8 |  | 24.4 | 24.4 |  | 24.4 | 24.4 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.51 | 0.49 |  | 0.58 | 0.53 |  | 0.31 | 0.31 |  | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 390 | 901 |  | 192 | 960 |  | 410 | 495 |  | 197 | 557 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.00 | 0.43 |  | c0.06 | 0.26 |  |  | 0.10 |  |  | 0.03 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.03 |  |  | c0.59 |  |  | c0.14 |  |  | 0.09 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.05 | 0.87 |  | 1.11 | 0.50 |  | 0.45 | 0.32 |  | 0.31 | 0.10 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 10.1 | 17.9 |  | 15.9 | 12.2 |  | 22.2 | 21.2 |  | 21.1 | 19.7 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.1 | 8.8 |  | 99.0 | 0.4 |  | 3.5 | 1.7 |  | 0.9 | 0.1 |  |
| Delay (s) | 10.1 | 26.7 |  | 114.9 | 12.6 |  | 25.7 | 23.0 |  | 22.0 | 19.8 |  |
| Level of Service | B | C |  | F | B |  | C | C |  | C | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 26.3 |  |  | 43.7 |  |  | 23.9 |  |  | 20.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 31.1 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | rvice |  | C |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 79.6 |  | Sum of lo | st time |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 90.1\% |  | ICU Leve | of Se | vice |  | E |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## DKS Associates

## Intersection Turn Movement Counts

Total Vehicle Summary

Out 76
In 12

5-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| Interval Start | Northbound <br> SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Southbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:05 AM | 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:10 AM | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 34 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:20 AM | 0 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 28 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:25 AM | 0 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 23 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 34 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:35 AM | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 32 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:40 AM | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 31 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 27 | 0 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 27 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:50 AM | 1 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 36 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 29 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:55 AM | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 27 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 21 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 32 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 22 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:05 AM | 0 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 24 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:10 AM | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 32 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 18 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 25 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:20 AM | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:25 AM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:35 AM | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:40 AM | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 26 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:50 AM | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:55 AM | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 4 | 208 | 94 | 0 | 600 | 253 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 4 | 0 | 68 | 119 | 391 | 0 | 1,779 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \end{gathered}$ | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 21 | 8 | 0 | 55 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 56 | 0 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 34 | 16 | 0 | 85 | 28 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 18 | 45 | 0 | 238 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 26 | 18 | 0 | 97 | 40 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 48 | 0 | 260 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 1 | 47 | 12 | 0 | 85 | 57 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 17 | 77 | 0 | 315 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 27 | 14 | 0 | 88 | 29 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 14 | 56 | 0 | 246 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 22 | 7 | 0 | 70 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 34 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 1 | 14 | 11 | 0 | 62 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 37 | 0 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 1 | 17 | 8 | 0 | 58 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 38 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 4 | 208 | 94 | 0 | 600 | 253 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 4 | 0 | 68 | 119 | 391 | 0 | 1,779 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Peak Hour Summary
7:15 AM to 8:15 AM

| By <br> Approach | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes |  |
| Volume | 195 | 199 | 394 | 0 | 517 | 361 | 878 | 0 | 12 | 76 | 88 | 0 | 335 | 423 | 758 | 0 | 1,059 |
| \%HV | 34.4\% |  |  |  | 18.4\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 12.5\% |  |  |  | 19.3\% |
| PHF | 0.81 |  |  |  | 0.89 |  |  |  | 0.60 |  |  |  | 0.73 |  |  |  | 0.82 |
| By <br> Movement | Northbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Southbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Total |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |
| Volume | 1 | 134 | 60 | 195 | 355 | 154 | 8 | 517 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 12 | 42 | 67 | 226 | 335 | 1,059 |
| \%HV | 0.0\% | 41.8\% | 18.3\% | 34.4\% | 18.6\% | 18.8\% | 0.0\% | 18.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 1.5\% | 15.0\% | 12.5\% | 19.3\% |
| PHF | 0.25 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.81 | 0.91 | 0.68 | 0.33 | 0.89 | 0.25 | 0.67 | 0.75 | 0.60 | 0.70 | 0.84 | 0.68 | 0.73 | 0.82 |



## Rolling Hour Summary

7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| Interval Start | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Interval } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 2 | 128 | 54 | 0 | 322 | 147 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 35 | 65 | 226 | 0 | 996 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 1 | 134 | 60 | 0 | 355 | 154 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 42 | 67 | 226 | 0 | 1,059 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 1 | 122 | 51 | 0 | 340 | 154 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 8 |  | 0 | 41 | 59 | 215 | 0 | 1,003 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 2 | 110 | 44 | 0 | 305 | 131 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 40 | 58 | 204 | 0 | 912 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 2 | 80 | 40 | 0 | 278 | 106 | 4 | , |  | 17 |  | 0 | 33 | 54 | 165 | 0 | 783 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

SW Grahams Ferry Rd \& SW Tonquin Rd
Thursday, June 15, 2006
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

5-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| Interval Start Time | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:05 AM | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:10 AM | 19 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:20 AM | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:25 AM | 21 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:35 AM | 22 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:40 AM | 22 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 29 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:50 AM | 25 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:55 AM | 19 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 21 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:05 AM | 16 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:10 AM | 13 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 24 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:20 AM | 17 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:25 AM | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 14 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:35 AM | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:40 AM | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:50 AM | 13 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:55 AM | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 391 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 42 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 647 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,541 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| Interval <br> Start <br> Time | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | EastboundSW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | WestboundSW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 46 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 46 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 52 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 73 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 6 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 272 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 50 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 53 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 34 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 37 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 391 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 42 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 647 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,541 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Peak Hour Summary
7:20 AM to 8:20 AM

| By <br> Movement | Northbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Southbound <br> SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |
| Volume | 238 | 112 | 0 | 350 | 0 | 124 | 17 | 141 | 46 | 0 | 365 | 411 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 902 |
| \%HV | 35.3\% | 10.7\% | 0.0\% | 27.4\% | 0.0\% | 8.1\% | 29.4\% | 10.6\% | 10.9\% | 0.0\% | 19.5\% | 18.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 20.7\% |
| PHF | 0.78 | 0.72 | 0.00 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.84 | 0.61 | 0.84 | 0.68 | 0.00 | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.83 |



Rolling Hour Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| Interval Start Time | Northbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Southbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 217 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 19 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 360 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 848 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 221 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 17 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 366 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 895 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 228 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 18 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 356 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 883 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 210 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 21 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 321 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 807 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 174 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 23 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 693 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |



I-5 NB Ramp \& SW Elligsen Rd
Thursday, June 15, 2006
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Peak Hour Summary } \\
& \text { 7:30 AM to 8:30 AM } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

5-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \end{gathered}$ | Northbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | EastboundSW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 22 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 23 | 0 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:05 AM | 29 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 27 | 0 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:10 AM | 17 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 35 | 0 | 136 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 32 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 30 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:20 AM | 19 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 31 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:25 AM | 17 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 24 | 0 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 24 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 38 | 0 | 188 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:35 AM | 35 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 42 | 0 | 208 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:40 AM | 35 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 37 | 0 | 220 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 32 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 30 | 0 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 7:50 AM | 41 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 31 | 0 | 224 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:55 AM | 35 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 31 | 0 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 32 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 29 | 0 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:05 AM | 39 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 24 | 0 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:10 AM | 33 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 28 | 0 | 220 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 27 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 23 | 0 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:20 AM | 34 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 21 | 0 | 175 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:25 AM | 32 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 25 | 0 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 21 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 25 | 0 | 173 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:35 AM | 17 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 38 | 0 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:40 AM | 20 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 37 | 0 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 21 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 32 | 0 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:50 AM | 20 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 35 | 0 | 181 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:55 AM | 20 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 35 | 0 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 654 | 0 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 519 | 731 | 0 | 4,419 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| Interval Start Time | Northbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Eastbound } \\ \text { SW Elligsen Rd } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | WestboundSW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 68 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 85 | 0 | 454 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 68 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 220 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 85 | 0 | 454 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 94 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 288 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 117 | 0 | 616 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 108 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 324 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 92 | 0 | 663 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 8:00 AM | 104 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 297 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 81 | 0 | 643 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:15 AM | 93 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 282 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 69 | 0 | 565 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 58 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 100 | 0 | 520 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 61 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 246 | 0 | 0 |  | 51 | 102 | 0 | 504 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 654 | 0 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 519 | 731 | 0 | 4,419 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |

Peak Hour Summary
7:30 AM to 8:30 AM

| By <br> Approach | Northbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | EastboundSW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| Volume | 656 | 0 | 656 | 0 | 0 | 359 | 359 | 0 | 1,191 | 680 | 1,871 | 0 | 640 | 1,448 | 2,088 | 0 | 2,487 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| \%HV | 5.9\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 5.8\% |  |  |  | 9.4\% |  |  |  | 6.8\% |  |  |  |  |
| PHF | 0.85 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  | 0.91 |  |  |  | 0.86 |  |  |  | 0.94 |  |  |  |  |
| By <br> Movement | Northbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 399 | 0 | 257 | 656 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,191 | 0 | 1,191 | 0 | 281 | 359 | 640 | 2,487 |  |  |  |  |
| \%HV | 7.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.3\% | 5.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.8\% | 0.0\% | 5.8\% | 0.0\% | 10.3\% | 8.6\% | 9.4\% | 6.8\% |  |  |  |  |
| PHF | 0.92 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.85 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.91 | 0.00 | 0.91 | 0.00 | 0.82 | 0.77 | 0.86 | 0.94 |  |  |  |  |

## Rolling Hour Summary

7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Northbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | EastboundSW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 338 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,034 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 283 | 379 | 0 | 2,187 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 7:15 AM | 374 | 0 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 279 | 375 | 0 | 2,376 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 7:30 AM | 399 | 0 | 257 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,191 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 281 | 359 | 0 | 2,487 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 7:45 AM | 363 | 0 | 264 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,151 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 271 | 342 | 0 | 2,391 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 8:00 AM | 316 | 0 | 255 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,073 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 352 | 0 | 2,232 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Total Vehicle Summary


5-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| Interval Start Time | Northbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 224 |
| 7:05 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 192 |
| 7:10 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 211 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 217 |
| 7:20 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 210 |
| 7:25 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 217 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 231 |
| 7:35 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 261 |
| 7:40 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 279 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 305 |
| 7:50 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 279 |
| 7:55 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 291 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 255 |
| 8:05 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 233 |
| 8:10 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 234 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 234 |
| 8:20 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 214 |
| 8:25 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 255 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 200 |
| 8:35 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 184 |
| 8:40 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 1 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 190 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 202 |
| 8:50 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 1 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 231 |
| 8:55 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 162 |
| Total Survey | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,583 | 2 | 1,306 | 0 | 0 | 1,261 | 398 | 0 | 0 | 961 | 0 | 0 | 5,511 |


| Pedestrians <br> Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | South | East | West |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Northbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | EastboundSW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 627 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 165 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 644 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 206 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 771 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 0 | 232 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 875 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 204 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 174 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 722 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 227 | 0 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 703 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 1 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 574 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 | 1 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 146 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 595 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,583 | 2 | 1,306 | 0 | 0 | 1,261 | 398 | 0 | 0 | 961 | 0 | 0 | 5,511 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Peak Hour Summary
7:30 AM to 8:30 AM

| By <br> Approach | Northbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes |  |
| Volume | 0 | 212 | 212 | 0 | 1,600 | 0 | 1,600 | 0 | 907 | 1,291 | 2,198 | 0 | 564 | 1,568 | 2,132 | 0 | 3,071 |
| \%HV | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 6.7\% |  |  |  | 15.2\% |  |  |  | 7.6\% |  |  |  | 9.4\% |
| PHF | 0.00 |  |  |  | 0.85 |  |  |  | 0.80 |  |  |  | 0.84 |  |  |  | 0.88 |
| By <br> Movement | Northbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Total |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |
| Volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 873 | 0 | 727 | 1,600 | 0 | 695 | 212 | 907 | 0 | 564 | 0 | 564 | 3,071 |
| \%HV | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 3.6\% | 0.0\% | 10.5\% | 6.7\% | 0.0\% | 14.7\% | 17.0\% | 15.2\% | 0.0\% | 7.6\% | 0.0\% | 7.6\% | 9.4\% |
| PHF | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.88 | 0.00 | 0.78 | 0.85 | 0.00 | 0.78 | 0.73 | 0.80 | 0.00 | 0.84 | 0.00 | 0.84 | 0.88 |



## Rolling Hour Summary

7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Northbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Eastbound } \\ \text { SW Elligsen Rd } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 770 | 0 | 741 | 0 | 0 | 653 | 236 | 0 | 0 | 517 | 0 | 0 | 2,917 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 832 | 0 | 736 | 0 | 0 | 680 | 226 | 0 | 0 | 538 | 0 | 0 | 3,012 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 873 | 0 | 727 | 0 | 0 | 695 | 212 | 0 | 0 | 564 | 0 | 0 | 3,071 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 847 | 1 | 662 | 0 | 0 | 641 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 524 | 0 | 0 | 2,874 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 813 | 2 | 565 | 0 | 0 | 608 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 444 | 0 | 0 | 2,594 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Total Vehicle Summary

SW Boones Ferry Rd \& SW 95th Ave
Thursday, June 15, 2006
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

Out 694
In 340

5-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| Interval Start Time | NorthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Westbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Interval Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  |
| 7:00 AM | 41 | 38 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 11 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 180 |
| 7:05 AM | 50 | 48 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171 |
| 7:10 AM | 48 | 30 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 |
| 7:15 AM | 35 | 49 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 |
| 7:20 AM | 46 | 39 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 175 |
| 7:25 AM | 48 | 45 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 12 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 |
| 7:30 AM | 53 | 39 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 |
| 7:35 AM | 46 | 50 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 |
| 7:40 AM | 48 | 60 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 190 |
| 7:45 AM | 64 | 60 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 11 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 |
| 7:50 AM | 52 | 59 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 199 |
| 7:55 AM | 56 | 74 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 241 |
| 8:00 AM | 48 | 39 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 |
| 8:05 AM | 47 | 34 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 12 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 174 |
| 8:10 AM | 52 | 52 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 |
| 8:15 AM | 53 | 51 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 |
| 8:20 AM | 39 | 33 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| 8:25 AM | 56 | 42 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 179 |
| 8:30 AM | 42 | 28 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| 8:35 AM | 34 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 |
| 8:40 AM | 34 | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |
| 8:45 AM | 41 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 143 |
| 8:50 AM | 39 | 33 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 166 |
| 8:55 AM | 40 | 29 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |
| Total Survey | 1,112 | 1,021 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 1,064 | 142 | 0 | 143 | 19 | 500 | 0 | 38 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 4,159 |


| Crostrians    <br> North South East  West |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| Interval Start Time | Northbound SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Westbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 139 | 116 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 16 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 74 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 514 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 129 | 133 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 23 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 58 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7:30 AM | 147 | 149 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 8 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 68 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 568 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 172 | 193 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 176 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 6 | 76 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 684 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 147 | 125 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 134 | 26 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 56 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 518 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 148 | 126 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 16 | 0 | 26 | 2 | 64 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 524 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 110 | 89 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 16 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 43 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 396 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 120 | 90 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 133 | 18 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 61 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 462 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 1,112 | 1,021 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 1,064 | 142 | 0 | 143 | 19 | 500 | 0 | 38 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 4,159 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Peak Hour Summary
7:20 AM to 8:20 AM

| By <br> Approach | NorthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Westbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes |  |
| Volume | 1,273 | 863 | 2,136 | 0 | 671 | 672 | 1,343 | 0 | 340 | 694 | 1,034 | 0 | 16 | 71 | 87 | 0 | 2,300 |
| \%HV | 8.6\% |  |  |  | 13.1\% |  |  |  | 21.8\% |  |  |  | 18.8\% |  |  |  | 11.9\% |
| PHF | 0.84 |  |  |  | 0.86 |  |  |  | 0.84 |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  | 0.84 |



| By | NorthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Westbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |
| Volume | 613 | 602 | 58 | 1,273 | 0 | 593 | 78 | 671 | 68 | 13 | 259 | 340 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 16 | 2,300 |
| \%HV | 9.6\% | 8.3\% | 0.0\% | 8.6\% | 0.0\% | 13.8\% | 7.7\% | 13.1\% | 13.2\% | 23.1\% | 23.9\% | 21.8\% | 18.2\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% | 18.8\% | 11.9\% |
| PHF | 0.89 | 0.78 | 0.66 | 0.84 | 0.00 | 0.84 | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.71 | 0.46 | 0.85 | 0.84 | 0.39 | 0.75 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.84 |

## Rolling Hour Summary

7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| Interval Start Time | Northbound SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Westbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 587 | 591 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 564 | 66 | 0 | 68 | 13 | 276 | 0 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 2,259 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7:15 AM | 595 | 600 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 586 | 76 | 0 | 61 | 13 | 258 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2,263 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7:30 AM | 614 | 593 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 585 | 69 | 0 | 73 | 12 | 264 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2,294 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 577 | 533 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 543 | 77 | 0 | 74 | 11 | 239 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2,122 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 525 | 430 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 500 | 76 | 0 | 75 | 6 | 224 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Total Vehicle Summary

SW Boones Ferry Rd \& SW Day St
Thursday, June 15, 2006
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

Out 335
In 389


5-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| Interval Start | NorthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 26 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:05 AM | 24 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:10 AM | 15 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 31 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:20 AM | 18 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:25 AM | 20 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 14 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:35 AM | 28 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:40 AM | 36 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 31 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:50 AM | 37 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:55 AM | 34 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 27 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:05 AM | 20 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:10 AM | 24 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 20 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:20 AM | 13 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:25 AM | 23 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:35 AM | 23 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:40 AM | 16 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 21 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:50 AM | 19 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:55 AM | 22 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 559 | 575 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 558 | 23 | 0 | 48 | 1 | 654 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2,426 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| Interval <br> Start <br> Time | NorthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | $\quad$ SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 65 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 267 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 69 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 306 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 78 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 326 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 102 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 405 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 71 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 321 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 56 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 64 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 290 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 56 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 62 | 42 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 559 | 575 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 558 | 23 | 0 | 48 | 1 | 654 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2,426 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Peak Hour Summary
7:15 AM to 8:15 AM

| By <br> Approach | NorthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes |  |
| Volume | 636 | 681 | 1,317 | 0 | 332 | 341 | 673 | 0 | 389 | 335 | 724 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1,358 |
| \%HV | 9.0\% |  |  |  | 5.4\% |  |  |  | 19.3\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 11.0\% |
| PHF | 0.78 |  |  |  | 0.82 |  |  |  | 0.82 |  |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  | 0.84 |
| By <br> Movement | Northbound SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Southbound SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Total |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |
| Volume | 320 | 316 | 0 | 636 | 0 | 317 | 15 | 332 | 25 | 1 | 363 | 389 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1,358 |
| \%HV | 11.6\% | 6.3\% | 0.0\% | 9.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.7\% | 20.0\% | 5.4\% | 16.0\% | 0.0\% | 19.6\% | 19.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 11.0\% |
| PHF | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.80 | 0.47 | 0.82 | 0.78 | 0.25 | 0.81 | 0.82 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.84 |



