## MEMORANDUM

Date: February 11, 2020

To: Mike Miller<br>City of Florence Public Works<br>250 Highway 101<br>Florence, OR 97439<br>From: $\quad$ Amy Griffiths \& Diego Arguea, PE<br>Project: Florence Residential Subdivision<br>Subject: Traffic Impact Analysis Report

Project \#: 24714

This traffic impact analysis (TIA) report has been prepared as part of the site plan application for the proposed residential development to be located on a vacant site in Florence, Oregon. A site vicinity map is shown in Figure 1. Based on the analysis provided and documented herein, the proposed residential development can be constructed while maintaining acceptable traffic operations at the study intersections. No capacity-based mitigation needs were identified at the study intersections. Additional details documenting the methodology, proposed development plan, operations results, and recommendations are provided herein.

## INTRODUCTION

The applicant proposes development of up to 31 detached single-family homes and up to 101 low-rise multi-family homes to be located on a vacant site in north Florence. The site is bounded by Rhododendron Road to the west, $35^{\text {th }}$ Street and Siano Loop Road to the south, and Royal Saint Georges Drive to the east and north. Access to the site is proposed via two full-movement new street connections, spaced approximately 340 feet and 610 feet north of $35^{\text {th }}$ Street. The proposed development is expected to be constructed and occupied in 2021. A site plan is shown in Figure 2.

## SCOPE OF WORK

This TIA has been prepared as part of the Florence Residential Subdivision development application. Pursuant to the methodology memorandum provided and the ODOT response (included in Attachment " $A$ "), this report includes the following:

- Operational assessment of study intersections under existing traffic conditions;
- Review of latest five years of reported crash data at study intersections;


- Background traffic operations assessment for opening year 2021, not including the proposed development traffic volumes;
- Trip generation and trip distribution estimate for the proposed residential development;
- Total traffic operations assessment for opening year 2021, including the proposed development traffic volumes; and,
- Driveway operations and sight distance assessment.

Findings and recommendations are provided at the conclusion of the report.

The study intersections were identified based on the project's trip generation impact on adjacent intersections within the site vicinity and include the following (also shown in Figure 1):

- Site Driveway " A "/Rhododendron Drive
- Site Driveway "B"/Rhododendron Drive
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Rhododendron Drive
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Royal St. Georges Drive
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Kingwood Street
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Oak Street


## ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY AND APPLICABLE STANDARDS

All operations analyses described in this report were performed in accordance with the procedures stated in the Highway Capacity Manual, $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition (HCM - Reference 1).

All intersection level-of-service evaluations used the peak 15 -minute flow rate during the weekday morning and evening commuter peak hours. Using the peak 15-minute flow rate ensures that this analysis is based on a reasonable worst-case scenario. For this reason, the analysis reflects conditions that are only likely to occur for 15 minutes out of each average peak hour. A description of level-of-service criteria is contained in Attachment " $B$ ".

## Operating Standards

The City of Florence has adopted level-of-service (LOS) and volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio operating standards for signalized and unsignalized intersections as documented in the 2012 Transportation System Plan (TSP). The following operating standards apply to City intersections:

- LOS " D " is considered acceptable at signalized and all-way stop controlled intersections if the $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ratio is not higher than 1.0 for the sum of critical movements.
- LOS " E " is considered acceptable for the poorest operating approach at two-way stop intersections. LOS " $F$ " is allowed in situations where a traffic signal is not warranted.


## EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing conditions analysis identifies the site conditions and current physical and operational characteristics of the roadways within the study area. These conditions will be compared with future conditions later in this report.

Kittelson \& Associates, Inc. (Kittelson) staff visited and inventoried the proposed development site and surrounding study area in February 2020. At that time, Kittelson collected information regarding site conditions, adjacent land uses, existing traffic operations, and transportation facilities in the study area.

## SITE CONDITIONS AND ADJACENT LAND USES

The site is currently vacant. The land uses in the site vicinity include residential, community commercial, and recreational.

## TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of the existing transportation facilities in the study area.
Table 1: Existing Transportation Facilities

| Roadway | Functional <br> Classification | Number of <br> Lanes | Posted <br> Speed (mph) | Sidewalks | Bicycle <br> Lanes | On-Street <br> Parking |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rhododendron Drive | Minor Arterial | 2 | 40 | No | No | No? |
| $35^{\text {th Street }}$ | Collector | 2 | 25 | No | Yes | No |
| Wecoma Loop - Royal <br> Saint Georges Drive | Local | 2 | 40 | No | No | Yes |
| Kingwood Street | Local | 2 | 25 | Yes | Yes | Nes |
| Oak Street | Collector | 2 |  | Yes | No |  |

${ }^{1}$ Functional Classification from Florence Transportation System Plan (December, 2012, Reference 2).
NP: not posted

## Roadway Facilities

Figure 3 illustrates the existing lane configurations and traffic control devices at the study intersections. All of the study intersections are two-way stop-controlled (TWSC).


## Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

There are sidewalks along Kingwood Street and Oak Street, but not along the rest of the study area. $35^{\text {th }}$ Street, Kingwood Street, and Oak Street have on-street bike lanes.

## Transit Facilities

The nearest transit stop is located at Lane Community College at Oak Street/32 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street, approximately 1 mile away from the site. This stop serves the Rhody Express North Loop, which has 60-minute headways and provides connections to various schools and grocery stores in Florence.

## TRAFFIC VOLUMES AND PEAK HOUR OPERATIONS

Turning-movement counts were conducted at the study intersection in December 2019. The counts were conducted on a typical mid-week day during the morning (6:30 to 9:30 AM) and evening (3:30 to 6:30 PM) peak time periods.

City of Florence engineering staff requested that a seasonal adjustment factor be applied to local street intersections to account for seasonal fluctuations in travel demand. As such, the traffic volumes on Rhododendron Drive and $35^{\text {th }}$ Street were seasonally adjusted to $30^{\text {th }}$ Highest Hour Volumes ( 30 HV ) in accordance with the Seasonal Trend Table methodology identified in the ODOT Analysis Procedures Manual (APM - Reference 3). As summarized in the methodology memorandum and ODOT response (Attachment "A"), the local street traffic volumes were increased by a factor of 1.76.

Figure 4 and Figure 5 summarize the year 2019 turning-movement counts after applying the seasonal adjustment factor.

Attachment "C" contains the traffic count worksheets used in this study and details of the 30HV methodology and ODOT response are included in Attachment " $A$ ".

As shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5, traffic operations satisfy the City of Florence operating standards for unsignalized intersections.

Attachment "D" contains the year 2019 existing traffic conditions worksheets.



## Traffic Safety

The crash history of the study intersections was reviewed to identify crash patterns. ODOT provided five years of crash data available for the study intersections, which includes all reported crashes from January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2017. Table 2 summarizes the crash data provided by ODOT.

Table 2: Study Intersection Crash Summary (January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2017)

|  | Crash Type |  |  |  | Crash Severity |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | RearEnd | Turn | Angle | Ped | PDO | Injury | Fatal | Total |
| 35 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street/ <br> Rhododendron Drive | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ```35 th Street / Royal St. Georges Drive-Wecoma Loop``` | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 35^{\text {th }} \text { Street / } \\ & \text { Sand Pines Golf Course-Kingwood Street } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $35^{\text {th }}$ Street $/$ <br> Oak Street | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 |

PDO=Property Damage Only
As shown in Table 2, the only intersection with crashes reported over the five-year period is the $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Oak Street intersection. At this intersection, angle crashes were the most common crash type. No other intersections in the study area had reported crashes in the most recent five years. No crash patterns were identified that would warrant mitigation as a result of the proposed development.

Attachment " $E$ " contains the crash data provided by ODOT.

## TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

The TIA identifies how the study area's transportation system will operate in the year the proposed development is expected to be fully built, year 2021. The impact of traffic generated by the proposed residential subdivision during the typical weekday AM and PM peak hours was examined as follows:

- Developments and transportation improvements planned in the site vicinity were identified.
- Year 2021 and background traffic conditions were analyzed at the study intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.
- Site-generated trips were estimated for build-out of the site.
- Site trip-distribution patterns were derived based on surrounding land uses.
- Year 2021 total traffic conditions were analyzed at the study intersections and site-access points during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.
- Driveway operations and sight distance were assessed.


## YEAR 2021 BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

The year 2021 background traffic conditions analysis identifies how the study area's transportation system will operate without the proposed residential subdivision. This analysis includes traffic attributed to planned developments within the study area and to general growth in the region but does not include traffic from the proposed development.

## Planned Developments and Transportation Improvements

Based on conversations and direction provided by City of Florence staff, no planned in-process developments in the area are included in the analysis. There are plans for a mixed-use path along $35^{\text {th }}$ Street, however there are no expected changes to the study intersections.

## Traffic Volumes

Regional traffic volume growth was evaluated based upon the ODOT Future Volume Tables which identify the average annual daily traffic (AADT). Two locations near the study area were identified on Oregon Coast Highway (US 101, ODOT Highway No. 009): 0.02 miles south of $36^{\text {th }}$ Street and 0.02 miles south of $29^{\text {th }}$ Street. Table 3 provides the base year (2018) and forecast year (2038) model AADTs for computation of the growth rate.

Table 3. ODOT Future Volume Table

| Highway | Milepost | Description | Year 2018 <br> AADT | Year 2038 <br> AADT | $R^{2}$ | Growth Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 009 | 188.64 | 0.02 miles south of $36^{\text {th }}$ Street | 12,500 | 12,600 | 0.4298 | 0.00040 |
| 009 | 21.34 | 0.02 miles south of $29^{\text {th }}$ Street | 14,100 | 14,200 | 0.8050 | 0.00035 |

[^0]Based on the volumes in Table 3, traffic volumes along the state highway in the vicinity of the study area are anticipated to increase by approximately 100 daily vehicles over a period of 20 years. This growth is negligible, and no annual background growth rate is proposed to be applied to the existing volumes for the 2021 buildout year analysis. Similarly, no regional growth factor will be applied to local streets.

With no in-process developments and no regional growth factor, the 2021 background conditions are expected to reflect the same conditions presented in Figure 4 and Figure 5.

## Intersection Operations

As stated previously, the 2021 background traffic intersection analysis is expected to be the same as the adjusted 2019 traffic operations. Therefore, the results of the analysis match that of the 2019 existing traffic analysis and the study intersections are forecast to satisfy the TSP operating standards during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Refer to Attachment "D" for the existing (and background) traffic operations worksheets.

## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The applicant proposes to develop up to 31 detached single-family homes, 55 attached townhome-style cottages, and 46 apartments.

## Trip Generation

A trip generation estimate was prepared for the proposed residential subdivision based on information provided in the standard reference manual, Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE - Reference 4). Based on the land use data provided by ITE, the proposed townhome-style cottages and the apartments are both classified as low-rise multi-family homes. As such, ITE Land Use Code 220 (Multifamily Housing - Low Rise) is applied for the combined 101 units. Land Use Code 210 (Single-Family Detached Housing) is applied for the 31 single-family homes. Table 4 summarizes the trip generation estimate for the weekday daily, morning, and evening peak hours.

Table 4. Land Use Trip Generation

| Land Use | ITE Code | Units | Daily <br> Trips | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Single Family Detached Housing | 210 | 31 | 354 | 27 | 7 | 20 | 33 | 21 | 12 |
| Apartment | 220 | 101 | 723 | 48 | 11 | 37 | 60 | 38 | 22 |
| Total Net New |  |  | 1,077 | 75 | 18 | 57 | 93 | 59 | 34 |

As shown in Table 4, the proposed development is estimated to generate approximately 1,077 net new weekday daily trips, with 75 net new trips (18 in, 57 out) occurring during the weekday AM peak hour and 93 net new trips ( $59 \mathrm{in}, 34$ out) occurring during the weekday PM peak hour.

## Site Trip Distribution/Trip Assignment

A trip distribution pattern was developed for the proposed development based existing traffic patterns and the location of major trip origins and destinations in the Florence area. Figure 6 and Figure 7 illustrate the estimated trip distribution pattern and assignment for the site-generated trips shown in Table 4 during weekday AM and PM peak hours.

## YEAR 2021 TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

The year 2021 total traffic conditions analysis forecasts how the study area's transportation system will operate with the traffic generated by the proposed residential subdivision. The year 2021 background traffic volumes shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5 were added to the site-generated traffic shown in Figure 6 and Figure 7 to arrive at the total traffic volumes that are shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9.

## Intersection Operations

The weekday AM and PM peak hour turning-movement volumes shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9 were used to conduct an operational analysis at the study intersections and site accesses to determine the year 2021 total traffic conditions. The results of the analysis indicate that the study intersections and site accesses are projected to continue to meet the City's TSP operating standards during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

Attachment " $F$ " contains the year 2021 total traffic conditions worksheets.