## Rolling Hour Summary

7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \end{gathered}$ | NorthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 314 | 314 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 282 | 17 | 0 | 22 | 1 | 353 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,304 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 320 | 316 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 317 | 15 | 0 | 25 | 1 | 363 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,358 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 307 | 337 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 300 | 15 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 354 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1,342 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 285 | 321 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 306 | 13 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 336 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1,290 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 245 | 261 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 276 | 6 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 301 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1,122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

SW Grahams Ferry Rd \& SW Clutter Rd
Thursday, June 15, 2006
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM


5-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Interval <br> Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:05 AM | 0 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:10 AM | 0 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:20 AM | 0 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:25 AM | 0 | 15 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:35 AM | 0 | 16 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:40 AM | 0 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:50 AM | 0 | 11 | 15 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:55 AM | 0 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:05 AM | 0 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:10 AM | 0 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 35 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:20 AM | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:25 AM | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:35 AM | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:40 AM | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:50 AM | 0 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:55 AM | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 0 | 190 | 232 | 0 | 237 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 42 | 3 | 104 | 0 | 922 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Northbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Southbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Interval <br> Total | Pedestrians |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 15 | 25 | 0 | 26 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 93 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 29 | 31 | 0 | 31 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 36 | 40 | 0 | 36 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 28 | 45 | 0 | 46 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 28 | 25 | 0 | 23 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 21 | 18 | 0 | 28 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 14 | 30 | 0 | 23 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 24 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 0 | 190 | 232 | 0 | 237 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 42 | 3 | 104 | 0 | 922 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Peak Hour Summary
7:10 AM to 8:10 AM

| By <br> Approach | Northbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes |  |
| Volume | 264 | 79 | 343 | 0 | 197 | 182 | 379 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 86 | 286 | 372 | 0 | 549 |
| \%HV | 10.2\% |  |  |  | 20.3\% |  |  |  | 50.0\% |  |  |  | 38.4\% |  |  |  | 18.4\% |
| PHF | 0.83 |  |  |  | 0.74 |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  | 0.60 |  |  |  | 0.78 |
| By Movement | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Total |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |
| Volume | 0 | 120 | 144 | 264 | 141 | 56 | 0 | 197 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 2 | 62 | 86 | 549 |
| \%HV | 0.0\% | 15.8\% | 5.6\% | 10.2\% | 15.6\% | 32.1\% | 0.0\% | 20.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | \#\#\#\#\# | 50.0\% | 13.6\% | 50.0\% | 46.8\% | 38.4\% | 18.4\% |
| PHF | 0.00 | 0.68 | 0.78 | 0.83 | 0.73 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.74 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.55 | 0.60 | 0.78 |



## Rolling Hour Summary

7:00 AM to 9:00 AM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 108 | 141 | 0 | 139 | 52 | , | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 64 | 0 | 529 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 121 | 141 | 0 | 136 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 2 | 59 | 0 | 541 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 113 | 128 | 0 | 133 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 27 | 1 | 55 | 0 | 518 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 91 | 118 | 0 | 120 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 59 | 0 | 478 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 82 | 91 | 0 | 98 | 59 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 1 | 40 | 0 | 393 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Total Vehicle Summary

SW Boones Ferry Rd \& SW 95th Ave
Thursday, June 15, 2006
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

Out 440
In 745

5-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| Interval Start <br> Time | Northbound <br> SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Westbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Interval Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  |
| 4:00 PM | 28 | 44 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 13 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 66 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 232 |
| 4:05 PM | 29 | 53 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 12 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 244 |
| 4:10 PM | 35 | 45 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 71 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 211 |
| 4:15 PM | 28 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 75 | 21 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 49 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 235 |
| 4:20 PM | 21 | 53 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 55 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 230 |
| 4:25 PM | 19 | 42 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 48 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 45 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 178 |
| 4:30 PM | 30 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 71 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 49 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 223 |
| 4:35 PM | 21 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 60 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 230 |
| 4:40 PM | 28 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 64 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 56 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 217 |
| 4:45 PM | 26 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 247 |
| 4:50 PM | 32 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 |
| 4:55 PM | 36 | 43 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 42 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 228 |
| 5:00 PM | 24 | 51 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 208 |
| 5:05 PM | 22 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 12 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 233 |
| 5:10 PM | 24 | 60 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 243 |
| 5:15 PM | 22 | 55 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 8 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 229 |
| 5:20 PM | 30 | 54 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 68 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 243 |
| 5:25 PM | 24 | 63 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 55 | 11 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 42 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 |
| 5:30 PM | 30 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 209 |
| 5:35 PM | 29 | 39 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 13 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 207 |
| 5:40 PM | 30 | 66 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 17 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 221 |
| 5:45 PM | 38 | 41 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 12 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 211 |
| 5:50 PM | 31 | 47 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 199 |
| 5:55 PM | 48 | 54 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 195 |
| Total Survey | 685 | 1,209 | 27 | 4 | 5 | 1,577 | 244 | 1 | 274 | 18 | 1,139 | 0 | 125 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 5,328 |


| Pedestrians <br> Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | South | East | West |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| Interval Start Time | Northbound SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Westbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 92 | 142 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 196 | 30 | 1 | 34 | 4 | 167 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 687 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 68 | 140 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 205 | 36 | 0 | 25 | 5 | 149 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 643 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 79 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 200 | 28 | 0 | 29 | 6 | 165 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 670 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4:45 PM | 94 | 151 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 252 | 28 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 134 | 0 | 22 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 711 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 70 | 162 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 204 | 24 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 23 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 684 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 76 | 172 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 198 | 33 | 0 | 48 | 1 | 146 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 691 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 89 | 162 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 36 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 127 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 637 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 117 | 142 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 158 | 29 | 0 | 33 | 1 | 101 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 605 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 685 | 1,209 | 27 | 4 | 5 | 1,577 | 244 | 1 | 274 | 18 | 1,139 | 0 | 125 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 5,328 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Peak Hour Summary
4:30 PM to 5:30 PM

| By <br> Approach | Northbound <br> SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Southbound <br> SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Westbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes |  |
| Volume | 952 | 1,528 | 2,480 | 2 | 970 | 767 | 1,737 | 0 | 745 | 440 | 1,185 | 0 | 89 | 21 | 110 | 0 | 2,756 |
| \%HV | 12.0\% |  |  |  | 3.6\% |  |  |  | 6.4\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 7.1\% |
| PHF | 0.95 |  |  |  | 0.87 |  |  |  | 0.90 |  |  |  | 0.77 |  |  |  | 0.96 |
| By <br> Movement | Northbound SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Southbound <br> SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Westbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Total |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |
| Volume | 319 | 623 | 10 | 952 | 3 | 854 | 113 | 970 | 142 | 8 | 595 | 745 | 79 | 8 | 2 | 89 | 2,756 |
| \%HV | 20.4\% | 7.9\% | 0.0\% | 12.0\% | 0.0\% | 3.0\% | 8.0\% | 3.6\% | 4.9\% | 12.5\% | 6.7\% | 6.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 7.1\% |
| PHF | 0.85 | 0.91 | 0.42 | 0.95 | 0.25 | 0.85 | 0.86 | 0.87 | 0.71 | 0.33 | 0.89 | 0.90 | 0.76 | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.77 | 0.96 |



Rolling Hour Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | NorthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | Westbound SW 95th Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Intrval } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 333 | 571 | 9 | 1 | 5 | 853 | 122 | 1 | 112 | 16 | 615 | 0 | 64 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 2,711 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4:15 PM | 311 | 591 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 861 | 116 | 0 | 119 | 12 | 598 | 0 | 74 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 2,708 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4:30 PM | 319 | 623 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 854 | 113 | 0 | 142 | 8 | 595 | 0 | 79 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 2,756 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4:45 PM | 329 | 647 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 818 | 121 | 0 | 153 | 2 | 557 | 0 | 71 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 2,723 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 352 | 638 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 724 | 122 | 0 | 162 | 2 | 524 | 0 | 61 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 2,617 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Total Vehicle Summary

SW Grahams Ferry Rd \& SW Day St
Thursday, June 15, 2006
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

Out 26
In 50


5-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| Interval <br> Start <br> Time | Northbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 19 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:05 PM | 0 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 28 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:10 PM | 0 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 42 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 24 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 26 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:20 PM | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:25 PM | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 29 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 1 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 26 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:35 PM | 0 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 22 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:40 PM | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 27 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 35 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:50 PM | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 23 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:55 PM | 0 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 30 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 27 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 28 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:05 PM | 0 | 18 | 8 | 0 | 20 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:10 PM | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 36 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 23 | 6 | 0 | 31 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 29 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:20 PM | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 25 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 26 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:25 PM | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 31 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:35 PM | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 20 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:40 PM | 0 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 31 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 30 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:50 PM | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:55 PM | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 16 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 1 | 295 | 91 | 0 | 615 | 207 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 98 | 2 | 0 | 74 | 51 | 555 | 0 | 1,999 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Southbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | IntervalTotal | Pedestrians |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 43 | 15 | 0 | 89 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 260 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 26 | 11 | 0 | 67 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 77 | 0 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 1 | 41 | 15 | 0 | 75 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 60 | 0 | 267 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 48 | 8 | 0 | 86 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 57 | 0 | 249 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 40 | 14 | 0 | 83 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 74 | 0 | 251 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 42 | 10 | 0 | 77 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 86 | 0 | 271 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 34 | 8 | 0 | 85 | 25 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 70 | 0 | 252 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 21 | 10 | 0 | 53 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 73 | 0 | 212 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 1 | 295 | 91 | 0 | 615 | 207 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 98 | 2 | 0 | 74 | 51 | 555 | 0 | 1,999 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Peak Hour Summary
4:30 PM to 5:30 PM

| By <br> Approach | Northbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes |  |
| Volume | 219 | 148 | 367 | 0 | 433 | 450 | 883 | 0 | 50 | 26 | 76 | 0 | 336 | 414 | 750 | 0 | 1,038 |
| \%HV | 2.7\% |  |  |  | 6.7\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 11.9\% |  |  |  | 7.2\% |
| PHF | 0.76 |  |  |  | 0.87 |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  | 0.82 |  |  |  | 0.92 |
| By Movement | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Total |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |
| Volume | 1 | 171 | 47 | 219 | 321 | 112 | 0 | 433 | 2 | 46 | 2 | 50 | 34 | 25 | 277 | 336 | 1,038 |
| \%HV | 0.0\% | 3.5\% | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 6.2\% | 8.0\% | 0.0\% | 6.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 35.3\% | 0.0\% | 10.1\% | 11.9\% | 7.2\% |
| PHF | 0.25 | 0.75 | 0.62 | 0.76 | 0.87 | 0.80 | 0.00 | 0.87 | 0.25 | 0.52 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.47 | 0.39 | 0.81 | 0.82 | 0.92 |



Rolling Hour Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 1 | 158 | 49 | 0 | 317 | 94 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 69 | 2 | 0 | 53 | 12 | 252 | 0 | 1,013 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 1 | 155 | 48 | 0 | 311 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 54 | 2 | 0 | 44 | 16 | 268 | 0 | 1,004 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 1 | 171 | 47 | 0 | 321 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 46 | 2 | 0 | 34 | 25 | 277 | 0 | 1,038 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 164 | 40 | 0 | 331 | 107 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 36 | 287 | 0 | 1,023 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 137 | 42 | 0 | 298 | 113 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 39 | 303 | 0 | 986 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Total Vehicle Summary

I-5 SB Ramp \& SW Elligsen Rd
Thursday, June 15, 2006
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM


5-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| Interval Start <br> Time | Northbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | WestboundSW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:05 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 41 | 1 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 1 | 260 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:10 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 211 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 255 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:20 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 240 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:25 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 220 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 234 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:35 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 246 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:40 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 253 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:50 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 276 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:55 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 212 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 223 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:05 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 1 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 251 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:10 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 238 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:20 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 1 | 264 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:25 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 1 | 245 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:35 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 251 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:40 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 223 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 249 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:50 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 1 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:55 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 878 | 2 | 720 | 0 | 0 | 1,782 | 1,089 | 1 | 0 | 1,167 | 0 | 4 | 5,638 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| IntervalStart Time | Northbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | EastboundSW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | WestboundSW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 1 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 239 | 114 | 1 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 1 | 653 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 232 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 715 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 259 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 0 | 0 | 709 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 741 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 1 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 210 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 715 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 2 | 747 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 676 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 136 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 146 | 0 | 1 | 682 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 878 | 2 | 720 | 0 | 0 | 1,782 | 1,089 | 1 | 0 | 1,167 | 0 | 4 | 5,638 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Peak Hour Summary
4:30 PM to 5:30 PM

| By <br> Approach | Northbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes |  |
| Volume | 0 | 606 | 606 | 0 | 805 | 0 | 805 | 0 | 1,551 | 925 | 2,476 | 0 | 556 | 1,381 | 1,937 | 2 | 2,912 |
| \%HV | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 10.3\% |  |  |  | 4.3\% |  |  |  | 8.8\% |  |  |  | 6.8\% |
| PHF | 0.00 |  |  |  | 0.98 |  |  |  | 0.93 |  |  |  | 0.87 |  |  |  | 0.96 |
| By <br> Movement | Northbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Total |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |
| Volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 | 1 | 369 | 805 | 0 | 946 | 605 | 1,551 | 0 | 556 | 0 | 556 | 2,912 |
| \%HV | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 3.7\% | 0.0\% | 18.2\% | 10.3\% | 0.0\% | 4.2\% | 4.3\% | 4.3\% | 0.0\% | 8.8\% | 0.0\% | 8.8\% | 6.8\% |
| PHF | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.91 | 0.25 | 0.93 | 0.98 | 0.00 | 0.88 | 0.84 | 0.93 | 0.00 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 0.87 | 0.96 |



## Rolling Hour Summary

4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Northbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 SB Ramp |  |  |  | EastboundSW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 395 | 1 | 336 | 0 | 0 | 966 | 565 | 1 | 0 | 555 | 0 | 1 | 2,818 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 429 | 1 | 354 | 0 | 0 | 937 | 605 | 0 | 0 | 554 | 0 | 0 | 2,880 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 | 1 | 369 | 0 | 0 | 946 | 605 | 0 | 0 | 556 | 0 | , | 2,912 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 455 | 1 | 369 | 0 | 0 | 873 | 593 | 0 | 0 | 588 | 0 | , | 2,879 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 483 | 1 | 384 | 0 | 0 | 816 | 524 | 0 | 0 | 612 | 0 | 3 | 2,820 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Total Vehicle Summary


5-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| Interval Start Time | Northbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | EastboundSW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | WestboundSW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  |
| 4:00 PM | 32 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 47 | 0 | 203 |
| 4:05 PM | 29 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 57 | 0 | 231 |
| 4:10 PM | 24 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 71 | 0 | 228 |
| 4:15 PM | 15 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 81 | 0 | 244 |
| 4:20 PM | 22 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 52 | 0 | 218 |
| 4:25 PM | 11 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 53 | 0 | 178 |
| 4:30 PM | 9 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 64 | 0 | 248 |
| 4:35 PM | 31 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 72 | 0 | 236 |
| 4:40 PM | 14 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 81 | 0 | 237 |
| 4:45 PM | 23 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 78 | 0 | 257 |
| 4:50 PM | 32 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 78 | 0 | 229 |
| 4:55 PM | 21 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 50 | 0 | 211 |
| 5:00 PM | 21 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 83 | 0 | 251 |
| 5:05 PM | 14 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 96 | 0 | 273 |
| 5:10 PM | 21 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 84 | 0 | 291 |
| 5:15 PM | 23 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 101 | 0 | 288 |
| 5:20 PM | 28 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 100 | 0 | 292 |
| 5:25 PM | 35 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 86 | 0 | 259 |
| 5:30 PM | 16 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 81 | 0 | 227 |
| 5:35 PM | 12 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 78 | 0 | 247 |
| 5:40 PM | 19 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 78 | 0 | 276 |
| 5:45 PM | 22 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 62 | 0 | 216 |
| 5:50 PM | 18 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 63 | 0 | 216 |
| 5:55 PM | 21 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 55 | 0 | 217 |
| Total Survey | 513 | 0 | 554 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,504 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,451 | 1,751 | 0 | 5,773 |


| Pedestrians <br> Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | South | East | West |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 8 | 7 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| Interval Start Time | Northbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Eastbound } \\ \text { SW Elligsen Rd } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 85 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 175 | 0 | 662 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 48 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 186 | 0 | 640 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 54 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 217 | 0 | 721 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 76 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 206 | 0 | 697 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| 5:00 PM | 56 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 210 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 210 | 263 | 0 | 815 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 5:15 PM | 86 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183 | 0 | , | 0 | 195 | 287 | 0 | 839 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 5:30 PM | 47 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 205 | 237 | 0 | 750 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 61 | - | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 180 | 0 | 649 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 513 | 0 | 554 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,504 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,451 | 1,751 | 0 | 5,773 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 7 |

Peak Hour Summary
4:45 PM to 5:45 PM

| $\begin{gathered} \text { By } \\ \text { Approach } \end{gathered}$ | Northbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes |  |
| Volume | 542 | 0 | 542 | 0 | 0 | 993 | 993 | 0 | 794 | 1,037 | 1,831 | 0 | 1,765 | 1,071 | 2,836 | 0 | 3,101 |
| \%HV | 7.7\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 2.8\% |  |  |  | 1.1\% |  |  |  | 2.7\% |
| PHF | 0.78 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  | 0.92 |  |  |  | 0.87 |  |  |  | 0.89 |
| ByMovement | Northbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |
| Volume | 265 | 0 | 277 | 542 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 794 | 0 | 794 | 0 | 772 | 993 | 1,765 | 3,101 |
| \%HV | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.8\% | 0.0\% | 2.8\% | 0.0\% | 1.0\% | 1.1\% | 1.1\% | 2.7\% |
| PHF | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.79 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.92 | 0.00 | 0.92 | 0.00 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.87 | 0.89 |



## Rolling Hour Summary

4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \end{gathered}$ | Northbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | Southbound I-5 NB Ramp |  |  |  | EastboundSW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Elligsen Rd |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Interval } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 263 | 0 | 272 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 722 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 679 | 784 | 0 | 2,720 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 |
| 4:15 PM | 234 | 0 | 268 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 774 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 725 | 872 | 0 | 2,873 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 |
| 4:30 PM | 272 | 0 | 297 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 774 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 756 | 973 | 0 | 3,072 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| 4:45 PM | 265 | 0 | 277 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 794 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 772 | 993 | 0 | 3,101 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| 5:00 PM | 250 | , | 282 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 782 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 772 | 967 | 0 | 3,053 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |

Out 429
In 294

SW Grahams Ferry Rd \& SW Tonquin Rd
Thursday, June 15, 2006
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM


5-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| Interval Start <br> Time | Northbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 17 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:05 PM | 31 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:10 PM | 32 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 33 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:20 PM | 21 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:25 PM | 33 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 27 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:35 PM | 20 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:40 PM | 24 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 28 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:50 PM | 33 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:55 PM | 26 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 23 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:05 PM | 30 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:10 PM | 34 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 31 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:20 PM | 32 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:25 PM | 25 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 25 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:35 PM | 27 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:40 PM | 34 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 27 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:50 PM | 19 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:55 PM | 33 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 665 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 288 | 159 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 476 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,822 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| Interval Start Time | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | EastboundSW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 80 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 15 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 226 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 87 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 17 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 71 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 19 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 87 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 16 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 247 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 87 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 19 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 88 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 24 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 86 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 22 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 79 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 27 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 665 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 288 | 159 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 476 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,822 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Peak Hour Summary
4:45 PM to 5:45 PM

| By <br> Approach | Northbound <br> SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes |  |
| Volume | 444 | 394 | 838 | 0 | 219 | 134 | 353 | 0 | 294 | 429 | 723 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 957 |
| \%HV | 8.1\% |  |  |  | 3.2\% |  |  |  | 7.8\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 6.9\% |
| PHF | 0.87 |  |  |  | 0.76 |  |  |  | 0.92 |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  | 0.93 |
| By <br> Movement | Northbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Southbound <br> SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Total |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |
| Volume | 348 | 96 | 0 | 444 | 0 | 138 | 81 | 219 | 38 | 0 | 256 | 294 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 957 |
| \%HV | 9.8\% | 2.1\% | 0.0\% | 8.1\% | 0.0\% | 2.9\% | 3.7\% | 3.2\% | 2.6\% | 0.0\% | 8.6\% | 7.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 6.9\% |
| PHF | 0.90 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 0.77 | 0.75 | 0.76 | 0.68 | 0.00 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.93 |



Rolling Hour Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| Interval Start Time | Northbound <br> SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Southbound <br> SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Tonquin Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 325 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 67 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 243 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 911 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 332 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 71 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 240 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 922 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 333 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 | 78 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 246 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 946 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 348 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 81 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 256 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 957 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 340 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 92 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 911 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Total Vehicle Summary

SW Boones Ferry Rd \& SW Day St
Thursday, June 15, 2006
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

Out 321
In 397

5-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| Interval Start <br> Time | NorthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 24 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:05 PM | 26 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:10 PM | 22 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 23 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:20 PM | 32 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:25 PM | 26 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 31 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:35 PM | 23 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 38 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:40 PM | 19 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 23 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:50 PM | 22 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:55 PM | 24 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 39 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:05 PM | 24 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:10 PM | 29 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 20 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:20 PM | 23 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:25 PM | 27 | 57 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 43 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 28 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:35 PM | 30 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:40 PM | 29 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 25 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:50 PM | 21 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:55 PM | 31 | 37 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 621 | 879 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1,021 | 37 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 769 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3,360 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| Interval <br> Start <br> Time | NorthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | $\quad$ SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 72 | 93 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 118 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 81 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 416 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 73 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 127 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 405 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 69 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 464 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 92 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 70 | 160 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 132 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 465 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 87 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 382 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 77 | 100 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 105 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 385 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 621 | 879 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1,021 | 37 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 769 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3,360 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Peak Hour Summary
4:30 PM to 5:30 PM

| By <br> Approach | Northbound <br> SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Southbound <br> SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes |  |
| Volume | 797 | 936 | 1,733 | 1 | 574 | 511 | 1,085 | 0 | 397 | 321 | 718 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1,769 |
| \%HV | 7.2\% |  |  |  | 3.1\% |  |  |  | 5.5\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 5.5\% |
| PHF | 0.87 |  |  |  | 0.78 |  |  |  | 0.95 |  |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  | 0.95 |
| By <br> Movement | Northbound SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Southbound <br> SW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Total |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |
| Volume | 304 | 493 | 0 | 797 | 1 | 556 | 17 | 574 | 17 | 0 | 380 | 397 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1,769 |
| \%HV | 13.2\% | 3.4\% | 0.0\% | 7.2\% | 0.0\% | 2.9\% | 11.8\% | 3.1\% | 11.8\% | 0.0\% | 5.3\% | 5.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.5\% |
| PHF | 0.83 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.87 | 0.25 | 0.79 | 0.71 | 0.78 | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.95 |



Rolling Hour Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \end{gathered}$ | NorthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Boones Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Westbound SW Day St |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 295 | 388 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 557 | 16 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 419 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1,693 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 315 | 420 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 563 | 15 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 388 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1,720 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 304 | 493 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 556 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 380 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1,769 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 318 | 499 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 535 | 19 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 359 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,746 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 326 | 491 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 464 | 21 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 350 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,667 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Total Vehicle Summary


SW Grahams Ferry Rd \& SW Clutter Rd
Thursday, June 15, 2006
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

Clay Carney (503) 833-2740

Out 2
In 2

5-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:05 PM | 0 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:10 PM | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:20 PM | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:25 PM | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:35 PM | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:40 PM | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:50 PM | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:55 PM | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:05 PM | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:10 PM | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:20 PM | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:25 PM | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:35 PM | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:40 PM | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:50 PM | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:55 PM | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 0 | 119 | 63 | 0 | 127 | 193 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 214 | 2 | 247 | 0 | 973 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

15-Minute Interval Summary
4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| Interval <br> Start <br> Time | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 22 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 15 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 16 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 12 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 18 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 1 | 34 | 0 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 17 | 8 | 0 | 18 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 20 | 23 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Survey | 0 | 119 | 63 | 0 | 127 | 193 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 214 | 2 | 247 | 0 | 973 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

Peak Hour Summary
4:25 PM to 5:25 PM

| By <br> Approach | Northbound SW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes | In | Out | Total | Bikes |  |
| Volume | 89 | 216 | 305 | 0 | 163 | 198 | 361 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 256 | 94 | 350 | 0 | 510 |
| \%HV | 4.5\% |  |  |  | 6.1\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 7.4\% |  |  |  | 6.5\% |
| PHF | 0.79 |  |  |  | 0.89 |  |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  | 0.77 |  |  |  | 0.87 |
| By Movement | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Total |
|  | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total | L | T | R | Total |  |
| Volume | 0 | 55 | 34 | 89 | 59 | 103 | 1 | 163 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 112 | 1 | 143 | 256 | 510 |
| \%HV | 0.0\% | 5.5\% | 2.9\% | 4.5\% | 11.9\% | 2.9\% | 0.0\% | 6.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 0.0\% | 11.9\% | 7.4\% | 6.5\% |
| PHF | 0.00 | 0.72 | 0.61 | 0.79 | 0.70 | 0.80 | 0.25 | 0.89 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.85 | 0.25 | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.87 |



## Rolling Hour Summary

4:00 PM to 6:00 PM

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Interval } \\ \text { Start } \\ \text { Time } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | NorthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | SouthboundSW Grahams Ferry Rd |  |  |  | Eastbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Westbound SW Clutter Rd |  |  |  | Interval Total | Pedestrians Crosswalk |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes | L | T | R | Bikes |  | North | South | East | West |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 62 | 29 | 0 | 59 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 471 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 53 | 32 | 0 | 60 | 102 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 108 | 0 | 135 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 53 | 34 | 0 | 63 | 95 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 111 | 1 | 146 | 0 | 507 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 60 | 37 | 0 | 64 | 99 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 112 | 1 | 133 | 0 | 510 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 57 | 34 | 0 | 68 | 97 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 120 | 2 | 116 | 0 | 502 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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## Introduction

This memorandum identifies preliminary fiscal benefits and costs associated with the planned development in the Coffee Creek Industrial Area for two conceptual land use and transportation alternatives. This memorandum covers the following items:

- Determination of the revenues, potential assessed value, and tax revenues generated from new development;
- Determination of the costs to serve the area;
- Anticipated capital costs of providing new urban public facilities, such as roads, sewer, water, and storm water treatment facilities;
- Identification of potential funding sources.


## Memorandum Contents

The body of this memorandum contains the following sections:
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Funding Strategies.......................................................page 22
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## Development Assumptions

There are two land use/transportation alternatives being evaluated for the Coffee Creek Industrial Area. Both of the alternatives emerged after significant discussion with the project Technical Advisory Committee, and take into account public input received at the initial public open house event.

Alternative 1 "Industrial" follows the precise land use functional plan designations identified by Metro, which includes Regionally Significant Industrial Area (RSIA) designation south of Day Road, and "industrial" designation north of Day Road. Please refer to Figure 1.

Alternative 2 "Industrial/Mixed Employment" also follows Metro's plan designation south of Day Road, but varies from Metro's "industrial" designation for a portion of the planning area north of Day Road. This alternative assumes there to be a combination of industrial and commercial/mixed use development north of Day Road, in the northeastern portion of the study area located between Basalt Creek and Lower Boones Ferry Road. This area has a significant amount of topographic grade change, and there are several rural residential dwellings located within the plan area, and immediately north. The creek basin also provides a natural buffer between planned industrial areas to the west.

Providing housing in close proximity to industrial areas is included in Alternative 2 north of Day Road given the topographic constraints, natural creek buffers, and compatibility of rural housing areas. In this alternative, it is assumed that new "work force" housing would provide rental and homeownership opportunities, at mid-market and affordable price ranges. The location for housing in this area would be potentially beneficial for residents that want to walk or bicycle to work and the shopping opportunities within one-half mile from this site.

Table 1A
Wilsonville Coffee Creek Industrial Plan
Gross Buildable Land Area and Employment/Housing Assumptions*

|  | Industrial <br> Land Area <br> (acres) | Comm. <br> Service <br> Area <br> (acres) | Housing <br> (acres) | Total <br> (acres) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Socation of Day Road | 154.2 | 9.6 | -- | $\mathbf{1 6 3 . 8}$ |
| Alt.1 \& Alt. 2 |  |  |  |  |
| North of Day Road | 43.5 | 2.7 | -- | $\mathbf{4 6 . 2}$ |
| Alt.1 Industrial | 20.0 | 9.0 | 23.2 | $\mathbf{2 9 . 1}$ |
| Alt. 2. Industrial/Mixed Use | 20.0 |  |  |  |

* Gross buildable acres are net of development constraints, such as slopes over 15\% and Title 3 floodways, wetlands, and locally designated Significant Resource Overlay Zones.
Source: Otak, Inc.

March 28, 2007

Table 1B
Wilsonville Coffee Creek Industrial Plan
Employment and Households, 20-Year Forecast*

|  | Industrial <br> Jobs | Comm. <br> Service <br> Jobs | Total <br> Jobs | Work force <br> Housing <br> (dwellings) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| South of Day Road <br> Alt.1 \& Alt. 2 | 1,387 | 87 | $\mathbf{1 , 4 7 4}$ | -- |
| North of Day Road |  |  |  |  |
| Alt.1 Industrial | 392 | 24 | 416 | -- |
| Alt. 2. Industrial/Mixed Use | 180 | 81 | $\mathbf{2 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 2}$ |

*These job density assumptions are consistent with Metro Title 1, Summary of 2040 Growth Concept, effective 2/15/06: 9 jobs/acre, and 10 dwellings/acre. Source: Otak, Inc.

Figure 1, Alternative 1


Figure 2, Alternative 2


## Public Facility Requirements

Preliminary public facility requirements have been identified for roads, water lines, sewer lines, storm water systems, parks/trails, and wayside improvements. Tables 2-4 summarize the recommended public facilities in vicinity of the planning area.

## Transportation Improvements

Traffic analysis was conducted by DKS Associates to ascertain existing and future (year 2030) roadway congestion and service levels at key intersections. Please refer to the DKS Memorandum dated February 12, 2007. Major roadway improvements were identified for the "no build" and "build alternatives."

The list of roadway improvements required to address anticipated growth in and around Wilsonville is extensive, even without annexing Coffee Creek and allowing urban development to occur in that location. Table 2 provides a list of required improvements that are necessary to provide an adequate transportation network with favorable service levels. Please refer to Appendix A for a summary of unit costs used for this analysis.

The total cost of constructing the roadway improvements identified in Table 2 is estimated at $\$ 19.7$ million in year 2007 dollar amounts. The recommended short-term (years 1-5) improvements include the Kinsman Road extension between Ridder Road and Day Road (project C-24) at a cost of approximately $\$ 6.0$ million, and a new traffic signal at the Kinsman/Day Road intersection (project S-36) at an estimated cost of $\$ 280,000$.

Most other improvements reflected on Table 2 are considered to be long-term (beyond year 5) and may need to be added in the City and County TSPs prior to dedicating local or non-local funding for construction.

In addition to the roadway projects listed in Table 2, other improvements would be needed if the Coffee Creek Industrial Area is developed. A list of potential improvement projects that would be required with development limited to the area south of Day Road as per Alternative 1 (master plan area) is included in Table 3. Recommended public facilities for the area north of Day Road (concept plan area) are included in Table 4.

Please refer to Appendix B for a map of existing and planned street improvements.

Table 2 Summary of Transportation Improvements Assumed with No Build Scenario

| ID \# | Project Name | Prelim. Cost Estimate (millions)* | Priority | Required Amendments | Potential Funding Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transportation Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| C-24 | Kinsman Road (Day Road to Ridder Road) | \$6.00 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Years } \\ 1-5+ \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TSP amendment required for Green Street or for 3 lane section | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| C7 | Kinsman Road (Ridder to Boeckman Road) | \$3.60 | Years <br> 6+ | no | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| S-36 | Day Road/Kinsman Road Signal | \$0.28 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Years } \\ & 1-5+ \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | no | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-1 | Boones Ferry Road/ $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue eastbound right turn lane | \$0.61 | Years 6+ | no | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-2 | Boones Ferry Road/ $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue westbound left turn pocket | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | no | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-3 | Boones Ferry Road/ $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue median | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | no | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-4 | Boones Ferry Road/ $95^{\text {th }}$ Avenue northbound turn lane | \$0.20 | Years <br> 6+ | requires City TSP amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| S-18 | Ridder Road/Kinsman Road left turn pockets and signal | \$0.58 | Years <br> 6+ | no | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-5 | Clutter Road/Grahams Ferry Road westbound left turn lane | \$0.85 | Years 6+ | Consistent with County TSP, but requires City TSP amend. | County SDCs, Developers |
| T-6 | Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road southbound turn lane | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | Same as T-5 | County SDCs, Developers |
| T-7 | Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road signal | \$0.28 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Years } \\ 6+ \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Same as T-5 | County SDCs, Developers |
| T-8 | Grahams Ferry Road Railroad Crossing | \$4.00 | Years 6+ | requires City TSP amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, ODOT, Metro, TriMet |
| T-9 | Boones Ferry Road widen four-lane section north of Day Road | \$2.49 | Years 6+ | requires City \& County TSP amendments | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-10 | Tonquin/SW Grahams Ferry Road westbound turn lane | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | in County TSP | County SDCs, Developers |
| T-11 | Tonquin/SW Grahams Ferry Road northbound turn lane | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | in County TSP | County SDCs, Developers |
| T-12 | Tonquin/SW Grahams Ferry Road signal | \$0.28 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Years } \\ 6+ \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | in County TSP | County SDCs, Developers |
| Cost Summary |  |  Years <br> Total $1-5$ |  | Years 6+ |  |
| Roads |  | \$16.67 | \$6.28 | \$10.39 |  |
| Rail Crossing Total |  | \$4.00 | 0 | \$4.00 |  |
|  |  | \$20.67 | \$6.28 | \$14.39 |  |

Notes: * costs are in 2007 dollars and reflect "ordinary" design, construction, and right-of-way. Special allowances for environmental mitigation, unstable soils, etc. not included. Compiled by Otak, Inc. and DKS Associates.

Table 3 Summary of Public Improvements
Coffee Creek Master Plan, South of Day Road, Alternative 1
This list identifies projects needed beyond those identified in the 2030 "No Build" Alternative.

| ID \# | Project Name | Prelim. Cost Estimate (millions)* | Priority | Required Amendment | Potential Funding Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transportation Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-13A | Day Road/Kinsman left turn pocket | \$0.30 | Years 1-5 | requires City TSP amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-14 | Kinsman/Day northbound right turn lane | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | requires City TSP amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-15A | Grahams Ferry Road (RR-xing to Day Road) | \$4.20 | Years 6+ | in County TSP, but requires City TSP amend. | SDCs,Developers |
| T-15B | Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road duel southbound left turn lanes | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | Same as T- $15 \mathrm{~A}$ | SDCs,Developers |
| T-16 | Clutter Road Reconstruction | \$2.10 | Years 6+ | requires City TSP amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-17 | Boones Ferry Road 5-lane section between Day Road and I-5 | \$2.25 | Years 6+ | requires City TSP amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| P-1 | Commerce Circle Trail Connection | \$0.27 | Years 6+ | requires City TSP amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| Sanitary Sewer Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| SS-1 | Kinsman Road - Sewer Main | \$0.68 | Years 1-5 | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| SS-2 | Grahams Ferry -Sewer Main | \$0.10 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| SS-3 | Garden Acres Sewer Main | \$0.20 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| SS-4 | Clutter Road Sewer Main | \$0.28 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| SS-5 | Ridder Road Sewer Main | \$0.27 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |

Table 3 continued - Summary of Public Improvements

## Coffee Creek Master Plan, South of Day Road, Alternative 1

This list identifies projects needed beyond those identified in the 2030 "No Build" Alternative.

| ID \# | Project Name | Prelim. Capital Cost Estimate (millions)* | Priority | Required Amendments | Potential Funding Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water Line Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| W-1 | Kinsman Road - Water Main | \$0.42 | Years 1-5 | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| W-2 | Grahams Ferry -Water Main | \$0.45 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| W-3 | Clutter Road Sewer Main | \$0.27 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| Storm Water Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| SW-1 | Construct Kinsman Road and Grahams Ferry Road as "Greenstreets" with bioswales | cost included w/proj. | on going | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| SW-2 | Regional Detention/Treatment Pond | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Developers |
| Wayside Projects/Parks |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Construct 3 new waysides | \$0.30 | Years 6+ |  | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |

Notes:

* Costs are in 2007 dollars and reflect "ordinary" design, construction, and right-of-way. Special allowances for environmental mitigation, unstable soils, etc. not included. Compiled by Otak, Inc. and DKS Associates.

Table 3 Cost Summary (site-related improvements)

|  | Total | Years 1-5 | Years 6+ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roads | $\$ 7.20$ | $\$ 0.30$ | $\$ 6.90$ |
| Pedestrian/Bicycle Pathways | $\$ 2.25$ | 0 | $\$ 2.25$ |
| Sewer | $\$ 1.53$ | $\$ 0.68$ | $\$ 0.85$ |
| Water | $\$ 1.14$ | $\$ 0.42$ | $\$ 0.72$ |
| Storm water | $\$ 0.30$ | 0 | $\$ 0.30$ |
| Waysides | $\$ 0.30$ | 0 | $\$ 0.30$ |
| Total | $\$ 12.72$ | $\$ 1.40$ | $\$ 11.32$ |

March 28, 2007

Table 4 Summary of Public Improvements
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, North of Day Road, Alternatives 1 \& 2
This list identifies projects needed beyond those identified in the 2030 "No Build" Alternative and South of Day Improvements

| ID \# | Project Name | Prelim. <br> Capital Cost Estimate (millions)* | Priority | Required Amendments | Potential Funding Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transportation Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-13B | Day Road/Kinsman left turn pocket | \$0.30 | Years $6+$ | in City TSP | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-19 | Boones Ferry Road / Day Road duel eastbound turn lanes | \$0.60 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Years } \\ 6+ \end{gathered}$ | requires City TSP amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-20 | Grahams Ferry Road (north of Day Road) | \$1.05 | Years <br> 6+ | in County TSP, requires City TSP amendment | County SDCs, Developers |
| P-2 | Basalt Creek Parallel Trail | \$0.09 | Years <br> 6+ | parks plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| Sanitary Sewer Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| SS-6 | Day Road - Sewer Main | \$0.28 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Years } \\ 6+ \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| SS-7 | Boones Ferry Road Sewer Main | \$0.27 | Years <br> 6+ | requires City <br> Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| SS-8 | North of Kinsman Sewer Main | \$0.20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Years } \\ 6+ \end{gathered}$ | requires City <br> Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| Water Line Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| W-4 | Grahams Ferry -Water Main | \$0.27 | Years 6+ | requires City <br> Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| W-5 | Boones Ferry Road Sewer Main | \$0.18 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| Storm Water Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| SW-3 | Basalt Creek Buffer Restoration \& Drainage Improvements | \$0.15 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Developers |
| Wayside Projects/Parks |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Construct 1 new wayside | \$0.10 | Years 6+ |  | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |

## Notes:

* Costs are in 2007 dollars and reflect "ordinary" design, construction, and right-of-way. Special allowances for environmental mitigation, unstable soils, etc. not included. Compiled by Otak, Inc. and DKS Associates.

Table 4 Cost Summary (site related improvements)

|  | Total | Years <br> $\mathbf{1 - 5}$ | Years 6+ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roads | $\$ 1.95$ | 0.0 | $\$ 1.95$ |
| Pedestrian/Bicycle Pathways | $\$ 0.09$ | 0.0 | $\$ 0.09$ |
| Sewer | $\$ 0.75$ | 0.0 | $\$ 0.75$ |
| Water | $\$ 0.45$ | 0.0 | $\$ 0.45$ |
| Storm water | $\$ 0.15$ | 0.0 | $\$ 0.15$ |
| Waysides | $\$ 0.10$ | 0.0 | $\$ 0.10$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 3 . 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | $\$ \mathbf{3 . 4 9}$ |

## Sanitary Sewer System

The Coffee Creek Urban Planning Area is located in the United Disposal Interceptor basin subarea. The majority of the Coffee Creek Urban Planning Area was included as Urban Planning Area 4 (UPA-4) in the sewer master plan. This area was assumed to include the Coffee Creek Correctional Institution (on 113-acres) and 313-acres of future industrial land. Future unit flow assumptions for industrial uses were forecasted to be 2,000 gallons/day/acre. After considering factors for average daily flows, the industrial portion of UPA-4 is assumed to generate 626,000 gallons per day (gpd) of sewer flow at build-out.

It should also be noted that the assumptions included in the Preliminary Urban Reserve Plan for Coffee Creek Area 42 (prepared in 1998), calculated sewer flows at 3.0 mgd for the prison and industrial sites, that can serve between 12 and 21 persons per acre. The current sewer master plan assumes 0.8 mgd of average flows from this area, which is consistent with the lower end of the range in employment ( 12 jobs/acre). The master plan for Coffee Creek Industrial Area (south of Day Road) estimates potential employment to be 9 jobs/gross buildable acre for each Alternative. Hence, the sewer capacity assumptions appear to be in line with current sewer master plan assumptions.

The sewer master plan identifies two specific capital improvements that would be required to adequately serve the majority of the Coffee Creek Planning Area. These include:

- United Disposal Parallel Pipe (CIP-UD1 and listed as SS-1 in Appendix C). Includes construction of a 12 -inch line from SMH3503 to SMH0269 to convey peak wastewater flows over a distance of 5,315 feet. The project includes an 8 -foot diameter manhole with a diversion weir. Railcrossing will require trenchless technology. Alternative alignments should be investigated to minimize impacts to wetland and natural areas. This project should coordinate with Kinsman Road extension where possible. Estimated cost for the Kinsman segment of this pipe is $\$ 680,000$. Additional off-site costs were estimated by the City in 2001 to be approximately $\$ 1,105,704$. After adjusting for cost escalation, the current cost for off-site construction for this project is likely to be approximately $\$ 1.47$ million.
- Garden Acres Road New Trunk Sewer (CIP-UD3 and SS-3 in Appendix C). Includes a new 12inch trunk service extension along Garden Acres Road between Day Road and SW Ridder Road
to serve future development. A portion of this project was constructed a few years ago to accommodate the prison demand. Remaining cost for the Garden Acres extension segment of this pipe is approximately $\$ 200,000$.

Additional sewer line improvements that are recommended for the Planning Area are reflected in the sewer facility maps in Appendix C, and Tables 3 and 4. It is important to note, that all identified projects and cost estimates are made for preliminary planning purposes. Site survey work will need to occur and the City will need to update its sewer system model to determine more accurate on and off-site water system improvements and trunk line size, location and cost.

## Storm water Facilities

The City of Wilsonville, Storm water Master Plan Final Report (2001) addresses the management of stormwater runoff quantity and quality within the City's Urban Growth Boundary and adjoining planning areas. The plan specifically addresses Comprehensive Plan Policy 3.1.7 which requires that, The City of Wilsonville shall develop and maintain an adequate storm drainage system.

The Coffee Creek Planning Area is located within the Coffee Lake Creek Basin. The north tributary to Basalt Creek is located south of Day Road. Basalt Creek drains into Coffee Creek Lake and extends north of Day Road into the City of Tualatin UGB.

The Storm water Maser Plan identifies potential regional detention facilities in the Coffee Creek Planning Area as effective pollution reduction facilities. Planned facilities in the Planning Area include:

- North Wilsonville Planning Area comprehensive storm drainage system. The former Urban Reserve Area 42 (portion of Coffee Creek Planning Area) requires a system of storm drainage improvements in addition to on-site storm water detention and treatment provided by developers. The off-site public facility improvements are estimated to cost $\$ 2.46$ million (2001 dollars).

In addition to requiring each new development within the Coffee Creek Industrial Planning Area to detain and treat any projected run off per existing City Code, it is recommended that the planned Kinsman Road and Grahams Ferry Road improvements be constructed as "green streets." Green streets will require a variance from existing City Street Standards to allow bio-swales and pervious surfaces to be used in lieu of curb and gutter to help convey storm water runoff.

Another recommendation is for the City to conduct a Basalt Creek and Coffee Creek sub-basin analysis to better define existing storm water events and flooding-related issues. Future development within the sub-basin should be modeled to ascertain likely impacts of urban development, and to identify impacts of beneficial storm water design standards. The possibility for a new regional storm water detention pond within the Coffee Creek Planning Area should be assessed.

Please refer to Appendix D for a map of existing and planned storm water facilities.

## Water Facilities

Prior to the construction of the City of Wilsonville's Willamette Water Treatment Plant in 2002, the City relied on eight underground wells in the Columbia River Aquifer to serve its needs. The Willamette Treatment Plant now provides the majority of the City's water needs, with its main transmission line that runs up Kinsman Road. The Water Master Plan provides a plan for evaluating future water system needs to meet anticipated growth.

The Water Master Plan assumes current water usage rates of 44-gallons per day for industrial (average) and 176-gallons per day (peak) per user. The City's Community Development Department has also assumed that two 1.0 mgd average daily demand (ADD) industrial users will locate in the City by 2020 that will also need to be accommodated. The resulting analysis of water demand indicates that average peak day demand for industrial uses will increase from $1.25 \mathrm{mgd}(2000)$ to 8.35 $\mathrm{mgd}(2020)$. Total water demand for the city is forecasted to increase from $6.8 \mathrm{mgd}(2000)$ to 20.02 mgd (2020).

The existing Willamette Treatment Plan combined with existing wells has the capacity to handle approximately 10 mgd of total water demand. Future capacity expansion is planned to include 5 mgd through reservoirs (using aquifer storage and recovery wells) and another 5 mgd through expansion at the Willamette Treatment Plant.

The Water Master Plan includes a capital improvement phasing plan that identifies the need to add 4,220 linear feet of 12 -inch water line between Grahams Ferry to Ridder Road and Ridder Road to Garden Acres. A preliminary list of recommended water system improvements for the Coffee Creek Industrial Area is provided in Appendix E, and Tables 3-4.

It is important to note, that all identified projects and cost estimates are made for preliminary planning purposes. Site survey work will need to occur and the City will need to update its water system model to determine more accurate on and off-site water system improvements and trunk line size, location and cost. Hence, additional water system improvements could include a pro rata share of off-site improvements for the new reservoir and pump stations.

## Parks and Trails

The Wilsonville Parks and Recreation Master Plan specifically identifies the Northwest Industrial Area as having a strong need for accessible green space and recreation opportunities and
recommends providing parks in this area and/or improving linkages between the Industrial Area and existing parks.

Protecting natural resources is a hallmark of the Comprehensive Plan and the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Natural resource protection and opportunities to partner with private land owners, as has historically been the case in Wilsonville, should be considered during the planning process for the Coffee Creek Area. Focus should also be placed on creating an interconnected park system including greenways and trails, but also connections for bike, pedestrian, and transit transportation choices.

The recommended plan for the Coffee Creek Industrial Area includes at least four new waysides which can function as strategic "gateway" design features with informational displays that depict area site/building configurations. These waysides should also function as "pocket parks" for local employees and residents with picnic tables and benches.

There are also local and regional pedestrian and bicycle trail connections that are included in the Coffee Creek Industrial Area plan. These pathways can be constructed within existing powerline easement corridors and should connect with Metro's planned regional trail that will parallel the Portland and Western Railroad. Please refer to Appendix F for a map of existing and planned parks and natural areas and trails.

## Power, Gas and Telecommunications

This analysis assumes that public power, telecommunications (phone, cable and internet) and natural gas line extensions can be made into the Coffee Creek Industrial Area by private utility companies, as no expense to the City of Wilsonville. Additional coordination will be required with Portland General Electric, Quest, Sprint, Pacific Natural Gas, and other utilities if and when annexation procedures commence.

## Fiscal Impact Analysis

The fiscal impact findings are based on the assumption that future development will generate revenue and costs for the City. A fiscal impact analysis is contained herein which presents the estimated revenue from property taxes, fees, and other revenue sources, if the area is annexed and developed-and compares it to the associated administration costs to the public sector. The analysis of public expenditures is based upon the on-site improvements that can be attributed to new development within the Coffee Creek Planning Area Boundary. Any additional public capital improvements that are reflected as No Build Improvements (Table 1) are not included in the calculation of fiscal impacts for this project since they are needed whether or not this area is annexed and developed as planned.

The methodology used to conduct this fiscal impact study is similar to that used in prior fiscal impact assessments that have been conducted in Tualatin, Sherwood, Portland, Gresham, and other cities. The method used generally follows the guidance described in the publication by the Council for Urban Economic Development, Redevelopment Handbook, 2003.

The basic methodology includes the following steps:

1. Determine the land use pattern, employment, population, and assessed land value.
2. Estimate revenues associated with land values, employment, and population.
3. Estimate costs of providing services.
4. Compare revenues and costs.
5. Estimate operating and maintenance $(\mathrm{O} \& \mathrm{M})$ costs upon annexation.
6. Determine net fiscal impact from the City's perspective.

As new development occurs, general government responsibilities will be incurred by the City of Wilsonville. We have assumed the existing cost/revenue structure for the City shall remain as it is today (i.e. Measures 5 \& 50 will apply and a consumption tax or other fee structure is not adopted locally or at the state level). It is assumed that with the increase of service responsibilities and costs, the City will receive revenues related to property values and business activities. If costs exceed revenues, a fiscal deficit is incurred; if revenues exceed costs, a surplus is generated. Underlying the analysis is the estimation of revenues and costs associated with annexation and development. Revenue and cost estimates are based on "drivers," which in this analysis are primarily employment, assessed property values, or real market values.

- This analysis focuses exclusively on the revenues and costs associated within the City of Wilsonville.
- Secondary fiscal impacts within the City that result from on-site development within the study area, such as increased population and business activity, are no estimated. .
- Upon annexation, general government services will transfer from Washington County and Clackamas County to the City of Wilsonville.
- The services provided to the study area will be the same as those currently provided to City property owners, businesses, and residents.
- The analysis focuses on revenues that are derived from existing taxes and fees. This includes current mil rates, system development charges, and user fees.

The results of the fiscal impact analysis conclude that there is a positive local fiscal impact that is likely to result upon build out with Alternative 1. As indicated in Table 5, the primary fiscal revenue streams to the City would include: local property tax revenues, city enterprise funds (from water and sewer user fees) and city franchise fee revenues (from a portion of utility charges collected by private utilities). These revenues are expected to reach $\$ 1.67$ million per year upon buildout. Please refer to Appendix Tables G1 and G-6, G-7 and G-8 for detailed revenue forecasts.

Annual operating expenses for maintaining expanded local roads, water, sewer, storm water and parks systems and indirect administrative costs for urbanizing Coffee Creek are expected to increase with time. Total annual operating expenses are expected to reach $\$ 679,000$ per year for the area south of Day Road upon buildout. Please refer to Appendix Tables G-1 through G-5 for a summary of operating expenses.

The net fiscal position for the City of Wilsonville will vary by year, but once build out is achieved the potential revenues from serving the Coffee Creek Industrial area south of Day Road are projected to exceed operating costs by approximately $\$ 994,000$ per year.

Additional non-local revenues are projected to primarily accrue to Washington County, Metro, and the State of Oregon.

Table 5
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, South of Day Road, Alt. 1 Preliminary Fiscal Revenue and Expense Forecast (Buildout)

|  | Total <br> (cumulative or <br> capitalized <br> revenues)* |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Total Cumulative Revenues \& Costs (2007 \$) | Annualized Value* |  |  |
| City Tax Revenue | $\$ 14,251,070$ | $\$ 1,425,107$ |  |
| City Share of State Shared Revenues | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
| City Share of County Revenues (library) | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |
| City Enterprise Fund Revenues | $\$ 2,480,330$ | $\$ 248,033$ |  |
| City Franchise Fee Revenues | $\$ 766,561$ | $\$ 76,656$ |  |
| Subtotal City Revenues | $\$ 16,731,400$ | $\$ 1,673,140$ |  |
| City Operating Expenses* | $(\$ 6,794,955)$ | $(\$ 679,495)$ |  |
| Net Fiscal Position for City | $\$ 9,936,445$ | $\$ 993,645$ |  |
| Non-Local Revenues |  |  |  |
| WA County Tax Revenue | $\$ 6,495,189$ | $\$ 649,519$ |  |
| Metro Property Tax | $\$ 237,431$ | $\$ 23,743$ |  |
| Metro Excise Tax | $\$ 290,288$ | $\$ 29,029$ |  |
| State Income Tax Revenue | $\$ 24,092,028$ | $\$ 2,409,203$ |  |

* based on a 20-year buildout time period; and a capitalization rate of 10\%.

Source: analysis by Otak, Inc.

The area north of Day Road is also expected to provide the City of Wilsonville with positive fiscal impacts once build out is achieved. With Alternative 1, the City is expected to experience approximately $\$ 553,000$ in annual revenues, and incur approximately $\$ 218,000$ in annual expenses. This would result in a net positive fiscal position of over $\$ 330,000$ per year, as indicated in Table 6.

Table 6
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, North of Day Road, Alt. 1 Preliminary Fiscal Revenue and Expense Forecast (Buildout)

|  | Total <br> (cumulative or <br> capitalized <br> revenues)* |  |  | Annualized Value* |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Cumulative Revenues \& Costs (2007 \$) | $\$ 4,524,855$ | $\$ 452,485$ |  |  |
| City Tax Revenue | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |  |
| City Share of State Shared Revenues | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |  |  |
| City Share of County Revenues (library) | $\$ 791,657$ | $\$ 79,166$ |  |  |
| City Enterprise Fund Revenues | $\$ 216,403$ | $\$ 21,640$ |  |  |
| City Franchise Fee Revenues | $\$ 5,532,915$ | $\$ 553,292$ |  |  |
| Subtotal City Revenues | $\$ 2,187,850)$ | $\mathbf{( \$ 2 1 8 , 7 8 5 )}$ |  |  |
| City Operating Expenses* | $\$ 3,345,065$ | $\$ 334,506$ |  |  |
| Net Fiscal Position for City | $\$ 2,091,331$ | $\$ 209,133$ |  |  |
| Selected Non-Local Revenues | $\$ 76,448$ | $\$ 7,645$ |  |  |
| WA County Tax Revenue | $\$ 93,467$ | $\$ 9,347$ |  |  |
| Metro Property Tax | $\$ 6,801,278$ | $\$ 680,128$ |  |  |
| Metro Excise Tax |  |  |  |  |
| State Income Tax Revenue |  |  |  |  |

* based on a 20-year buildout time period; and a capitalization rate of 10\%.

Source: analysis by Otak, Inc.
Development Alternative 2, with more housing and less industrial development than Alternative 2 is not expected to provide a positive fiscal impact. As indicated in Table 7, Alternative 2 north of Day Road is projected to result in more revenues than Alternative 1 ( $\$ 703,000$ at buildout) because there are more potential state shared revenues as population rises. However, the annual operating costs are expected to be slightly higher $(\$ 752,000)$ given the need to provide more public services, such as police, fire, safety, parks, and libraries for the 232 new projected households.

As indicated in Table 7, the net fiscal position to the City with Alternative 2 (north of Day Road) is projected to be close to breakeven, at negative $\$ 49,000$ per year.

Table 7
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, North of Day Road, Alt. 2 Preliminary Fiscal Revenue and Expense Forecast (Buildout)

|  | Total <br> (cumulative or <br> capitalized <br> revenues)* |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total Cumulative Revenues \& Costs (2007 \$) | Annualized Value* |  |
| City Tax Revenue | $\$ 4,491,024$ | $\$ 449,102$ |
| City Share of State Shared Revenues | $\$ 160,173$ | $\$ 16,017$ |
| City Share of County Revenues (library) | $\$ 61,550$ | $\$ 6,155$ |
| City Enterprise Fund Revenues | $\$ 2,058,496$ | $\$ 205,850$ |
| City Franchise Fee Revenues | $\$ 256,664$ | $\$ 25,666$ |
| Subtotal City Revenues | $\mathbf{( \$ 7 , 0 2 7 , 9 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 7 0 2 , 7 9 1}$ |
| City Operating Expenses** | $\mathbf{( \$ 4 9 2 , 5 5 1 )}$ | $\mathbf{( \$ 7 5 2 , 0 4 6 )}$ |
| Net Fiscal Position for City | $\$ 2,167,938$ | $\mathbf{( \$ 4 9 , 2 5 5 )}$ |
| Selected Non-Local Revenues | $\$ 79,249$ | $\$ 216,794$ |
| WA County Tax Revenue | $\$ 96,891$ | $\$ 7,925$ |
| Metro Property Tax | $\$ 4,056,715$ | $\$ 9,689$ |
| Metro Excise Tax | $\$ 405,671$ |  |
| State Income Tax Revenue |  |  |

* based on a 20-year buildout time period; and a capitalization rate of 10\%.
** Payment assumes 6\% interest and 20 year term financing.
Source: analysis by Otak, Inc.