## SIGHT DISTANCE ASSESSMENT

A preliminary sight distance analysis was conducted at the existing site accesses based on review of the proposed site plan. We recommend final sight distance certification be confirmed upon buildout. Preliminary site plan review of available sight distance indicates that both intersection and stopping sight distance (ISD and SSD) are expected to meet the design guidance presented in A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (AASHTO, Reference 5) upon buildout.

## AASHTO Design Guidelines

One of the primary inputs in determining safe sight distance metrics according to AASHTO guidelines is the design speed of the respective roadway. The posted speed along Rhododendron Drive is 40 miles per hour and the advisory speed along the frontage of the property is posted at 35 miles per hour.

For an assumed design speed of the 40 mile-per-hour facility, Table 5 below summarizes the recommended minimum design guidance.

Table 5. Sight Distance Summary (Case B1 - Left Turn from the Minor Road)

| Access Locations | Direction of Travel | AASHTO Design Guideline (feet) (ISD / SSD) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Access A (north) | Northbound (facing south from access) | 445 / 305 |
|  | Southbound (facing north from access) | 445 / 305 |
| Access B (south) | Northbound (facing south from access) | 445 / 305 |
|  | Southbound <br> (facing north from access) | 445 / 305 |

ISD: Intersection Sight Distance
SSD: Stopping Sight Distance
The following Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 illustrate a preliminary sight distance triangle for up to 445 feet of intersection sight distance. The red lines indicate the sightline from a vehicle at each corresponding site access while the yellow line indicates the on-road distance ( 445 feet) recommended for a design speed of 40 miles per hour.

Exhibit 1 Sight Triangle for Driveway A (approximate)


Exhibit 2 Sight Triangle for Driveway B (approximate)


Based on the preliminary assessment in Exhibits 1 and 2, no vertical curvature or horizontal curvature of Rhododendron Drive is expected to limit sight distances. However, there may be some foliage and low hanging branches that may be partially obstructing sight lines within the right-of-way - we recommend these be cleared upon construction of the site. Site landscaping, signage or above-ground utilities along the site frontages should be installed and maintained to provide adequate sight distance per City requirements.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this analysis indicate that the proposed residential subdivision can be constructed while maintaining acceptable traffic operations at the study intersections and site-accesses. The primary findings and recommendations of this study are summarized below.

- The proposed residential development is estimated to generate approximately 1,077 net new weekday daily trips, with 75 net new trips ( $18 \mathrm{in}, 57$ out) occurring during the weekday AM peak hour and 93 net new trips ( $59 \mathrm{in}, 34$ out) occurring during the weekday PM peak hour.
- All study intersections were found to operate acceptably under existing and forecast future conditions.
- No transportation capacity or safety-related mitigations are recommended as a result of the proposed development impacts.
- Landscaping, signage or above-ground utilities along the site frontages should be installed and maintained to provide adequate sight distance.

We trust this report adequately addresses the traffic impacts associated with the proposed residential subdivision. Please contact us if you have any questions.

## REFERENCES

1. Transportation Research Board. Highway Capacity Manual, $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition. 2019.
2. City of Florence, Oregon. Florence Transportation System Plan. 2012.
3. Oregon Department of Transportation. Analysis Procedures Manual. Updated in 2019.
4. Institute of Transportation Engineers. Trip Generation, 10 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition, 2017.
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## Attachment A

Scoping Memorandum

## MEMORANDUM - DRAFT

To: Mike Miller, Public Works Director
City of Florence Public Works
250 Highway 101
Florence, OR 97439
Cc: $\quad$ Matt Caswell, PE, ODOT
From: Diego Arguea, PE \& Amy Griffiths
Project: Florence Residential Subdivision
Subject: Traffic Impact Study Scoping

This memorandum documents the methodology and key assumptions to be used in preparation of the traffic impact analysis (TIA) for a residential development in Florence, Oregon.

## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The applicant proposes development of 91 single-family homes and up to 48 low-rise ${ }^{1}$ apartments to be located on a vacant site in north Florence, Oregon. The site is bounded by Rhododendron Road to the west, $35^{\text {th }}$ Street and Siano Loop Road to the south, and Royal Saint Georges Drive to the east and north. Access to the site is proposed via two driveways, spaced at approximately 340 feet and 610 feet north of $35^{\text {th }}$ Street. A site vicinity map is shown in Figure 1.

The proposed development is expected to be constructed in 2021. A site plan is shown in Figure 2.

## TRIP GENERATION AND DISTRIBUTION

Table 1 summarizes the estimated site-generated trips for the proposed development. Trip generation rates for the single-family and apartment land uses are based on the standard reference Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition. For each land use, the regression equation is used to estimate trip generation if there are more than 20 data points and the coefficient of correlation ( $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ value) is 0.75 or higher. If these criteria are not met, the average rate is used.

[^1]
Florence Residential Subdivision

$\mathbb{R} \mathbb{K}$

Table 1. Proposed Land Use Trip Generation

| Land Use | ITE Code | Units | Daily <br> Trips | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Single Family Detached Housing | 210 | 91 | 953 | 69 | 17 | 52 | 93 | 59 | 34 |
| Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 220 | 48 | 322 | 24 | 6 | 18 | 31 | 19 | 12 |
| Total Net New |  |  | 1,275 | 93 | 23 | 70 | 124 | 78 | 46 |

Figure 3 and Figure 4 display a preliminary trip distribution and assignment based on review of surrounding land uses and the roadway network. The trip distribution pattern used in the formal traffic impact analysis may be revised based on traffic volume data to be collected at the study intersections as well as agency review comments.

## STUDY INTERSECTIONS

Proposed study intersections were identified based on the project's anticipated trip generation impact on adjacent intersections within the site vicinity. One intersection under ODOT ${ }^{2}$ jurisdiction was identified to be impacted - however, under both weekday AM and PM peak hours, this intersection is forecast to be impacted by fewer than 50 trips (see Figures 3 and 4). As such, the intersection of $35^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Oregon Coast Highway (Hwy 101) has been included in the study area to address City requirements. All proposed study intersections are summarized below.