## Regional and State Fiscal Benefits

Primary fiscal benefits to the state include revenues from state personal payroll taxes and corporate income taxes. Because there are wide variations in corporate income taxes (based on $6.6 \%$ of Oregon taxable income) it is difficult to measure its fiscal revenue generation potential. Hence, the focus in this analysis is on state payroll tax collections.

New development and related trip generation will lead to increases in vehicle miles and fuel tax and weight-mile tax revenues for Oregon, Washington County and Clackamas County (only a very small portion of the plan area is located in Clackamas County). However, those revenues and related state pass-through tax revenue reimbursements to local governments and related costs are beyond the scope of this analysis and have not been calculated. It should be noted that state pass-through tax reimbursements to local governments, such as fuel taxes, liquor taxes, cigarette taxes, etc. have population-based disbursement formulae which are only affected by local population growth that occurs with Alternative 2 (north of Day Road).

Metro's new Construction Excise Tax, which was approved by the Metro Council in March 2006, is a temporary construction tax to be assessed on construction permits throughout the region to fund planning in new areas brought into the UGB in 2002 and 2004. These tax revenues could generate
up to $\$ 290,000$ from the area south of Day Road and another $\$ 75,000$ from the area North of Day Road.

In summary, this fiscal impact analysis indicates that the existing development impact fees, review fees, and tax rates in the City of Wilsonville are structured in a manner that could yield positive fiscal impacts from new industrial and commercial developments. The addition of new housing in development Alternative 2 would counter some of the positive fiscal benefit.

## Local and Regional Economic Benefits

In addition to the fiscal benefits, the development of the Coffee Creek Industrial Area is expected to result in new construction and permanent economic impacts for the greater Portland-Vancouver Metro Region.

Significant private investment in new buildings, equipment and infrastructure is expected to occur over the next 20 years, if the Coffee Creek Industrial Area is annexed. Preliminary estimates include over $\$ 300$ million in private investment being leveraged by approximately $\$ 20$ million in public investment. The construction impact from this scale of private and public investment could result in over 4,000 person years of construction employment. Please refer to Appendix Tables G-10, G-11 and G-12.

Preliminary results summarized in Appendix Table G-9 indicate that total potential employment (full time equivalent) jobs on site could reach 1,474 south of Day Road at buildout. An additional 262 to 416 jobs are projected in the area north of Day Road, with Alternatives 2 and 1, respectively.

These jobs would provide good family wage income to local and regional residents. Total projected payroll is expected to reach $\$ 55$ million per year south of Day Road, and between $\$ 9$ and $\$ 15$ million per year north of Day Road at buildout.

The indirect regional impact of local job growth would eventually be all new to the region, as the region doubles in size over the next 20 to 30 years, according to Metro forecasts. If we assume a local indirect multiplier of 1.5 , the regional direct and indirect economic impact from development in the Coffee Creek Industrial Area is projected to reach nearly $\$ 165$ million, including approximately $\$ 135$ million for the area south of Day Road, and another $\$ 30$ million for the area north of Day Road.

The indirect economic impact is created as local direct payroll is deposited in local banks, invested, and expended on local goods and services-which in turn created second round economic impacts. As a portion of the second round economic impacts are invested or spent, the regional indirect impact expands-like the rings that ripple from a stone cast into a pond.

## Funding Strategies

As with most successful large master planned developments, the Coffee Creek Industrial Area will require a mix of public and private funding and financing for on- and off-site improvements.

The first step in the funding process entails amendments to local (City of Wilsonville and Washington County) Transportation System Plans to identify the facilities identified in Tables 2, 3 and 4. After the TSP amendment processes occur (assuming there is support from ODOT and other state, Metro and local agencies/stakeholders), the county and/or city can work with ODOT and local stakeholders to update local ordinances (such as the Wilsonville and Washington County Systems Development Charge Methodology), capital improvement programs and the ODOT State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to designate appropriate improvements for funding.

As local plan amendments are adopted, funding sources should be identified. Potential local funding sources may include the following:

Local Systems Development Charges-The City of Wilsonville and Washington County SDC methodology could be amended to include capital facilities, such as Kinsman Road extension, Boones Ferry Road realignment, Tonquin Road/Grahams Ferry Road intersection improvements. These facilities are required to accommodate planned urban growth.

A preliminary analysis by Otak indicates that the existing SDC rate system, if applied to the anticipated level of development within the Coffee Creek Industrial Area, could be expected to generate approximately $\$ 13.6$ million in revenue (area south of Day Road) and approximately $\$ 4$ million in revenue (area north of Day Road) by the time build out is reached, assuming no SDC waivers are granted. ${ }^{1}$ Please refer to Appendix H. The SDC analysis has generally concluded that on-site public facility capital costs for water, sewer, parks, and storm water facilities could be covered by SDC revenues from development in Coffee Creek. However, there would likely be a large funding gap for street projects.

The SDC analysis indicates that existing City SDC rates, if applied to new development in Coffee Creek Industrial Area, could fund approximately $\$ 4.4$ million in street improvements, including $\$ 3.4$ million from development south of Day Road, and another $\$ 1.0$ million from development north of Day Road. This is well below the expected street funding cost requirements of $\$ 9.2$ million, including $\$ 7.2$ million for development south of Day Road and another $\$ 2.0$ million for development north of Day Road. Hence, it is likely that existing SDCs would need to increase and additional revenue sources (identified below) would be required.

It should also be noted that in addition to these "site related street improvements" there are several additional transportation improvements that are recommended to accommodate local and regional increases in vehicle trips (even without new development in the Coffee Creek Industrial Area). The cost of these "off-site related improvements" is estimated at $\$ 20.1$ million, including $\$ 16.1$ million for streets and an additional $\$ 4.0$ million for an improved railroad underpass along Grahams Ferry

[^15]Road. Funding these additional improvements will also require a mix of City and County SDCs and other local revenue sources, along with state grants that could apply to the railroad underpass.

Urban Renewal Plan District-Wilsonville may consider expanding its urban renewal district area into a portion of the Coffee Creek Industrial Area. However, the City has recently determined that it is near its capacity for urban renewal district expansion given recent commitments made to accommodate the Villebois Village mixed use community. Notwithstanding the challenge of meeting state and local planning approval regulations regarding the formation or expansion of urban renewal plans (please refer to ORS 457.085), there are significant funding resources that could be obtained using Tax Increment Financing. A preliminary analysis by Otak indicates that potential assessed valuation in the Coffee Creek Industrial Area south of Day Road could increase from $\$ 16$ million today to approximately $\$ 258$ million at buildout. This $\$ 242$ million increase in assessed valuation could support an additional $\$ 3.5$ million in annual property tax revenues at buildout. If a conservative estimate of $50 \%$ site buildout is assumed over the life of the urban renewal district, these net new property tax revenues could support approximately $\$ 12$ million in capital improvements. ${ }^{2}$

Local Improvement District (LID)—This approach assumes formation of a local improvement district in accordance with local ordinance and state statutes. A LID can be initiated by either the local jurisdiction or affected property owners for specific capital improvements with consent of at least $51 \%$ of affected property owners in the LID and at least two-thirds support from councilors. LID assessments result in a lien placed on properties by the local jurisdiction until the assessment is paid in full.

Zone of Benefit Recovery District (ZBR)—This approach is similar to the LID financing method, but is almost always initiated by the private sector and does not require a lien on properties for the assessment.

Combination of LID or ZBR and SDCs-Wilsonville and Washington County can combine LID and SDCs for the construction financing for improvements to collector and arterial roads, such as SW Boones Ferry Road. .

Metro Transportation Improvement Program—Selected arterial improvements, such as SW Boones Ferry Road and selected regional pathway improvements may be funded through the Metro TIP process.

ODOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)—State transportation facilities, such as reconstructing the Portland \& Western Rail Road underpass, are eligible for funding through updates to the STIP. Recent preference for improvements required to address freight mobility requirements and dedication of funds from federal and state programs (such as the ConnectOregon program re-authorization being considered by the 2007 Oregon Legislature) can help raise the priority of improvements that benefit industrial job growth.

Oregon Immediate Opportunity Program—ODOT grants up to $50 \%$ of project ( $\$ 500,000 \mathrm{cap}$ ) based on job creation for street improvements. A letter of intent from employers indicating job hiring and wage estimates is required.

2 Urban Renewal TIF revenues assume existing local tax rate of $\$ 14.3$ per $\$ 1,000$ of assessed valuation for general government and schools, $70 \%$ debt: coverage ratio, and $10 \%$ capitalization rate.

## Infrastructure Grants, Loans and Private Dedications

Water, sewer, storm water and parks facilities are often funded through special district bond issues paid for by customer service charges and commodity charges. As the service provider, the City is expected to provide major trunk line improvements to provide urban sanitary sewer, water, parks and sub-basin storm water facilities in the Coffee Creek Industrial Area. In addition to urban renewal district funding, other state and federal funding sources for infrastructure may include:

Special Public Works Fund-Grants awarded in conjunction with a joint loan application for construction and/or improvement of infrastructure needs to support industrial, manufacturing and certain types of commercial development. Typically covers up to $\$ 5,000$ per job. Loans can be awarded up to $\$ 10$ million at a rate of approximately $5.0 \%+/-$. A grant award is based on a financial analysis of the applicant and a debt carrying capacity assessment. (Actual amounts of grant awards are subject to loan application ratios).
Oregon Community Block Grant Program—Grants for infrastructure improvements needed to support a business that will create or retain permanent jobs, the majority of which will be made available to low and moderate income workers. For public infrastructure projects, the ratio is one job per $\$ 20,000$ invested.
Oregon Industrial Development Revenue Bond Program—Administered by the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department (OECDD) this program is focused on non-retail job creation. Bonds may be issued for manufacturing, processing and tourism facilities. Eligible companies may borrow $\$ 500,000$ to $\$ 10$ million though this program, and are obligated to pay back the bondholders.

## Public/Private Development Agreements

In addition to these funding sources, major development projects often include advanced financing agreements between private developers and local jurisdictions. With advanced financing agreements, private entities that build public facilities that are on an adopted SDC funding list, can be compensated for a share of their investment by the city after development occurs. For projects that are not on the SDC project list (such as local streets), the City will typically require the adjacent developer to construct "half street" improvements (along property frontage) or allow the developer to build full street improvements. In some instances the developer may opt to create an LID or ZBR or similar benefit district with affected property owners to compensate the developer for a share of specific improvements.

## Next Steps

The findings contained in this memorandum shall be presented and discussed with the Coffee Creek Technical Advisory Committee on Friday, February 16, 2007. Information regarding development costs and fiscal impacts will be used to help select a preferred alternative for the Coffee Creek Industrial Area.

## APPENDIX TABLES

Table A-1 Unit Cost Assumptions

|  | Type | Capital Cost* | Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transportation Improvements |  |  |  |
| New 3 Lane Arterial (2 travel lanes, center turn lane, bike lanes, sidewalks, street illumination, landscaping) | concrete | \$2,000 | linear foot |
| New 2 Lane Collector (2 travel lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, street illumination, landscaping) | concrete | \$1,500 | linear foot |
| Additional Turn Lane | concrete | \$300,000 | allowance |
| New 2 Lane Local Street | asphalt | \$850 | linear foot |
| Pathway (6 foot hard surface) | asphalt | \$100 | linear foot |
| Pathway (6 foot soft surface) | pervious | \$60 | linear foot |
| New Traffic Signal |  | \$275,000 | each |
| Modified Traffic Signal |  | \$150,000 | each |
| Rail Bridge Structure Replacement |  | \$4,000,000 | allowance |
| ODOT Interstate Ramp Access Modifications |  | \$1,000,000 | allowance |
| Median (100 feet long, landscaped) |  | \$200,000 | each |
| Water, Sewer \& Storm Water Improvements |  |  |  |
| Sewer Main Line (21 inch) | Iron | \$225 | linear foot |
| Sewer Main Line (18 inch) | Iron | \$200 | linear foot |
| Water Main Line (18 inch) with hydrants | PVC | \$180 | linear foot |
| Water Main Line (12 inch) with hydrants | PVC | \$140 | linear foot |
| Storm Water Pond |  | \$150,000 | each |
| Bio Swales |  | \$50 | linear foot |
| Other Improvements |  |  |  |
| Wayside Signage/Landscaping |  | \$200,000 | each |

[^16]March 28, 2007




March 28, 2007


March 28, 2007



March 28, 2007


March 28, 2007


March 28, 2007


March 28, 2007


March 28, 2007


March 28, 2007


Appendix G-1
Coffee Creek Industrial Area
Summary of Fiscal and Economic Impact Assumptions

|  | Factor | Units | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost of Materials Allocation | 45\% | \% of construction costs | RS Means |
| Cost of Construction Payroll | 55\% | \% of construction costs | RS Means |
| Average Construction Wage Rate | \$45,000 | /worker | Oregon Emp. Dept. |
| Avg. Development Cost - Commercial | \$160 | /sf of building area | Allowance |
| Avg. Development Cost - Light Industrial (standard) | \$110 | /sf of building area | Allowance |
| Avg. Development Cost-Mixed Use Housing | \$175,000 | per dwelling unit | Allowance |
| Vacancy Rate | 5\% |  | Allowance |
| City share of Local Road Cost (public) | 0\% | of total cost | Allowance |
| Income and Income Taxes |  |  |  |
| Average Wage Rate - Commercial | \$29,400 | /worker | Oregon Emp. Dept. |
| Average Wage Rate - Light Industrial | \$36,750 | /worker | Oregon Emp. Dept. |
| Employment Assumptions |  |  |  |
| State Income Tax Rate | 4.5\% |  | Oregon State Dept. of Revenue |
| Population Density |  |  |  |
| Dwelling Units |  |  |  |
| People Per Dwelling Unit | 2.34 | people per dwelling | US Census 2000 for City of Wilsonville |
| Assessed Value to Market Value Conversion R |  |  |  |
| Commercial | 0.90 |  | Allowance |
| Industrial | 0.80 |  | Allowance |
| Residential | 0.95 |  | Allowance |
| Special Assessment | \$0.00 | Per Sq.Ft. of Land Area |  |
| Property Tax Rates |  |  |  |
| Education: |  |  |  |
| ESD-NW Regional | \$0.1837 | /\$1000 AV | Washington County Assessor |
| COLL - Portland | \$0.3377 | / \$1000 AV | Washington County Assessor |
| SCH - Sherwood (SD-88) | \$5.7460 | /\$1000 AV | Washington County Assessor |
| General Government |  |  |  |
| City of Wilsonville | \$2.5500 | /\$1000 AV | Washington County Assessor |
| Washington County | \$2.6850 | /\$1000 AV | Washington County Assessor |
| FIRE and Rescue | \$1.5490 | /\$1000 AV | Washington County Assessor |
| PORT Portland | \$0.0713 | / \$1000 AV | Washington County Assessor |
| REG- METRO | \$0.0982 | / \$1000 AV | Washington County Assessor |
| TV Fire and Rescue | \$0.2985 | /\$1000 AV | Washington County Assessor |
| UR-Wilsonville DOT | \$0.8297 | /\$1000 AV | Washington County Assessor |
| Metro Construction Excise Tax | \$1.2000 | / \$1000 AV | Metro |
| Transit Payroll Tax | 0.3\% | of payroll | City of Wilsonville |
| State Shared Revenues (alch. Cig, 911, other) | \$22.71 | /per capita | City of Wilsonville |
| Highway Revenues (fuel tax, veh. reg., wmtax) | \$46.33 | /per capita | City of Wilsonville |
| Franchise Fees** | \$2.08 | /\$1000 AV | Allowance |
| Avg. Annual Utilities Paid | \$52 | per peak pop/job | Allowance based on city data |
| County Library Shared Revenues | \$26.53 | /per capita | City of Wilsonville |
| Enterprise Fund Revenues |  |  |  |
| Average Annual Water Rates | \$313.44 | /dwelling | City of Wilsonville |
| Average Annual Sewer Rates | \$284.76 | /dwelling | City of Wilsonville |
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| Average Annual Storm Water Rates | $\$ 44.64$ | $/$ dwelling | City of Wilsonville |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Average Annual Road Maintenance | $\$ 48.36$ | /dwelling | City of Wilsonville |
| Other/Misc. Revenue | $10 \%$ | of gross revenues | Allowance |
| Equivalent Dwelling Unit Conversion Factor |  |  |  |
| Commercial | $33 \%$ | times SF/2,500 | Allowance |
| Industrial | $50 \%$ | times SF/2,500 | Allowance |

## Appendix G-1 (continued)

## Coffee Creek Industrial Area

Summary of Fiscal and Economic Impact Assumptions

|  |  | Factor | Units |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Incremental Operating Costs (avg. annual) |  |  |  |
| Policy \& Admin. | $\$ 1.70$ | $/ \$ 1000 \mathrm{AV}$ | City of Wilsonville |
| Community Development | $\$ 1.65$ | $/ \$ 1000 \mathrm{AV}$ | City of Wilsonville |
| Public Works | $\$ 3.83$ | $/ \$ 1000 \mathrm{AV}$ | City of Wilsonville |
| Community Services | $\$ 0.77$ | $1 \$ 1000 \mathrm{AV}$ | City of Wilsonville |
| Transportation | $\$ 1.27$ | $/ \$ 1000 \mathrm{AV}$ | City of Wilsonville |
| Public Safety | $\$ 1.40$ | $1 \$ 1000 \mathrm{AV}$ | City of Wilsonville |
| Total Operating Cost Per Household | $\$ 2,913$ | Per household | City of Wilsonville |
| Operating Cost Adjustment Factor |  |  |  |
| Commercial | 0.50 | times operating cost | Allowance |
| Industrial | 0.25 | times operating cost | Allowance |
| Residential | 0.80 | times operating cost | Allowance |
| General Assumptions |  |  |  |
| Capitalization Rate for Annual Costs/Revenues | $10.0 \%$ |  | Allowance |
| Economic Impact Multiplier | 2.5 | times direct income | Allowance |
| Buildout of site area | 20 | years | Allowance |

* derived from comparable analysis of developed properties in Portland Metro Region.
** reflects estimate of charges for electricity, telephone, natural gas and cable TV.
Source: compiled by Otak, Inc.