- Site Driveway " A "/Rhododendron Drive
- Site Driveway "B"/Rhododendron Drive
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Rhododendron Drive
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Royal St. Georges Drive
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Kingwood Street
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Oak Street
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Oregon Coast Highway (Hwy 101)

[^2]


## OPERATIONS ANALYSIS

The traffic operations analysis will include evaluation of the following performance measures for the study intersections:

- Turning movement counts;
- Volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio;
- Level-of-service (LOS) and delay; and,
- $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queuing.

Individual study intersection performance will be documented in tables, figures, and/or technical appendices using the measures of effectiveness listed above. Study intersection performance will then be compared to applicable City and ODOT performance thresholds.

## Analysis Years

We will report performance measures for the following analysis years:

- Existing year 2019 traffic analysis;
- Opening year 2021 background traffic analysis (without added trips from the proposed development); and,
- Forecast year 2021 total traffic analysis (including added trips from the proposed development).


## Mobility Standards

ODOT assesses intersection operations based on v/c ratio. Table 6 of the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) provides $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio targets statewide. These OHP ratios are used to evaluate existing and future no-build conditions, and the mobility standard is based on characteristics of the state highway.

Within the study area, the Oregon Coast Highway (Hwy 101) is classified as a statewide highway (not a freight route), located within the urban growth boundary (non-MPO), and has a posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour. As such, the ODOT required mobility standard for the $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Oregon Coast Highway (Hwy 101) intersection is a v/c ratio of 0.90.

Table 6 of the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) is shown on the following page.

| VOLUME TO CAPACITY RATIO TARGETS OUTSIDE METRO ${ }^{17 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}, \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway Category | Inside Urban Growth Boundary |  |  |  |  | Outside Urban Growth Boundary |  |
|  | STA ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | MPO | Non-MPO Outside of STAs where non- freeway posted speed $<=35$ mph, or a Designated UBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Non-MPO } \\ \text { outside of } \\ \text { STAs where } \\ \text { non-freeway } \\ \text { speed }>35 \\ \text { mph but }<45 \\ \text { mph } \end{gathered}$ | Non-MPO where nonfreeway speed limit $>=45 \mathrm{mph}$ | Unincorporated Communities ${ }^{F}$ | Rural <br> Lands |
| Interstate Highways | N/A | 0.85 | N/A | N/A | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| Statewide Expressways | N/A | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| Freight Route on a Statewide Highway | 0.90 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| Statewide (not a Freight Route) | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.85 | 0.80 | 0.75 | 0.70 |
| Freight Route on a regional or District Highway | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.75 | 0.70 |
| Expressway on a Regional or District Highway | N/A | 0.90 | N/A | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.75 | 0.70 |
| Regional Highways | 1.0 | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.75 | 0.70 |
| District/Local Interest Roads | 1.0 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.80 | 0.75 |

Table 6: Volume to Capacity Ratio Targets for Peak Hour Operating Conditions

We request that the City of Florence provide us with the applicable mobility standards for the other study intersections.

## SEASONAL ADJUSTMENT FACTOR

Peak hour traffic counts will be collected in December 2019 and will subsequently be adjusted to reflect $30^{\text {th }}$ highest hour design volumes, based on applicable adjustment factors. Version 2 of the APM identifies three methods for identifying seasonal adjustment factors for highway traffic volumes:

- On-Site ATR Method
- ATR Characteristic Table Method
- Seasonal Trend Method

All three methods utilize information provided by Automatic Traffic Recorders (ATRs) situated in select locations throughout the State Highway System that collect traffic data 24 -hours a day/365 days a year.

The On-Site ATR Method meets the criteria that the ATR be located within or near the project area. ATR Florence (20-026) was identified on Highway 101 and located 0.77 miles north of Heceta Beach Road, and 2.21 miles north of the $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Highway 101 study intersection. No major intersections that would impact seasonal trends are located between the study intersection and the ATR location. As such, we propose using ATR 20-026 data to seasonally adjust traffic volume data collected in December 2019.

Table 2 displays the ATR data used to develop the seasonal adjustment factor for the study area.
Table 2. Seasonal Adjustment Factor Calculation (weekday daily data)

| Year | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Month (July) \% of ADT | $136 \%$ | $136 \%$ | $134 \%$ | $142 \%$ | $140 \%$ | $137 \%$ |
| Month of Data Collection (December) \% of ADT | $76 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $77 \%$ |

Note: Shaded values removed from average calculation per ODOT methodology.

Cells highlighted in grey reflect the highest and lowest values and were excluded from the average per ODOT guidelines. From this data, the seasonal factor can be computed as $137 \% \div 77 \%=1.78$.

Based on direction provided in the ODOT Analysis Procedures Manual, a seasonal adjustment greater than $30 \%$ should not be used. To supplement the ATR methodology, the most up-to-date seasonal trend tables ${ }^{3}$ were reviewed - for the count month December, the seasonal adjustments shown for the following routes are as follows:

- Coastal Destination: 1.1636
- Coastal Destination Route: 1.2836

Averaging the seasonal trend table values for December results in a 1.2236 seasonal adjustment.
We welcome you providing historic traffic count data that may be available for the study intersections that could help further inform the seasonal adjustment. If no additional data is available, and subject to ODOT and City feedback, we propose to adjust the through movements on Highway 101 by a factor of 1.22 to reflect the $30^{\text {th }}$ highest hour volumes.

## CRASH DATA REVIEW

The most-recent three-year period of reported crash data (January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2018) will be reviewed at the study intersections. Any study intersections that are identified as a Safety Priority Index System sites (top 5- or 10-percent) will be included in the crash data and highlighted in the analysis.

[^3]The data will be analyzed for a variety of factors to include type, severity, general conditions, and location to identify potential crash patterns or anomalies.

## FORECAST YEAR VOLUME DEVELOPMENT

Growth rates for opening year background traffic volumes will be based upon the ODOT Future Volume Tables. Two locations near the study area were identified on Oregon Coast Highway (US 101, ODOT Highway No. 009): 0.02 miles south of $36^{\text {th }}$ Street and 0.02 miles south of $29^{\text {th }}$ Street. Table 3 provides the base year (2018) and forecast year (2038) model AADTs for computation of the growth rate.

Table 3. ODOT Future Volume Table

| Highway | Milepost | Description | 2018 | 2038 | $R^{2}$ | Growth Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 009 | 188.64 | 0.02 miles south of $36^{\text {th }}$ Street | 12,500 | 12,600 | 0.4298 | 0.00040 |
| 009 | 21.34 | 0.02 miles south of $29^{\text {th }}$ Street | 14,100 | 14,200 | 0.8050 | 0.00035 |

Growth rate calculation example: $(12,600 / 12,500-1) /(2038-2018)=0.00040$
Based on the volumes in Table 3, traffic volumes along the state highway in the vicinity of the study area are anticipated to increase by approximately 100 daily vehicles over a period of 20 years. This growth is negligible and suggests it may not be necessary to apply an annual background growth rate to the existing volumes for the 2021 buildout year analysis. We would appreciate receipt of in-process development and/or annual growth rate data that may be available. In the absence of additional data, we propose to not apply a regional growth factor to the local streets.

## NEXT STEPS

Please review the information presented in this memorandum and provide us your feedback regarding the study assumptions and methodology. Please also provide confirmation of the City of Florence mobility standards. We would be pleased to schedule a conference call to discuss if desired.

| From: | BLAIR Keith P [Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, January 3, 2020 7:19 AM |
| To: | BAUMGARTNER Douglas G; Diego Arguea |
| Cc: | Mike.Miller@ci.florence.or.us; Amy Griffiths; UPTON Dorothy J; NELSON Brian S * Scott |
| Subject: | RE: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5 |

Doug and Diego:
Thank you for passing along this scoping letter. My comments are:

1. Traffic study should be consistent with ODOT's Analysis Procedures Manual (APM) https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Pages/APM.aspx
2. Does the City concur with the proposed Trip Distribution? It appears the assumed $30 \%(10 \%$ to/from north, $20 \%$ to/from south) of the total trips accessing the US- $101 / 35^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is low, but I concur that it appears this intersection will not trigger ODOT's 50 peak hour net trip increase threshold to recommend study of the intersection. That said, I am still available and willing to review the draft traffic study as a resource for the City.
3. The OHP mobility target for the US-101/35 $5^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is actually 0.85 rather than 0.90 as cited within the scoping letter (statewide highway, non-OHP freight route, 40 MPH ).
4. The citation within ODOT's APM about avoiding the use of seasonal adjustments above $30 \%$ is not intended to limit the adjustment itself, but rather identify the least appropriate months during the year to conduct traffic counts. Due to the seasonal trending nature of the local transportation network, traffic counts at the US-101/35 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection should be collected between March 1 and November 15. However, if the City will accept December counts for the purpose of this traffic study, Region Traffic recommends a seasonal adjustment of 1.76 for the US-101/35 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection based on an average of the following trends:
a. 1.84 using Florence ATR 20-026 and the Average Daily Traffic method (as opposed to the Average Weekday Traffic method)
b. 1.49 using the Coastal Destination trend (the proposed calculation must have included an error)
c. 1.96 using the Coastal Destination Route trend (the proposed calculation must have included an error)
5. Per Table 3.3 of ODOT's Development Review Guidelines, for a development of this size ( $1,000-$ 2,999 ADT), Region Traffic recommends the following analysis scenario years:
a. Existing (2019)
b. Opening Year (2021)
i. Background
ii. Total
c. Opening Year +5 Years (2026)
i. Background
ii. Total

I hope the above information will help, but please let me know if there are any more questions or if I may be of any further assistance. Thanks!

Keith P. Blair, P.E.
Interim Traffic Analysis Engineer | ODOT Region 2

ODOT's mission is to provide a safe and reliable multimodal transportation system that connects people and helps Oregon's communities and economy thrive.

From: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Sent: Friday, December 27, 2019 3:24 PM
To: NELSON Brian S * Scott [Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us)
Cc: BAUMGARTNER Douglas G [Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us); Mike.Miller@ci.florence.or.us; Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com); BLAIR Keith P [Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us)
Subject: RE: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5

## Hi Scott -

Thanks for email. I was also told that Keith Blair is someone who has been involved in development review? We are currently scoping, but we are on a fast track to deliver this project by end of January. I have included the scoping memorandum attached for your reference. Note that the only intersection under ODOT jurisdiction is $35^{\text {th }}$ Ave/Hwy 101, but we do not estimate more than 50 peak hour trips to this intersection, so, ultimately, it may even not be required for study - I will defer to you. If it is required, please confirm the seasonal adjustment methodology.

Thanks!
Diego

Diego Arguea, P.E. | Associate Engineer | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc. d: 503.535.7462-1462 (ext) | o: 503.228.5230 | c: 503.334.3183

From: NELSON Brian S * Scott [Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us)
Sent: Thursday, December 26, 2019 2:57 PM
To: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Cc: BAUMGARTNER Douglas G [Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us)
Subject: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5
Hello Diego, I here you are working on a TIS in Florence. Doug Baumgartner is our development review coordinator for that area, however Doug is out until January $6^{\text {th }}$. In the meantime I can help you get started. Are you looking for a scope or are you beyond that?
thanks

B Scott Nelson, P.E.<br>Region 2 Access Management Engineer

455 Airport Rd SE, Bldg. B
Salem, OR 97301
Office 503.986.2882

## Amy Griffiths

| From: | Mike Miller [mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us](mailto:mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, January 9, 2020 9:49 AM |
| To: | BLAIR Keith P; Diego Arguea |
| Cc: | Amy Griffiths; BAUMGARTNER Douglas G; Wendy Farley-Campbell |
| Subject: | RE: Florence - revision in site plan |

Thanks Keith! I agree, since we know what the mix is using ITE codes 210 and 220 will be more accurate.

Mike

From: BLAIR Keith P [Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us)
Sent: Thursday, January 9, 2020 9:07 AM
To: 'Diego Arguea' [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com); Mike Miller [mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us](mailto:mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us)
Cc: Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com); BAUMGARTNER Douglas G [Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us)
Subject: RE: Florence - revision in site plan
Diego and Mike:
My recommendation would be to utilize trip generation for land uses 210 and 220 as opposed to 270 for the combination of the following reasons:

- it appears the proposed land use mix is known, as opposed to a general PUD application
- ITE data sample sizes for land uses 210 and 220 are significantly larger than that for 270 and, as a result, likely more accurate
- trip generation results for land uses 210 and 220 are slightly larger (more conservative) for the daily and PM peak hour

Please let me know if I may be of further assistance. Thanks!