Table G-2

## Coffee Creek Industrial Area

Estimated Assessed Value at Buildout

| Location | Industrial | Comm. Service | Work force Housing | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area of Buildings (SF) |  |  |  |  |
| South of Day Road |  |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 \& Alt. 2 | 1,722,451 | 107,653 | -- | -- |
| North of Day Road |  |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 Industrial | 549,762 | 34,360 | -- | -- |
| Alt. 2. Industrial/Mixed Use | 252,901 | 114,260 | 232 | -- |
| Development Cost Per Unit | \$160 | \$110 | \$175,000 | -- |
| Market Value |  |  |  |  |
| South of Day Road |  |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 \& Alt. 2 | \$275,592,202 | \$11,841,852 | -- | \$287,434,054 |
| North of Day Road |  |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 Industrial | \$87,961,928 | \$3,779,614 | -- | \$91,741,542 |
| Alt. 2. Industrial/Mixed Use | \$40,464,104 | \$12,568,606 | \$40,600,000 | \$93,632,710 |
| Assessed Value Ratio | 90\% | 80\% | 95\% |  |
| Potential New Assessed Value |  |  |  |  |
| South of Day Road |  |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 \& Alt. 2 | \$248,032,982 | \$9,473,482 | -- | \$257,506,464 |
| North of Day Road |  |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 Industrial | \$79,165,735 | \$3,023,691 | -- | \$82,189,426 |
| Alt. 2. Industrial/Mixed Use | \$36,417,693 | \$10,054,885 | \$38,570,000 | \$85,042,578 |
| Existing Assessed Value |  |  |  |  |
| South of Day Road |  |  |  | \$15,600,000 |
| North of Day Road |  |  |  | \$4,300,000 |
| Net New Assessed Value |  |  |  |  |
| South of Day Road |  |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 \& Alt. 2 | \$233,006,895 | \$8,899,569 | -- | \$241,906,464 |
| North of Day Road |  |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 Industrial | \$75,023,929 | \$2,865,497 | -- | \$77,889,426 |
| Alt. 2. Industrial/Mixed Use | \$34,576,309 | \$9,546,481 | \$36,619,789 | \$80,742,578 |

Table G-3
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, South of Day Road, Alts 1 and 2
Preliminary Estimated Local Annual Operating Expenses at Buildout

| Expenditure | Factor | Units | Buildout Assumptions | Expense | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy \& Admin. | \$1.70 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$410,635 | annual expense |
| Community Development | \$1.65 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$398,171 | annual expense |
| Public Works | \$3.83 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$926,170 | annual expense |
| Community Services | \$0.77 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$186,563 | annual expense |
| Transportation | \$1.27 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$307,360 | annual expense |
| Public Safety | \$1.40 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$338,083 | annual expense |
| Subtotal |  |  |  | \$2,566,983 |  |
| Total Unweighted Expense |  |  |  | \$2,566,983 | annual expense |
| Total Weighted Expense* | 0.3 | times opera | ng expense | \$679,495 | annual expense |
| * this adjustment accounts for lower operating cost in commercial and industrial areas: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjustment Weights |  |  |  | weights | applied factor |
| Commercial | 0.50 | 107,653 | sf | 6\% | 0.0 |
| Industrial | 0.25 | 1,722,451 | sf | 94\% | 0.2 |
| Residential | 0.80 | 0 | sf | 0\% | 0.0 |
| Total |  | 1,830,104 |  | 100\% | 0.3 |

Table G-4
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, North of Day Road, Alt. 1 Preliminary Estimated Local Annual Operating Expenses at Buildout

| Expenditure | Factor | Units | Buildout Assumptions | Expense | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | /\$1000 |  |  |  |
| Policy \& Admin. | \$1.70 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AV } \\ & \text { /\$1000 } \end{aligned}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$132,217 | annual expense |
| Community Development | \$1.65 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AV } \\ & / \$ 1000 \end{aligned}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$128,204 | annual expense |
| Public Works | \$3.83 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{AV} \\ & \text { /\$1000 } \end{aligned}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$298,210 | annual expense |
| Community Services | \$0.77 | $\begin{gathered} \text { AV } \\ / \$ 1000 \end{gathered}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$60,070 | annual expense |
| Transportation | \$1.27 | $\begin{gathered} \text { AV } \\ \text { /\$1000 } \end{gathered}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$98,964 | annual expense |
| Public Safety | \$1.40 | AV | \$77,889,426 | \$108,857 | annual expense |
| Subtotal |  |  |  | \$826,521 |  |
| Total Unweighted Expense |  |  |  | \$826,521 | annual expense |
| Total Weighted Expense* | 0.3 | times operating expense |  | \$218,785 | annual expense |
| * this adjustment accounts for lower operating cost in commercial and industrial areas: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjustment Weights |  |  |  | weights | applied factor |
| Commercial | 0.50 | 34,360 | sf | 6\% | 0.0 |
| Industrial | 0.25 | 549,762 | sf | 94\% | 0.2 |
| Residential | 0.80 | 0 | sf | 0\% | 0.0 |
| Total |  | 584,122 |  | 100\% | 0.3 |
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Table G-5
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, North of Day Road, Alt. 2
Preliminary Estimated Local Annual Operating Expenses at Buildout

| Expenditure | Factor | Units | Buildout Assumptions | Expense | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industrial/Commercial |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy \& Admin. | \$1.70 | /\$1000 AV | \$44,122,790 | \$74,898 | annual expense |
| Community Development | \$1.65 | /\$1000 AV | \$44,122,790 | \$72,625 | annual expense |
| Public Works | \$3.83 | /\$1000 AV | \$44,122,790 | \$168,930 | annual expense |
| Community Services | \$0.77 | /\$1000 AV | \$44,122,790 | \$34,028 | annual expense |
| Transportation | \$1.27 | /\$1000 AV | \$44,122,790 | \$56,061 | annual expense |
| Public Safety | \$1.40 | /\$1000 AV | \$44,122,790 | \$61,665 | annual expense |
| Subtotal |  |  |  | \$468,208 |  |
| Total Unweighted Expense |  |  |  | \$468,208 | annual expense |
| Total Weighted Expense* | 0.3 | times operati | expense | \$142,377 | annual expense |
| * this adjustment accounts for lower operating cost in commercial and industrial areas: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjustment Weights |  |  |  | weights | applied factor |
| Commercial | 0.50 | 114,260 | sf | 22\% | 0.1 |
| Industrial | 0.25 | 252,901 | sf | 78\% | 0.2 |
| Total |  | 367,161 |  | 100\% | 0.3 |
| Housing |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy \& Admin. | \$466.04 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { per } \\ \text { household } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 262 | \$121,909 | annual expense |
| Community Development | \$451.90 | /per household | 262 | \$118,209 | annual expense |
| Public Works | \$1,051.14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { /per } \\ \text { household } \end{gathered}$ | 262 | \$274,961 | annual expense |
| Community Services | \$211.74 | $\begin{gathered} \text { /per } \\ \text { household } \end{gathered}$ | 262 | \$55,387 | annual expense |
| Transportation | \$348.83 | $\begin{gathered} \text { /per } \\ \text { household } \end{gathered}$ | 262 | \$91,249 | annual expense |
| Public Safety | \$383.70 | $\begin{gathered} \text { /per } \\ \text { household } \end{gathered}$ | 262 | \$100,370 | annual expense |
| SubtotalTotal Unweighted Expense |  |  |  | \$762,085 |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$762,085 | annual expense |
| Total Weighted Expense* | 0.8 | times operating expense |  | \$609,668 | annual expense |

Table G-6
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, South of Day Road
Preliminary Estimated Local Annual Tax Revenues at Buildout

| Property Tax Rates | Factor | Units | Buildout Assumptions | Revenue | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ESD-NW Regional | 0.1837 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$44,438 | annual revenue |
| COLL - Portland | 0.3377 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \$ 1000 \\ & \text { AV } \end{aligned}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$81,692 | annual revenue |
| SCH - Sherwood (SD-88) | 5.746 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$1,389,995 | annual revenue |
| General Government |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Wilsonville | 2.55 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$616,861 | annual revenue |
| UR-Wilsonville DOT | 0.8297 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$200,710 | annual revenue |
| Washington County | 2.685 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$649,519 | annual revenue |
| FIRE and Rescue | 1.549 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$374,713 | annual revenue |
| PORT Portland | 0.07129 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$17,246 | annual revenue |
| REG- METRO | 0.09815 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$23,743 | annual revenue |
| TV Fire and Rescue | 0.2985 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$72,209 | annual revenue |
| Metro Construction Excise Tax | 1.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \$ 1000 \\ & \text { AV } \end{aligned}$ | \$241,906,464 | \$290,288 | total revenue |
| Transit Payroll Tax | 0.003 | of payroll | \$53,537,841 | \$160,614 | annual revenue |
| Subtotal local prop. Tax, fire, police, URD, transit |  |  |  | \$1,425,107 | annual revenue |
| County Shared Rev. Library | \$26.53 | /per capita | 0 | \$0.00 | annual revenue |
| Franchise Fees | \$52.00 | /per job | 1,474 | \$76,656 | annual revenue |
| State Shared Revenues to City |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Shared Revenues* | \$22.71 | /per capita | 0 | pop | no new pop |
| Highway Revenues (fuel tax, veh.reg., wmtax) | \$46.33 | /per capita | 0 | pop | no new pop |
| Subtotal State Shared Revenues |  |  |  | \$0 |  |
| Enterprise Fund Revenues to City |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Annual Water Rates | \$313.44 | /E.D.U. | 359 | \$112,476 | annual revenue |
| Average Annual Sewer Rates | \$284.76 | IE.D.U. | 359 | \$102,184 | annual revenue |
| Average Annual Storm Water Rates | \$44.64 | IE.D.U. | 359 | \$16,019 | annual revenue |
| Average Annual Road Maintenance | \$48.36 | /E.D.U. | 359 | \$17,354 | annual revenue |
| Subtotal |  |  |  | \$248,033 |  |
| Subtotal Potential Revenues to City Other/Misc. Revenues \& Fees | 10\% | potential re |  | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \$ 1,749,796 \\ \$ 174,980 \\ \hline \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Total Potential Local Revenues |  |  |  | \$1,924,776 | annual revenue |
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Table G-7
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, North of Day Road Alt. 1
Preliminary Estimated Local Annual Tax Revenues at Buildout

| Property Tax Rates | Factor | Units | Buildout Assumptions | Revenue | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ESD-NW Regional | 0.1837 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$14,308 | annual revenue |
| COLL - Portland | 0.3377 | $\begin{gathered} \text { /\$1000 } \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$26,303 | annual revenue |
| SCH - Sherwood (SD-88) | 5.746 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$447,553 | annual revenue |
| General Government |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Wilsonville | 2.55 | $\begin{gathered} \text { /\$1000 } \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$198,618 | annual revenue |
| UR-Wilsonville DOT | 0.8297 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$64,625 | annual revenue |
| Washington County | 2.685 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \$ 1000 \\ & \text { AV } \end{aligned}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$209,133 | annual revenue |
| FIRE and Rescue | 1.549 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$120,651 | annual revenue |
| PORT Portland | 0.07129 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$5,553 | annual revenue |
| REG- METRO | 0.09815 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$7,645 | annual revenue |
| TV Fire and Rescue | 0.2985 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$23,250 | annual revenue |
| Metro Construction Excise Tax | 1.2 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$77,889,426 | \$93,467 | total revenue |
| Transit Payroll Tax | 0.003 | of payroll | \$15,113,952 | \$45,342 | annual revenue |
| Subtotal local prop. Tax, fire, police, URD, transit |  |  |  | \$452,485 | annual revenue |
| County Shared Rev. Library | \$26.53 | /per capita | 0 | \$0.00 | annual revenue |
| Franchise Fees | \$52.00 | /per job | 416 | \$21,640 | annual revenue |
| State Shared Revenues to City |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Shared Revenues* | \$22.71 | /per capita | 0 | pop | no new pop |
| Highway Revenues (fuel tax, veh.reg., wmtax) | \$46.33 | /per capita | 0 | pop | no new pop |
| Subtotal State Shared Revenues |  |  |  | \$0 |  |
| Enterprise Fund Revenues to City |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Annual Water Rates | \$313.44 | IE.D.U. | 115 | \$35,899 | annual revenue |
| Average Annual Sewer Rates | \$284.76 | IE.D.U. | 115 | \$32,615 | annual revenue |
| Average Annual Storm Water Rates | \$44.64 | IE.D.U. | 115 | \$5,113 | annual revenue |
| Average Annual Road Maintenance | \$48.36 | /E.D.U. | 115 | \$5,539 | annual revenue |
| Subtotal |  | \$79,166 |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Potential Revenues to City Other/Misc. Revenues \& Fees | 10\% | potential rev. |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 553,292 \\ \$ 55,329 \\ \hline \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Total Potential Local Revenues |  |  |  | \$608,621 | annual revenue |

* includes alcoholic beverage tax, cigarette tax, emergency 911 tax and misc. shared revenues.
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Table G-8
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, North of Day Road Alt. 2
Preliminary Estimated Local Annual Tax Revenues at Buildout

| Property Tax Rates | Factor | Units | Buildout Assumptions | Revenue | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ESD-NW Regional | 0.1837 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$80,742,578 | \$14,832 | annual revenue |
| COLL - Portland | 0.3377 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { /\$1000 } \\ & \text { AV } \end{aligned}$ | \$80,742,578 | \$27,267 | annual revenue |
| SCH - Sherwood (SD-88) | 5.746 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$80,742,578 | \$463,947 | annual revenue |
| General Government |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Wilsonville | 2.55 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$80,742,578 | \$205,894 | annual revenue |
| UR-Wilsonville DOT | 0.8297 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$80,742,578 | \$66,992 | annual revenue |
| Washington County | 2.685 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { / } \$ 1000 \\ & \text { AV } \end{aligned}$ | \$80,742,578 | \$216,794 | annual revenue |
| FIRE and Rescue | 1.549 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$80,742,578 | \$125,070 | annual revenue |
| PORT Portland | 0.07129 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$80,742,578 | \$5,756 | annual revenue |
| REG- METRO | 0.09815 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$80,742,578 | \$7,925 | annual revenue |
| TV Fire and Rescue | 0.2985 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$80,742,578 | \$24,102 | annual revenue |
| Metro Construction Excise Tax | 1.2 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \$ 1000 \\ \text { AV } \end{gathered}$ | \$80,742,578 | \$96,891 | total revenue |
| Transit Payroll Tax | 0.003 | of payroll | \$9,014,922 | \$27,045 | annual revenue |
| Subtotal local prop. Tax, fire, police, URD, transit |  |  |  | \$449,102 | annual revenue |
| County Shared Rev. Library | \$26.53 | /per capita | 232 | \$6,155 | annual revenue |
| Franchise Fees | \$52.00 | /per job | 494 | \$25,666 | annual revenue |
| State Shared Revenues to City |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Shared Revenues* | \$22.71 | /per capita | 232 | \$5,269 | no new pop |
| Highway Revenues (fuel tax, veh.reg., wmtax) | \$46.33 | /per capita | 232 | \$10,749 | no new pop |
| Subtotal State Shared Revenues |  |  | \$16,017 |  |  |
| Enterprise Fund Revenues to City |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Annual Water Rates | \$313.44 | /E.D.U. | 298 | \$93,347 | annual revenue |
| Average Annual Sewer Rates | \$284.76 | /E.D.U. | 298 | \$84,806 | annual revenue |
| Average Annual Storm Water Rates | \$44.64 | /E.D.U. | 298 | \$13,294 | annual revenue |
| Average Annual Road Maintenance | \$48.36 | /E.D.U. | 298 | \$14,402 | annual revenue |
| Subtotal |  | \$205,850 |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Potential Revenues to City Other/Misc. Revenues \& Fees | 10\% | potential rev. |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 702,791 \\ \$ 70,279 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Potential Local Revenues |  |  |  |  | \$773,070 | annual revenue |

* includes alcoholic beverage tax, cigarette tax, emergency 911 tax and misc. shared revenues.
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Table G-9
Coffee Creek Industrial Area
Permanent Economic Impacts at Buildout (2007 dollars)

| Location | Industrial | Comm. Service | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employment (Full Time Equivalent) |  |  |  |
| South of Day Road |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 \& Alt. 2 | 1,387 | 87 | 1,474 |
| North of Day Road |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 Industrial | 392 | 24 | 416 |
| Alt. 2. Industrial/Mixed Use | 180 | 81 | 262 |
| Average Wage Rate | \$36,750 | \$29,400 |  |
| Direct Annual Payroll |  |  |  |
| South of Day Road |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 \& Alt. 2 | \$50,988,420 | \$2,549,421 | \$53,537,841 |
| North of Day Road |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 Industrial | \$14,394,240 | \$719,712 | \$15,113,952 |
| Alt. 2. Industrial/Mixed Use | \$6,621,615 | \$2,393,307 | \$9,014,922 |
| Indirect Impact Multiplier |  |  | 2.5 |
| Total Direct \& Indirect Payroll |  |  |  |
| South of Day Road |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 \& Alt. 2 |  |  | \$133,844,603 |
| North of Day Road |  |  |  |
| Alt. 1 Industrial |  |  | \$37,784,880 |
| Alt. 2. Industrial/Mixed use |  |  | \$22,537,305 |

* job density assumptions consistent with Metro Title 1, Summary of 2040 Growth Concept, effective 2/15/06: 9 jobs/acre, and 10 dwellings/acre.
Compiled by Otak, Inc.

Table G-10
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, South of Day Road, Alt. 1
Preliminary Estimates of Private Development Value and Construction Impacts at Buildout

|  | Private <br> Buildings |  | Private <br> Facilities* |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Pucilities** | Total |  |  |  |
| Cost Share - Preliminary Est. | $\$ 287,434,054$ | $\$ 28,743,405$ | $\$ 19,075,000$ | $\$ 297,102,460$ |
| Direct Materials Expenditures | $\$ 129,345,324$ | $\$ 12,934,532$ | $\$ 8,583,750$ | $\$ 150,863,607$ |
| Direct Construction Payroll \& |  |  |  |  |
| Overhead | $\$ 158,088,730$ | $\$ 15,808,873$ | $\$ 10,491,250$ | $\$ 184,388,853$ |
| Est. Construction Jobs (person years) | 3,513 | 351 | 233 | 4,098 |
| Annual Avg. Const. Jobs |  |  |  | 205 |
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Table G-11
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, South of Day Road, Alt. 2
Preliminary Estimates of Private Development Value and Construction Impacts at Buildout

|  | Private <br> Buildings |  | Private <br> Facilities* |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Public <br> Facilities** |  | Total |  |
| Cost Share - Preliminary Est. | $\$ 287,434,054$ | $\$ 28,743,405$ | $\$ 20,795,000$ | $\$ 336,972,460$ |
| Direct Materials Expenditures | $\$ 129,345,324$ | $\$ 12,934,532$ | $\$ 9,357,750$ | $\$ 151,637,607$ |
|  <br> Overhead | $\$ 158,088,730$ | $\$ 15,808,873$ | $\$ 11,437,250$ | $\$ 185,334,853$ |
| Est. Construction Jobs (person years) | 3,513 | 351 | 254 | 4,119 |
| Annual Avg. Const. Jobs |  |  |  | 206 |

* Estimated at 10\% of building cost
** Derived from Appendix B.
Source: compiled by Otak, Inc.

Table G-12
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, North of Day Road, Alt. 1
Preliminary Estimates of Private Development Value and Construction Impacts at Buildout

|  | Private <br> Buildings | Private <br> Facilities* |  | Public <br> Facilities** |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost Share - Preliminary Est. | $\$ 91,741,542$ | $\$ 9,174,154$ | $\$ 3,590,000$ | $\$ 104,505,696$ |  |  |
| Direct Materials Expenditures | $\$ 41,283,694$ | $\$ 4,128,369$ | $\$ 1,615,500$ | $\$ 47,027,563$ |  |  |
| Direct Construction Payroll \& |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overhead | $\$ 50,457,848$ | $\$ 5,045,785$ | $\$ 1,974,500$ | $\$ 57,478,133$ |  |  |
| Est. Construction Jobs (person years) | 1,121 | 112 | 44 | 1,277 |  |  |
| Annual Avg. Const. Jobs |  |  |  | 64 |  |  |

* Estimated at 10\% of building cost
** Derived from Appendix B.
Source: compiled by Otak, Inc.