## Keith Blair

(503) 986-2857

From: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Sent: Wednesday, January 8, 2020 6:01 PM
To: Mike Miller [mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us](mailto:mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us); BLAIR Keith P [Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us)
Cc: Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com)
Subject: Florence - revision in site plan

Mike, Keith,

Thank you both for your time in coordination and working through the project assumptions. We have recently had a change (reduction) in the site plan units, and I wanted to share an updated trip generation prior to moving forward with our analysis. Please review and let us know if you are comfortable using the PUD trip generation rate.

In our scoping memorandum, the site plan identified 91 single family home lots and 48 apartments. The revised unit mix is as follows:

31 single family lots

46 apartments
55 attached townhome/cottage 2-story homes (owner occupied not rentals)

## 132 total units

The $9^{\text {th }}$ edition of Trip Generation included a category for 'townhomes' which does not exist in the $10^{\text {th }}$ edition. Rather, the townhome data has been lumped together with the rate in the Low Rise Residential data. As such, one potential trip generation estimate shown below includes 31 single family lots and 101 low rise residential ( 46 apartments +55 attached homes).

| Land Use | $\begin{gathered} \text { ITE } \\ \text { Code } \end{gathered}$ | Units | Daily Trips | Weekday AM |  |  | Weekday PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Family Detached Housing (AVG) | 210 | 31 | 354 | 27 | 7 | 20 | 33 | 21 | 12 |
| Internal Trips (0\% Daily, 0\% AM, Saturday 0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 220 | 101 | 723 | 48 | 11 | 37 | 60 | 38 | 22 |
| Internal Trips (0\% Daily, O\% AM, Saturday 0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Trip Generation |  |  | 1,077 | 75 | 18 | 57 | 93 | 58 | 34 |

Alternatively, the $10^{\text {th }}$ edition also has a new land use category called PUD Residential (Land Use 270). This rate is intended for developments that are PUDs and the final land use mix may or may not be known. The second table represents the revised trip generation assuming all 132 units are run as PUD.

| Land Use | ITE Code | Units | Daily Trips | Weekday AM |  |  | Weekday PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Planned Unit Development (PUD) Average Rate | 270 | 132 | 974 | 75 | 17 | 59 | 91 | 59 | 32 |
| Internal Trips (0\% Daily, 0\% AM, Saturday 0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Trip Generation |  |  | 974 | 75 | 17 | 59 | 91 | 59 | 32 |

As you'll note, the differences in net trip generation are very marginal - please review and let us know if you are both more comfortable with one over the other. Because this development application is going in as a PUD, I am comfortable with the trip generation and it seems appropriate to use this land use. But, given that we know the land use mix, I am open to either approach. Thanks in advance - please let us know your thoughts.

Thanks in advance,
Diego and Amy

Diego Arguea, P.E. | Associate Engineer | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.
d: 503.535.7462-1462 (ext) | o: 503.228.5230 | c: 503.334.3183

From: Mike Miller [mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us](mailto:mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us)
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2020 10:21 AM
To: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Cc: Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com)
Subject: RE: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5
Hi Diego,
Just left you a message. Sorry that yesterday did not work. I was just stepping into a meeting when you called and then I had an executive session with City Council plus our regular Council meeting last night.

I will be on the road traveling to Eugene to meet with Lane County at 11am and will be back in Florence after 3:30pm. I have a meeting scheduled with the City Manager, but should be available later after 4:30pm today.

If that doesn't work, I do have time available after 10am Wednesday.

Thank you,

Mike

From: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Sent: Monday, January 6, 2020 2:44 PM
To: Mike Miller [mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us](mailto:mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us)
Cc: Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com)
Subject: FW: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5

Hi Mike,

Just left a message with Sandy (receptionist?) regarding our transportation work in Florence. I am available the rest of the afternoon and have some flexibility tomorrow afternoon. Please let me know when is a good time to chat about the scope of the transportation work - thanks in advance!

Thanks,
Diego

Diego Arguea, P.E. | Associate Engineer | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.
d: 503.535.7462-1462 (ext) | o: 503.228.5230 | c: 503.334.3183

From: BLAIR Keith P [Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us)
Sent: Friday, January 03, 2020 7:19 AM
To: BAUMGARTNER Douglas G [Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us); Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Cc: Mike.Miller@ci.florence.or.us; Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com); UPTON Dorothy J
[Dorothy.J.UPTON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Dorothy.J.UPTON@odot.state.or.us); NELSON Brian S * Scott [Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us)
Subject: RE: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5

Doug and Diego:
Thank you for passing along this scoping letter. My comments are:

1. Traffic study should be consistent with ODOT's Analysis Procedures Manual (APM) https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Pages/APM.aspx
2. Does the City concur with the proposed Trip Distribution? It appears the assumed $30 \%(10 \%$ to/from north, $20 \%$ to/from south) of the total trips accessing the US-101/35 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is low, but I concur that it appears this intersection will not trigger ODOT's 50 peak hour net trip increase threshold to recommend study of the intersection. That said, I am still available and willing to review the draft traffic study as a resource for the City.
3. The OHP mobility target for the US-101/35 $5^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is actually 0.85 rather than 0.90 as cited within the scoping letter (statewide highway, non-OHP freight route, 40 MPH ).
4. The citation within ODOT's APM about avoiding the use of seasonal adjustments above $30 \%$ is not intended to limit the adjustment itself, but rather identify the least appropriate months during the year to conduct traffic counts. Due to the seasonal trending nature of the local transportation network, traffic counts at the US-101/35 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection should be collected between March 1 and November 15. However, if the City will accept December counts for the purpose of this traffic
study, Region Traffic recommends a seasonal adjustment of 1.76 for the US-101/35 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection based on an average of the following trends:
a. 1.84 using Florence ATR 20-026 and the Average Daily Traffic method (as opposed to the Average Weekday Traffic method)
b. 1.49 using the Coastal Destination trend (the proposed calculation must have included an error)
c. 1.96 using the Coastal Destination Route trend (the proposed calculation must have included an error)
5. Per Table 3.3 of ODOT's Development Review Guidelines, for a development of this size ( $1,000-$ 2,999 ADT), Region Traffic recommends the following analysis scenario years:
a. Existing (2019)
b. Opening Year (2021)
i. Background
ii. Total
c. Opening Year +5 Years (2026)
i. Background
ii. Total

I hope the above information will help, but please let me know if there are any more questions or if I may be of any further assistance. Thanks!

Keith P. Blair, P.E.
Interim Traffic Analysis Engineer | ODOT Region 2
455 Airport Rd SE, Bldg. A | Salem, Oregon 97301
(503) 986-2857 | Keith.P.Blair@odot.state.or.us

ODOT's mission is to provide a safe and reliable multimodal transportation system that connects people and helps Oregon's communities and economy thrive.

From: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Sent: Friday, December 27, 2019 3:24 PM
To: NELSON Brian S * Scott [Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us)
Cc: BAUMGARTNER Douglas G [Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us); Mike.Miller@ci.florence.or.us; Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com); BLAIR Keith P [Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us)
Subject: RE: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5

## Hi Scott -

Thanks for email. I was also told that Keith Blair is someone who has been involved in development review? We are currently scoping, but we are on a fast track to deliver this project by end of January. I have included the scoping memorandum attached for your reference. Note that the only intersection under ODOT jurisdiction is $35^{\text {th }}$ Ave/Hwy 101, but we do not estimate more than 50 peak hour trips to this intersection, so, ultimately, it may even not be required for study - I will defer to you. If it is required, please confirm the seasonal adjustment methodology.

Thanks!
Diego

Diego Arguea, P.E. | Associate Engineer | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.
d: 503.535.7462-1462 (ext) | o: 503.228.5230 | c: 503.334.3183

From: NELSON Brian S * Scott [Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us)
Sent: Thursday, December 26, 2019 2:57 PM
To: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Cc: BAUMGARTNER Douglas G [Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us)
Subject: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5

Hello Diego, I here you are working on a TIS in Florence. Doug Baumgartner is our development review coordinator for that area, however Doug is out until January 6 th. In the meantime I can help you get started. Are you looking for a scope or are you beyond that?
thanks

## B Scott Nelson, P.E.

Region 2 Access Management Engineer

455 Airport Rd SE, Bldg. B
Salem, OR 97301
Office 503.986.2882
Cell 503.602.0703

## Attachment B <br> Level-of-Service Criteria

## DESCRIPTION OF LEVEL OF SERVICE

Level of service (LOS) is a concept developed to quantify the degree of comfort (including such elements as travel time, number of stops, total amount of stopped delay, and impediments caused by other vehicles) afforded to drivers as they travel through an intersection or roadway segment. Six grades are used to denote the various level of service from " $A$ " to " $F$ ". ${ }^{1}$

## SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

The six level-of-service grades are described qualitatively for signalized intersections in Table B1. Additionally, Table B2 identifies the relationship between level of service and average control delay per vehicle. Control delay is defined to include initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. Using this definition, Level of Service " $D$ " is generally considered to represent the minimum acceptable design standard.

Table B1: Level-of-Service Definitions (Signalized Intersections)

| Level of Service | Average Delay per Vehicle |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | Very low average control delay, less than 10 seconds per vehicle. This occurs when progression is extremely favorable, and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay. |
| B | Average control delay is greater than 10 seconds per vehicle and less than or equal to 20 seconds per vehicle. This generally occurs with good progression and/or short cycle lengths. More vehicles stop than for a level of service A, causing higher levels of average delay. |
| C | Average control delay is greater than 20 seconds per vehicle and less than or equal to 35 seconds per vehicle. These higher delays may result from fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at this level, although many still pass through the intersection without stopping. |
| D | Average control delay is greater than 35 seconds per vehicle and less than or equal to 55 seconds per vehicle. The influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle length, or high volume/capacity ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable. |
| E | Average control delay is greater than 55 seconds per vehicle and less than or equal to 80 seconds per vehicle. This is usually considered to be the limit of acceptable delay. These high delay values generally (but not always) indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high volume/capacity ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences. |
| F | Average control delay is more than 80 seconds per vehicle. This is considered to be unacceptable to most drivers. This condition often occurs with oversaturation. It may also occur at high volume/capacity ratios below 1.0 with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also contribute to such high delay values. |

[^4]Table B2: Level-of-Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections

| Level of <br> Service | Average Control Delay per Vehicle (Seconds) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $<10.0$ |
| B | $>10$ and $\leq 20$ |
| C | $>20$ and $\leq 35$ |
| D | $>35$ and $\leq 55$ |
| E | $>55$ and $\leq 80$ |
| F | $>80$ |

## UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

Unsignalized intersections include two-way stop-controlled (TWSC) and all-way stop-controlled (AWSC) intersections. The Highway Capacity Manual, $6^{\text {th }}$ edition (HCM) provides models for estimating control delay at both TWSC and AWSC intersections. A qualitative description of the various service levels associated with an unsignalized intersection is presented in Table B3. A quantitative definition of level of service for unsignalized intersections is presented in Table B4. Using this definition, Level of Service "E" is generally considered to represent the minimum acceptable design standard.

Table B3: Level-of-Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections

| Level of Service | Average Delay per Vehicle to Minor Street |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | - Nearly all drivers find freedom of operation. <br> - Very seldom is there more than one vehicle in queue. |
| B | - Some drivers begin to consider the delay an inconvenience. <br> - Occasionally there is more than one vehicle in queue. |
| C | - Many times there is more than one vehicle in queue. <br> - Most drivers feel restricted, but not objectionably so. |
| D | - Often there is more than one vehicle in queue. <br> - Drivers feel quite restricted. |
| E | - Represents a condition in which the demand is near or equal to the probable maximum number of vehicles that can be accommodated by the movement. <br> - There is almost always more than one vehicle in queue. <br> - Drivers find the delays approaching intolerable levels. |
| F | - Forced flow. <br> - Represents an intersection failure condition that is caused by geometric and/or operational constraints external to the intersection. |

Table B4: Level-of-Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections

| Level of <br> Service | Average Control Delay per Vehicle (Seconds) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $<10.0$ |
| B | $>10.0$ and $\leq 15.0$ |
| C | $>15.0$ and $\leq 25.0$ |
| D | $>25.0$ and $\leq 35.0$ |
| E | $>35.0$ and $\leq 50.0$ |
| F | $>50.0$ |

It should be noted that the level-of-service criteria for unsignalized intersections are somewhat different than the criteria used for signalized intersections. The primary reason for this difference is that drivers expect different levels of performance from different kinds of transportation facilities. The expectation is that a signalized intersection is designed to carry higher traffic volumes than an unsignalized intersection. Additionally, there are a number of driver behavior considerations that combine to make delays at signalized intersections less galling than at unsignalized intersections. For example, drivers at signalized intersections are able to relax during the red interval, while drivers on the minor street approaches to TWSC intersections must remain attentive to the task of identifying acceptable gaps and vehicle conflicts. Also, there is often much more variability in the amount of delay experienced by individual drivers at unsignalized intersections than signalized intersections. For these reasons, it is considered that the control delay threshold for any given level of service is less for an unsignalized intersection than for a signalized intersection. While overall intersection level of service is calculated for AWSC intersections, level of service is only calculated for the minor approaches and the major street left turn movements at TWSC intersections. No delay is assumed to the major street through movements. For TWSC intersections, the overall intersection level of service remains undefined: level of service is only calculated for each minor street lane.