Table G-13
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, North of Day Road, Alt. 1
Preliminary Estimates of Private Development Value and Construction Impacts at Buildout

|  | Private <br> Buildings | Private <br> Facilities* |  | Public <br> Facilities** |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost Share - Preliminary Est. | $\$ 93,632,710$ | $\$ 9,363,271$ | $\$ 3,590,000$ | $\$ 106,585,981$ |  |  |
| Direct Materials Expenditures | $\$ 42,134,720$ | $\$ 4,213,472$ | $\$ 1,615,500$ | $\$ 47,963,691$ |  |  |
|  <br> Overhead | $\$ 51,497,991$ | $\$ 5,149,799$ | $\$ 1,974,500$ | $\$ 58,622,290$ |  |  |
| Est. Construction Jobs (person years) | 1,144 | 114 | 44 | 1,303 |  |  |
| Annual Avg. Const. Jobs |  |  |  | 65 |  |  |

* Estimated at 10\% of building cost
** Derived from Appendix B.
Source: compiled by Otak, Inc.
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Table H-1
System Development Charge Assumptions

| Coffee Creek Industrial Area | Water SDC's | Sewer SDCs | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Street } \\ & \text { SDCs } \end{aligned}$ | Supply street SDC's | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Stormwater } \\ & \text { SDCs } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Parks SDCs | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single Family Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SDC unit | EDU | EDU | EDU | PM peak hr trip thru WV IC area | ERU | EDU | Total |
| SDC per unit | \$4,345 | \$4,068 | \$3,082 | \$0 | \$482 | \$2,451 | \$14,428 |
| Per acre @ 10DU/acre | \$43,500 | \$40,700 | \$30,800 | \$0 | \$4,800 | \$24,500 | \$144,300 |
| Multifamily Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SDC unit | EDU | EDU | EDU | PM peak hr trip thru WV IC area | ERU | EDU | Total |
| SDC est. per unit | \$2,911 | \$3,051 | \$2,150 | \$0 | \$323 | \$1,864 | \$10,299 |
| Per acre @ 15DU/acre | \$29,100 | \$30,500 | \$21,500 | \$0 | \$3,200 | \$18,600 | \$102,900 |
| Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SDC unit | acre | acre | Employee | PM peak hr trip thru WV IC area | ERU | Employee | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  | Assume half is impervious |  |  |
| Use per acre | $\begin{aligned} & 3030 \text { to } \\ & 8500 \end{aligned}$ | 713 to 2000 | 14 |  | 10 | 14 |  |
| Use | 8500 | 2000 | 14 |  | 10 | 14 |  |
| Use per unit | 850 | 200 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 10 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SDC per unit | \$4,345 | \$4,068 | \$1,508 |  | \$482 | \$65 |  |
| SDC per acre | \$43,500 | \$40,700 | \$21,100 | \$0 | \$4,800 | \$900 | \$111,000 |
| Commercial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SDC unit | acre | acre | Employee | PM peak hr trip thru WV IC area | ERU | Employee | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  | Assume half is impervious |  |  |
| Use per acre | $\begin{aligned} & 3320 \text { to } \\ & 6380 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 782 to 1500 | 5 |  | 10 | 5 |  |
| Use | 3320 | 782 | 5 |  | 10 | 5 |  |
|  | 850 | 200 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.9 | 3.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SDC per unit | \$4,345 | \$4,068 | \$3,898 |  | \$482 | \$65 |  |
| SDC per acre | \$16,900 | \$15,900 | \$19,500 | 0 | \$4,800 | \$300 | \$57,400 |

Source: City of Wilsonville, December 2006.

Table H-2
Summary of Potential SDC Revenues*
Coffee Creek Concept Plan Area, North of Day Road

|  | Water SDCs | Sewer SDCs | Street SDCs | Suppl street SDCs | Storm water SDCs | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks } \\ & \text { SDCs } \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alternative 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Industrial | \$1,286,016 | \$1,203,328 | \$918,272 | \$0 | \$208,896 | \$39,168 | \$3,655,680 |
| Commercial | \$65,552 | \$61,336 | \$55,216 | \$0 | \$13,056 | \$1,632 | \$196,792 |
| Housing | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Subtotal | \$1,351,568 | \$1,264,664 | \$973,488 | \$0 | \$221,952 | \$40,800 | \$3,852,472 |
| Alternative 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Industrial | \$591,591 | \$553,553 | \$422,422 | \$0 | \$96,096 | \$18,018 | \$1,681,680 |
| Commercial | \$217,985 | \$203,965 | \$183,614 | \$0 | \$43,416 | \$5,427 | \$654,406 |
| Housing | \$518,520 | \$523,160 | \$494,160 | \$0 | \$92,800 | \$226,200 | \$1,854,840 |
| Subtotal | \$1,328,096 | \$1,280,678 | \$1,100,196 | \$0 | \$232,312 | \$249,645 | \$4,190,926 |

* Based on existing SDC rates for mid-range scenario, summarized in Appendix Table. Analysis by Otak, Inc.

Table H-3
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, South of Day Road Alt. 1 Summary of SDC Revenues Compared to Capital Costs

|  | Streets | Water | Sewer | Storm Water | Parks | Ped/Bike | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| On-Site Revenues/Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SDC Revenues* <br> On Site Capital Project | \$3,448,367 | \$4,787,632 | \$4,479,793 | \$786,216 | \$144,525 | \$0 | \$13,646,532 |
| Costs | (\$7,200,000) | (\$2,250,000) | (\$7,200,000) | $(\$ 1,525,000)$ | $(\$ 600,000)$ | $(\$ 300,000)$ | (\$19,075,000) |
| Subtotal | (\$3,751,634) | \$2,537,632 | (\$2,720,207) | (\$738,784) | (\$455,475) | $(\$ 300,000)$ | (\$5,428,468) |
| Off-Site \& No-Build Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roads/Infrastructure** | (\$16,647,578) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$16,647,578) |
| Safety (RR-xing) | (\$4,000,000) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | $(\$ 4,000,000)$ |
| Subtotal | (\$20,647,578) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$20,647,578) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand total | (\$24,399,211) | \$2,537,632 | (\$2,720,207) | $(\$ 738,784)$ | (\$455,475) | (\$300,000) | (\$26,076,045) |

* SDC revenue estimates provided in Appendix.
** Additional analysis required to determine when new off-site water reservoir and sewer trunk line improvements are needed.

Table H-4
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, South of Day Road Alt. 2
Summary of SDC Revenues Compared to Capital Costs

|  | Streets | Water | Sewer | Storm Water | Parks | Ped/Bike | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| On-Site Revenues/Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SDC Revenues* | \$3,448,367 | \$4,787,632 | \$4,479,793 | \$786,216 | \$144,525 | \$0 | \$13,646,532 |
| On Site Capital Project costs | (\$8,920,000) | (\$2,250,000) | (\$7,200,000) | (\$1,525,000) | (\$600,000) | $(\$ 300,000)$ | (\$20,795,000) |
| Subtotal | (\$5,471,634) | \$2,537,632 | (\$2,720,207) | $(\$ 738,784)$ | (\$455,475) | $(\$ 300,000)$ | (\$7,148,468) |
| Off-Site \& No-Build Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roads/Infrastructure** | (\$16,647,578) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$16,647,578) |
| Safety (RR-xing) | (\$4,000,000) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$4,000,000) |
| Subtotal | (\$20,647,578) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | $(\$ 20,647,578)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand total | (\$26,119,211) | \$2,537,632 | (\$2,720,207) | $(\$ 738,784)$ | (\$455,475) | (\$300,000) | (\$27,796,045) |

* SDC revenue estimates provided in Appendix.
** Additional analysis required to determine when new off-site water reservoir and sewer trunk line improvements are needed.
Source: analysis by Otak, Inc.

Table H-5
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, North of Day Road Alt. 1 Summary of SDC Revenues Compared to Capital Costs

|  | Streets | Water | Sewer | Storm Water | Parks | Ped/Bike | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| On-Site Revenues/Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SDC Revenues* | \$973,488 | \$1,351,568 | \$1,264,664 | \$221,952 | \$40,800 | \$0 | \$3,852,472 |
| On Site Capital Project Costs | (\$1,950,000) | (\$450,000) | (\$750,000) | (\$150,000) | $(\$ 200,000)$ | $(\$ 90,000)$ | (\$3,590,000) |
| Subtotal | $(\$ 976,512)$ | \$901,568 | \$514,664 | \$71,952 | (\$159,200) | $(\$ 90,000)$ | \$262,472 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Off-Site \& No-Build Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roads/Infrastructure** | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Safety (RR-xing) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Subtotal | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand total | (\$976,512) | \$901,568 | \$514,664 | \$71,952 | (\$159,200) | $(\$ 90,000)$ | \$262,472 |

* SDC revenue estimates provided in Appendix.
** Improvements have already been identified with the area South of Day Road. Additional analysis required to determine when new off-site water reservoir and sewer trunk line improvements are needed.
Source: analysis by Otak, Inc.

Table H-6
Coffee Creek Industrial Area, North of Day Road Alt. 2 Summary of SDC Revenues Compared to Capital Costs

|  | Streets | Water | Sewer | Storm Water | Parks | Ped/Bike | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| On-Site Revenues/Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SDC Revenues* | \$1,100,196 | \$1,328,096 | \$1,280,678 | \$232,312 | \$249,645 | \$0 | \$4,190,926 |
| On Site Capital Project costs | (\$1,950,000) | (\$450,000) | (\$750,000) | (\$150,000) | $(\$ 200,000)$ | $(\$ 90,000)$ | (\$3,590,000) |
| Subtotal | $(\$ 849,805)$ | \$878,096 | \$530,678 | \$82,312 | \$49,645 | $(\$ 90,000)$ | \$600,926 |
| Off-Site \& No-Build Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roads/Infrastructure** | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Safety (RR-xing) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Subtotal | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Grand total | (\$849,805) | \$878,096 | \$530,678 | \$82,312 | \$49,645 | $(\$ 90,000)$ | \$600,926 |

[^19]Source: analysis by Otak, Inc.
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17355 SW Boones Ferry Road Lake Oswego, OR 97035
Phone (503) 635-3618
Fax (503) 635-5395

To: $\quad$ Sandi Young, AICP City of Wilsonville
From: Todd Chase, AICP
Copies: Marah Danielson, ODOT/TGM
Date: $\quad$ March 30, 2007
Subject: Coffee Creek Industrial Area Draft Land Use Code
Amendments, Task 7 (revised draft)
Project \#: 13612

## Introduction

This memorandum identifies draft comprehensive plan and zoning amendments, transportation system plan and capital program amendments that should be considered by the City of Wilsonville for the implementation of the Coffee Creek Industrial Area Master Plan.

We anticipate the city will be exploring at least four options for amending the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code for land use regulations that apply to Coffee Creek. The possible approaches may include:

- Refining the existing Planned Development Industrial - Regionally Significant Industrial Area (PDI-RSIA) land use code;
- Creating a special design overlay zone affecting tax lots abutting Day Road;
- Adopting new minimum thresholds for annexation requests within the Coffee Creek Industrial Area; and
- Allowing green street design standards as a variance to the city's existing urban roadway design standards.

We have not attempted to view all the advantages and disadvantages of each option, but instead have provided the technical recommendations in outline format to help guide future city amendments and policies to achieve project implementation.

This memorandum also identifies other local plans that will need to be updated to abide by Metro Title 14 and Oregon State Land Use Planning Goals.

## Existing Comprehensive Plan Policies

The Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan is the overall guiding policy document for the City of Wilsonville. The Comprehensive Plan establishes general policies for land use, transportation, public facilities, housing, economic development, citizen involvement, and
related items. Existing goals and policies which are specific to the Coffee Creek Industrial Area were previously described in Otak's Technical Memorandum \#1 dated August 18, 2006. The existing comprehensive plan policies support the City's planning and future annexations of Coffee Creek I (area south of Day Road) but will need to be updated to support planning and annexation of the area North of Day Road.

Wilsonville's current zoning code contains two types of industrial zones: Planned Development Industrial (PDI), and Planned Development Industrial - Regionally Significant Industrial Area (PDI-RSIA). The draft Development Code amendments proposes to keep the PDI-RSIA zoning designation South of Day Road, with the addition of a new Design Overlay Zone for the properties fronting along Day Road.

A key feature of a zoning code is the type of uses allowed outright. A particular issue for Coffee Creek will be the extent to which the development code can reflect a high quality development standard for this important "northern gateway" to the City. The allowed uses within the two types of industrial zoning are generalized in Table 1 as follows.

- Planned Development Industrial (PDI) is the City's primary industrial zone. This zone is appropriate for most light manufacturing, warehousing, and distribution, and flex uses. Corporate headquarters and technology campuses are also allowed in PDI zones. Retail and service uses are allowed as long as their uses are limited in floor area as to not exceed 5,000 square feet per use in one building, and not more than 20,000 square feet in multiple buildings. Office uses must not exceed $30 \%$ of total floor area within a site. Prohibited uses include any use that violates performance standards regarding: screening of outdoor storage; vibration; emission of odorous gases; night time operations; heat and glare; dangerous substances; liquid and solid wastes; noise; electrical disturbances; discharge standards; open burning; open storage; and inadequate landscaping.
- Planned Development Industrial - Regionally Significant Industrial Area (PDI-RSIA) is the City's adopted zone for areas like Coffee Creek that have a Metro 2040 RSIA designation. This zone is similar to the PDI zone, but has more strict regulations regarding the maximum amount of retail, service and office allowed. Technology campuses are allowed in PDI-RSIA zones. Retail and service uses are allowed as long as their uses are limited in floor area as to not exceed 3,000 square feet per use in one building, and not more than 20,000 square feet in multiple buildings. Office uses must not exceed $20 \%$ of total floor area within a site. Housing is allowed as long as the floor area does not exceed $10 \%$ of the total floor area. Prohibited uses are subject to the same performance standards as in the PDI zone. There is also a lot size restriction for parcels over 50 acres in size (but none of these exist within the Coffee Creek Industrial area).

Table 1 Allowed uses in the Planned Industrial Development (PDI) and Planned Industrial Development - Regionally Significant Industrial Area (PDI-RSIA) Zones

|  | PDI | PDI - RSIA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industrial |  |  |
| Warehousing \& distribution | P | P |
| Outdoor Storage (with proper screening) | P | P |
| Product assembly and packing | P | P |
| Light manufacturing and processing | P | P |
| Motor vehicle services (ancillary only) | P | P |
| Fabrication | P | P |
| Office complexes- technology or corporate headquarters | P | P |
| Call Centers | P | N |
| Research \& Development, laboratories | P | P |
| Industrial Services | P | P |
| Product repair, finishing and testing | P | P |
| Residential |  |  |
| Residential Uses (not to exceed 10\% of total floor area) | N | P |
| Commercial |  |  |
| Service or retail uses (not to exceed 5,000 sf in floor area in single building or $20,000 \mathrm{sf}$ within multiple buildings. | P | N |
| Service or retail uses (not to exceed 3,000 sf in floor area in single building or $20,000 \mathrm{sf}$ within multiple buildings. | P | P |
| Office complex (not to exceed 30\% of total floor area within a site) | P | N |
| Office complex (not to exceed 20\% of total floor area within a site) | P | P |
| Training facilities with primary purpose to meet industrial needs | P | P |
| Temporary buildings or structures (removed within 30 days) | P | P |
| Public and Other |  |  |
| Public facilities (e.g., utilities, school district bus facilities, public works yards, vehicle storage) | P | P |
| Accessory Uses, incidental to permitted uses | P | P |
| Expansion of buildings or uses approved prior to Oct. 25, 2004 of up to $20 \%$ of added floor area and/or $10 \%$ of added land area | P | P |
| Other uses, per judgment of Planning Director to be consistent with purpose of the Zone | P | P |
| Public park and recreation facility and open space | P | P |

Source: City of Wilsonville 2006 Development Code, Chapter 4 - Planning and Land Development, and Otak, Inc. Note: $P=$ permitted; $N=$ not permitted.

Table 1 indicates that the existing Development Code maintains little distinction between the PDI and the PDI-RSIA zones that exists in the current zoning ordinance. Both zones allow similar uses. However, the commercial and office uses are more restricted in the PDIRSIA zone than in the PDI zone.

Several issues affect the appropriate zoning for the Coffee Creek Industrial Area (south of Day Road):

1. The Day Road Corridor should be developed with high quality buildings and landscaping to provide a favorable market image for the Coffee Creek area, as well as to define this location as the "northern gateway" for the City of Wilsonville.
2. Special considerations for large-lot industrial users. In light of the fact that there are no tax lots greater than 50 acres within the Coffee Creek Industrial Area which would be subject to minimum parcel size requirements, we recommend that the City require coordinated annexations and urban growth boundary amendments among multiple property owners for areas not less than 50 acres at a time. This approach would result in improved coordination among local property owners as new infrastructure is added, and furthers the planning goal for the project to provide large contiguous parcels for industrial development. Otherwise the City runs the risk that these large properties will be subdivided for smaller "standard industrial" users by subsequent property owners (if this land is sold or leased), and risk obtaining adequate private funding to construct needed infrastructure.
3. Special attention should be placed upon addressing significant environmental resource issues in conjunction with future annexation and development of the Coffee Creek Industrial Area. While there are limited wetlands within Coffee Creek, the area does include important drainages that feed Basalt Creek and Coffee Creek Lake. Future development within the Coffee Creek Industrial Area will inevitably exacerbate storm water runoff as impervious surfaces are constructed including roof tops, parking areas, and roadways. It is recommended that in addition to the City's existing standard storm water control measures, a network of "green streets be constructed.

Amendments to policies and implementation measures are needed to clearly implement the city's position of location and use of industrial lands within the Metro UGB.

## Draft Comprehensive Plan Amendments

## Pg. D-11. Industrial Development

Delete the first 4 sentences and replace with the following:
Wilsonville has a long history of providing for industrial development. The city currently has over 1000 acres of lands zoned for industrial use of which only about 150 acres are vacant. However, the city has insisted on high standards for industrial development with the result that industrial complexes are attractive and are compatible with neighboring residential and commercial uses. Due to the city's location on I-5, it is an attractive location
for warehousing and distribution facilities, and much of the industrial development west of I-5 is developed in this use. The North Wilsonville/Stafford I-5 Interchange was reconstructed to accommodate the large number of trucks from these businesses.

High tech businesses are generally located east of I-5, and employ approximately 4000 people. Wilsonville is a member of Metro and participated in the 2002/2004 Urban Growth Boundary expansion efforts to locate additional industrial lands. In 2002, the area identified as Coffee Creek I (located south of the correctional Facility) was added to the Metro UGB, followed in 2004 by two additional areas, Coffee Creek II, located west of the Correctional Facility, and another area located north of Day Road between Wilsonville and Tualatin. In 2006/2007, the city worked with property owners, consultants, ODOT and abutting jurisdictions to develop a Master Plan for Coffee Creek I in order that a continuing supply of shovel ready industrial lands would be available consistent with Metro direction in the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

The city has also amended its Planned Development Industrial Zone to be consistent with Metro guidelines, and has adopted a new Regionally Significant Industrial Zone (RSIA), also consistent with Metro guidelines. Coffee Creek I is designated RSIA on the Metro Title 4 map, and should be so designated on the City's Comprehensive Plan map. The RSIA zone will not be applied to specific property until such time as an annexation, rezone and development proposal is received from property owners.

## Draft Zoning Ordinance Amendments

The Coffee Creek Industrial Area Master Plan will provide a framework to guide the development of public facilities and private uses. This means that the policies, zoning, and codes must be consistent with the Master Plan to support the long-term vision.
Implementation is strengthened by the supportive City policies including:

- Establish new design overlay zone for properties along Day Road that are achievable and flexible yet focused on building forms, site layout, landscaping, and transit/pedestrian connectivity.
- Adopt new code language that requires coordinated annexation requests for a stated minimum threshold of land area not less than 50 acres at a time, unless this condition cannot be met.
- Allow green street design standards as a variation to the City's current roadway design standards for Grahams Ferry Road and Kinsman Road.

Appendix A includes a draft zoning ordinance for consideration and refinement by the City of Wilsonville.

## Day Road Design Overlay Zone

The primary advantage of adopting a design overlay zone for the Day Road Corridor is that it would be consistent with existing City PDI and RSIA zoning, and be focused on the "northern gateway" area that would improve market image for the entire Coffee Creek Industrial Area. Disadvantages include the potential to complicate the development
approval process, and could lead to added development costs that are higher than standard industrial buildings.

It is recommended that the city adopt a simple "form-based" design standard rather than more traditional code that regulates site uses. Advantages of form-based code usually include a more aesthetically pleasing urban environment, with a nice mixture of building roof lines, facades, landscaping and other design treatments. Disadvantages relate primarily to the control of uses within the plan district, which should not be an issue since this is addressed within the base zone.

The draft code presented in Appendix A is intended to incorporate some of the important "form-based code" regulations into the Building Orientation, Design Standards, and Development Standards for properties along Day Road. Those standards would address elements such as: lot size, setbacks, height, massing, landscaping, materials, transit/pedestrian orientation, parking, and circulation.

## Implementing Policies and Ordinances

It should also be noted that given the city's objective to provide orderly urbanization of Coffee Creek Industrial Area, future development must also be consistent with existing city public facility plans (including the Wilsonville Transportation System Plan, Sewer Plan, Water Plan, and Parks Plan) as well as other intergovernmental agreements that impact annexation and provision of public services. Hence, the Development Standards included in the draft code reflect a method for ensuring the future development proposals provides adequate public facilities and private cost-sharing arrangements consistent with long-range public facilities improvements.

In addition to the zoning ordinance amendments identified above, the City of Wilsonville will likely need to adopt additional amendments to Comprehensive Plans, Public Facility Plans, Transportation System Plans, and Capital Improvement Programs to implement the Master Plan. A draft list of recommended amendments to the Wilsonville TSP, Washington County TSP is included in Appendix B. A preliminary minor collector green street design standards is provided in Appendix C.

## Wilsonville Capital Improvement Program

The existing CIP for the City of Wilsonville identifies the five-year capital improvements plan for the City and lists out funding priorities. Additional projects that are recommended for inclusion in the City's CIP include:

- Kinsman Road Engineering and Permitting (with $\$ 500,000$ to identify corridor issues, traffic conditions, right-of-way requirements, design sections, land use forecasts, improvement alternatives analysis, capital costs, environmental impacts, and recommendations regarding design sections, alignment, improvement, and phasing/funding);
- Coffee Creek I water transmission line extension along Kinsman Road with approximately $\$ 420,000$ for planning, design, and capacity improvements;
- Coffee Creek I sanitary sewer transmission line extension along Kinsman Road with approximately $\$ 680,000$ for planning design, and capacity improvements;
- Coffee Creek Industrial Area SDC Overlay and Urban Renewal Study, with an approximately $\$ 60,000$ in funding to be scheduled in 2007/08.
- Coffee Creek I survey work and update of the City's water and sewer capacity models, with approximately $\$ 40,000$ in funding, to be schedule in 2007/08.
- Coffee Creek area storm water sub basin analysis, with approximately $\$ 100,000$ in funding, to be scheduled in 2008/09.

Note, that all of these recommended CIP improvements (with the exception of the SDC method study) would likely require funding that exceeds existing local SDC funding commitments. Hence, the city should work closely with ODOT and other state and local entities to leverage non-city public and private funding resources.

The city should adopt the Master Plan, and then subsequently complete updates to the City Water and Wastewater Master Plans. There are several preliminary water and sewer improvements identified in the Master Plan that can be incorporated into annual updates of the City's Water and Wastewater Improvement Programs. Pleaser refer to the future public facility recommendations contained in Appendix D.

## Other Local Public Facility Plans (including Water and Wastewater)

The city should adopt the Coffee Creek Master Plan, and then subsequently complete updates to the City Water and Wastewater Master Plans. There are several water and sewer improvements identified in the Master Plan that can be incorporated into annual updates of the City's Water and Wastewater Improvement Programs. Additional water, sewer, parks and storm water facility recommendations are identified in Appendix D. Following the adoption of the Coffee Creek Master Plan, it is recommended that the city undertake more detailed capacity modeling to refine the public facility projects, including line size, placement, cost, etc.

Preliminary sewer, water, parks, and storm water capital improvements are included in Appendix D. Note, that all of these recommended CIP improvements (with the exception of the SDC method study) would likely require funding that exceeds existing local SDC funding commitments. Hence, the city should work closely with ODOT and other state and local entities to leverage non-city public and private funding resources. This may entail additional funding strategies that could be funded by the City's Urban Renewal Agency pending available funds.

## Amendments to the Wilsonville Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) Inventories and Compliance Policies

The Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) inventories and compliance policies are included in Chapter 4.139.01 of the Wilsonville Planning and Land Development Ordinance. SROZ policies are described by the city development ordinance as follows:

The purpose of the Significant Resource Overlay Zone is to implement the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan relating to natural resources, open space, environment, flood hazard, and the Willamette River Greenway. In addition, the purposes of these regulations are to achieve compliance with the requirements of the Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) relating to Title 3 Water Quality Resource Areas, and that portion of Statewide Planning Goal 5 relating to significant natural resources. It is not the intent of this ordinance to prevent development where the impacts to significant resources can be minimized or mitigated. (Section 4.139.01 SROZ - Purpose)

The lands within the SROZ are shown in Figure 2. During the course of this master planning process it was determined by the City that the SROZ map should be amended and refined by excluding a portion of tax lot 3S102C000600.

## Next Steps

The findings contained in this memorandum shall be presented and discussed with the Coffee Creek Technical Advisory Committee on Friday, April 6, 2007. Information regarding development costs and fiscal impacts will be used to help guide final approval and adoption of a preferred alternative for the Coffee Creek Industrial Area.

## Appendix A

## Chapter 4 Planning and Land Development Draft Code Amendments

### 4.135.5---. 07 Other Standards

## E. Day Road Design Standards

A. Building Siting and Design: All properties along Day Road shall be designed using the following principles:

1. Sites shall be developed to the maximum extent practicable. A maximum setback of 30 feet is required for at least $50 \%$ of the building length along Day Road. Rear and side yard setbacks should be consistent with Section 4.135.5 (D).
2. Assure that building placement and orientation and landscaping allow ease of security surveillance, as long as it does not conflict with other stated design standards and performance measures.
3. Design buildings with shapes, colors, materials, textures, lines, and other architectural design features which enhance the character of the zone and complement the surrounding area and development, considering, but not limited to, the following techniques:
a. Use color, materials, and architectural design to visually reduce the scale and impact of large buildings;
b. Use building materials and features that are durable and consistent with the proposed use of the building, level of exposure to public view, and exposure to natural elements;
c. Provide window glazing for at least $25 \%$ of the façade facing Day Road.
4. To the extent possible, screen or mask roof-mounted mechanical equipment, except solar collection apparatus, from view;
5. Orient major service activity areas (e.g., loading, delivery and garbage collection, etc.) of the development away from major streets;
6. Arrange use and buildings to maximize opportunities for shared circulation, access, parking, loading, pedestrian walkways and plazas, recreation areas, and transit-related facilities;
B. Display Areas: All display areas shall be located within an office, multi-use or flexspace building. No outdoor display areas are to be visible along Day Road.
C. Landscaping: A landscape buffer of at least 20 feet shall be provided along Day Road. At least fifteen percent of the entire site must be landscaped. Typical landscaping in this zone shall:
7. Consist of a variety of lawn, trees, shrubbery, and ground cover.
8. Highlight public access points to buildings.
9. Buffer loading and utility areas.
10. Incorporate significant trees and other natural features into the site area as much as possible.
11. Street trees must be provided along street frontages and within required offstreet parking lots to help delineate entrances, provide shade and permeable areas for storm water runoff.
D. Screening and outside storage: Outside storage abutting gateway intersections and arterial streets is prohibited. Outside storage in side or rear yards is allowed, provided it is enclosed by a sight-obscuring fence or vegetative screen. Waste and recycle receptacles shall be maintained within an enclosed structure.
E. Performance Standards: The use shall not be of a type or intensity which produces dust, odor, smoke, fumes, noise, glare, heat, or vibrations which are incompatible with other uses allowed in this zone; and the use does not produce off-site impacts that create nuisance as defined by the Oregon D.E.Q. and the City Code section 4.135.5 (.06).

### 4.700-_ xxx Special Requirements within the PDI-RSIA Zone.

In the (PDI-RSIA) zone, the City Council shall only consider annexation requests for contiguous tax lots that are equal to or greater than 50 gross acres in size. Variances can be granted subject to Section 4.196.


Coffee Creek Industrial Area - Day Road Design Overlay Zone

Site parking areas to the rear or side of the building


## Appendix B <br> Recommended Transportation Amendments to Wilsonville TSP and Washington County TSP

Table B-1 Summary of Transportation Improvements Assumed with No Build Scenario

| ID \# | Project Name | Prelim. Cost Estimate (millions)* | Priority | Required TSP Amendments | Potential Funding Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transportation Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| C-24 | Kinsman Road (Day Road to Ridder Road) | \$6.00 | Years 1-5 <br> (design) and 6+ (construct) | TSP amendment required for Green Street or for 3 lane section | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| C7 | Kinsman Road (Ridder to Boeckman Road) | \$3.60 | Years 6+ | no | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| S-36 | Day Road/Kinsman Road Signal | \$0.28 | Same as C-24 | no | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-1 | Boones Ferry Road/95 th Avenue eastbound right turn lane | \$0.61 | Years 6+ | no | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-2 | Boones Ferry Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue westbound left turn pocket | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | no | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-3 | Boones Ferry Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue median | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | no | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-4 | Boones Ferry Road/95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue northbound turn lane | \$0.20 | Years 6+ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { requires City } \\ & \text { TSP } \\ & \text { amendment } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| S-18 | Ridder Road/Kinsman Road left turn pockets and signal | \$0.58 | Years 6+ | no | SDCs, Urban Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-5 | Clutter Road/Grahams Ferry Road westbound left turn lane | \$0.85 | Years 6+ | Consistent with County TSP, but requires City TSP amend. | County SDCs, Developers |
| T-6 | Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road southbound turn lane | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | Same as T-5 | County SDCs, Developers |
| T-7 | Grahams Ferry Road/Clutter Road signal | \$0.28 | Years 6+ | Same as T-5 | County SDCs, Developers |
| T-8 | Grahams Ferry Road Railroad Crossing | \$4.00 | Years 6+ | requires City TSP amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, ODOT, <br> Metro, TriMet |
| T-9 | Day Road/Boones Ferry Road southbound through lane (5 lane section) | \$2.49 | Years 6+ | requires City \& County TSP amendments | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-10 | Tonquin/SW Grahams Ferry Road westbound turn lane | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | in County TSP | County SDCs, Developers |
| T-11 | Tonquin/SW Grahams Ferry Road northbound turn lane | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | in County TSP | County SDCs, Developers |
| T-12 | Tonquin/SW Grahams Ferry Road signal | \$0.28 | Years 6+ | in County TSP | County SDCs, Developers |

Notes: * costs are in 2007 dollars and reflect "ordinary" design, construction, and right-of-way. Special allowances for environmental mitigation, unstable soils, etc. not included. Compiled by Otak, Inc. and DKS Associates.

Table B-2 Summary of Transportation Improvements Coffee Creek Master Plan Preferred Alternative, South of Day Road
This list identifies projects needed beyond those identified in the 2030 "No Build" Alternative.

| ID \# | Project Name | Prelim. Cost Estimate (millions)* | Priority | Required TSP <br> Amendments | Potential Funding Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transportation Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| T-13A | Day Road/Kinsman left turn pocket | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | requires City TSP <br> amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-14 | Kinsman/Day northbound right turn lane | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | requires City TSP <br> amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-15A | Grahams Ferry Road (RR-xing to Day Road) | \$4.20 | Years 6+ | in County TSP, but requires City TSP amend. | SDCs,Developers |
| T-15B | Grahams Ferry Road/Day Road duel southbound left turn lanes | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | Same as T-15A | SDCs,Developers |
| T-16 | Clutter Road Reconstruction | \$2.10 | Years 6+ | requires City TSP $\qquad$ | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| T-17 | Boones Ferry Road 5-lane section between Day Road and I-5 | \$2.25 | Years 6+ | requires City TSP $\qquad$ | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| P-1 | Commerce Circle Trail Connection | \$0.27 | Years 6+ | requires City TSP <br> amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |

Notes: * costs are in 2007 dollars and reflect "ordinary" design, construction, and right-of-way. Special allowances for environmental mitigation, unstable soils, etc. not included. Compiled by Otak, Inc. and DKS Associates.

## Collector Greenstreet



Collector Greenstreet
Plan View


## Appendix C

## Recommended Public Facility Amendments to Wilsonville Sanitary Sewer, Water and Parks Plans to Implement Preferred Coffee Creek Master Plan (South of Day Road)

Table 3 Summary of Public Improvements
Coffee Creek Master Plan, Preferred Alternative, South of Day Road
This list identifies projects needed beyond those identified in the 2030 "No Build" Alternative.

| ID \# | Project Name | Prelim. Cost Estimate (millions)* | Priority | Required Amendments | Potential Funding Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sanitary Sewer Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| SS-1 | Kinsman Road - Sewer Main | \$0.68 | Years 1-5 | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| SS-2 | Grahams Ferry -Sewer Main | \$0.10 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| SS-3 | Garden Acres Sewer Main | \$0.20 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| SS-4 | Clutter Road Sewer Main | \$0.28 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| SS-5 | Ridder Road Sewer Main | \$0.27 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| Water Line Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| W-1 | Kinsman Road - Water Main | \$0.42 | Years 1-5 | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| W-2 | Grahams Ferry -Water Main | \$0.45 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| W-3 | Clutter Road Sewer Main | \$0.27 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| Storm Water Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| SW-1 | Construct Kinsman Road and Grahams Ferry Road as "Greenstreets" with bioswales | cost included w/proj. | on going | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |
| SW-2 | Regional Detention/Treatment Pond | \$0.30 | Years 6+ | requires City Facility Plan amendment | SDCs, Developers |
| Wayside Projects/Parks |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Construct 3 new waysides | \$0.30 | Years 6+ |  | SDCs, Urban <br> Renewal/TIF, Developers |

Notes: Costs are in 2007 dollars and reflect "ordinary" design, construction, and right-of-way. Special allowances for environmental mitigation, unstable soils, etc. not included. Compiled by Otak, Inc. and DKS Associates.

# Coffee Creek Master Plan Appendix 

## Section I. Draft Code Amendments


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Preliminary Urban Reserve Plan, Area 42, OTAK, Inc. December 1998.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ City of Wilsonville Transportation System Plan, Adopted June 2, 2003.
    ${ }^{3}$ Washington County 2020 Transportation System Plan, Adopted October 29, 2002
    ${ }^{4}$ City of Wilsonville Transportation System Plan, Adopted June 2, 2003.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ Highway Capacity Manual 2000, Transportation Research Board, Chapters 16 and 17.
    ${ }^{6}$ City of Wilsonville 2003 Transportation Systems Plan, Adopted June 2, 2003, section 2.7.

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ Field observations by DKS Associates were conducted at the study intersections during the AM and PM peak hours on Wednesday January 31, 2007 and Wednesday February 6, 2007.

[^4]:    * includes public right-of-way for arterial and collector roads, utilities, and parks.

[^5]:    ${ }^{8}$ Trip Generation Manual, $7^{\text {th }}$ Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2003, Land Use Codes 130, 230, 710 and 814.

[^6]:    ' Preliminary Urban Reserve Plan, Area 42, OTAK, Inc. December 1998.

[^7]:    ${ }^{2}$ City of Wilsonville Transportation System Plan, Figure 4.8, Adopted June 2, 2003.
    ${ }^{3}$ Washington County 2020 Transportation System Plan, Adopted October 29, 2002
    ${ }^{4}$ City of Wilsonville Transportation System Plan, Table 4.o, Adopted June 2, 2003.

[^8]:    ${ }^{5}$ Highway Capacity Manual 2000, Transportation Research Board, Chapters 16 and 17.
    ${ }^{6}$ City of Wilsonville 2003 Transportation Systems Plan, Adopted June 2, 2003, section 2.7.

[^9]:    ${ }^{7}$ Field observations by DKS Associates were conducted at the study intersections during the AM and PM peak hours on Wednesday January 31, 2007 and Wednesday February 6, 2007.

[^10]:    * includes public right-of-way for arterial and collector roads, utilities, and parks.

[^11]:    ${ }^{8}$ Trip Generation Manual, $7^{\text {th }}$ Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2003, Land Use Codes 130, 230, 710 and 814.

[^12]:    It should be noted that the following mitigations are in addition to the improvements identified for the 2030 No Build scenario as shown in Table 13.

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ Highway Capacity Manual 2000, Transportation Research Board, Washington D.C., 2000, Chapters 16 and 17.

[^14]:    Source: Highway Capacity Manual 2000, Exhibit 16-2

[^15]:    1 Based on existing City of Wilsonville SDC rates shown in Appendix G. These rates are used for analysis purposes only. Actual rates will not be determined until after the city amends its SDC methodology. It should be noted that the City SDC rates for transportation have been assumed rather than Washington County SDC rates.

[^16]:    * Costs are in 2007 dollars and reflect "ordinary" design, construction, and right-of-way. Special allowances for environmental mitigation, unstable soils, etc. not included.
    Compiled by Otak, Inc.

[^17]:    * includes alcoholic beverage tax, cigarette tax, emergency 911 tax and misc. shared revenues.

[^18]:    * Estimated at 10\% of building cost
    ** Derived from Appendix B, includes on-site improvements only; excludes no-build improvements.
    Source: compiled by Otak, Inc.

[^19]:    * SDC revenue estimates provided in Appendix.
    ** Improvements have already been identified with the area South of Day Road. Additional analysis required to determine when new off-site water reservoir and sewer trunk line improvements are needed.