In the performance evaluation of TWSC intersections, it is important to consider other measures of effectiveness (MOEs) in addition to delay, such as $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios for individual movements, average queue lengths, and $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue lengths. By focusing on a single MOE for the worst movement only, such as delay for the minor-street left turn, users may make inappropriate traffic control decisions. The potential for making such inappropriate decisions is likely to be particularly pronounced when the HCM level-of-service thresholds are adopted as legal standards, as is the case in many public agencies.

## Attachment C

Traffic Count Data


Comments:



Comments:



Comments:


Comments:

| $\begin{array}{r} 121 \div 21 \\ 131 \\ 207 \Rightarrow 55 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | k-Hou <br> 15-M <br> Qua <br> DATA TH <br> $d$ | 7: | AM <br> AM <br> Co <br> COM | 8:35 $-8: 10$ | M AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Min Count Period Beginning At | Oak St(Northbound) |  |  |  | Oak St(Southbound) |  |  |  | 35th St(Eastbound) |  |  |  | 35th St(Westbound) |  |  |  | $\text { Total }\left\|\begin{array}{l} \text { Hourly } \\ \text { Totals } \end{array}\right\|$ |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 13 |  |
| 7:05 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 |  |
| 7:10 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 14 |  |
| 7:15 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 |  |
| 7:20 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 21 |  |
| 7:25 AM | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 |  |
| 7:35 AM | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 27 |  |
| 7:40 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 25 |  |
| 7:45 AM | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 45 |  |
| 7:50 AM | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 30 |  |
| 7:55 AM | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 275 |
| 8:00 AM | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 304 |
| 8:05 AM | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 334 |
| 8:10 AM | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 362 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 379 |
| 8:20 AM | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 396 |
| 8:25 AM | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 400 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 413 |
| 8:35 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 407 |
| 8:40 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 402 |
| 8:45 AM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 382 |
| 8:50 AM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 392 |
| 8:55 AM | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 372 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 20 | 36 | 24 | 0 | 4 | 36 | 44 | 0 | 12 | 144 | 100 | 0 | 8 | 68 | 0 | 0 |  | 96 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses Pedestrians Bicycles Scooters | 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 |  | 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 |  | 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 8 1 |  | 0 0 | 8 0 0 | 0 0 |  |  | 6 8 1 |

Comments:


Comments:

## Attachment D

## Existing Traffic Operations

Worksheets

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 33 | 102 | 49 | 49 | 192 | 92 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 33 | 102 | 49 | 49 | 192 | 92 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 21 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 43 | 134 | 64 | 64 | 253 | 121 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 723 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 128 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 96 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 627 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.61 | 6.25 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.61 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.61 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.689 | 3.345 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 366 | 952 | - | - | 1458 | - |
| Stage 1 | 882 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 498 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 298 | 952 | - | - | 1458 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 298 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 882 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 405 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 13.1 |  | 0 |  | 5.4 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 620 | 1458 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.287 | 0.173 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 13.1 | 8 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 1.2 | 0.6 | - |








| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | r |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 284 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 284 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 374 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | r |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 284 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 284 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 374 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | ajor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 573 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 199 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 199 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 374 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 484 | 847 | - | - | 1385 | - |
| Stage 1 | 839 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 700 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 484 | 847 | - | - | 1385 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 484 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 839 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 700 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | - | 1385 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | - | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 9.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 83 | 315 | 93 | 51 | 153 | 93 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 83 | 315 | 93 | 51 | 153 | 93 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Mvmt Flow | 89 | 339 | 100 | 55 | 165 | 100 |







| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 47 | 299 | 23 | 12 | 323 | 2 | 34 | 33 | 25 | 17 | 23 | 72 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 47 | 299 | 23 | 12 | 323 | 2 | 34 | 33 | 25 | 17 | 23 | 72 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 53 | 336 | 26 | 13 | 363 | 2 | 38 | 37 | 28 | 19 | 26 | 81 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 246 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 246 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 439 | 0 | 0 | 265 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | MF |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 246 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 246 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 439 | 0 | 0 | 265 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 704 | 439 | 0 | 0 | 439 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 439 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 265 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 406 | 622 | - | - | 1132 | - |
| Stage 1 | 654 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 784 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 406 | 622 | - | - | 1132 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 406 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 654 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 784 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | - | 1132 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | - | 0 | - |

## Attachment E Crash Data

Intersectional Crashes at 35th St \& Rhododendron Dr January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2017

| COLLISION TYPE | FATAL CRASHES | $\begin{gathered} \text { NON- } \\ \text { FATAL } \\ \text { CRASHES } \end{gathered}$ | PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY | TOTAL CRASHES | PEOPLE <br> KILLED | PEOPLE INJURED | TRUCKS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DRY } \\ \text { SURF } \end{gathered}$ | WET SURF | DAY | DARK | INTERSECTION | INTERSECTION RELATED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF- } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

YEAR.
TOTAL
FINAL TOTAL

Disclaimers: Effective 2016, collection of "Property Damage Only" (PDO) crash data elements was reduced for vehicles and participants. Age, Gender, License, Error and other elements are no longer available for PDO crash reporting. Please keep this in mind when comparing 2016 PDO crash data to prior years.

A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not necessarily reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers may result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file. Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics. For all disclaimers,
see https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Data/documents/Crash_Data_Disclaimers.pdf.

Intersectional Crashes at 35th St \& Royal St Georges Dr / Wecoma Lp
January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2017


YEAR.
TOTAL
FINAL TOTAL

Disclaimers: Effective 2016, collection of "Property Damage Only" (PDO) crash data elements was reduced for vehicles and participants. Age, Gender, License, Error and other elements are no longer available for PDO crash reporting. Please keep this in mind when comparing 2016 PDO crash data to prior years.

A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not necessarily reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers may result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file. Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics. For all disclaimers,
see https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Data/documents/Crash_Data_Disclaimers.pdf.

Intersectional Crashes at 35th St \& Kingwood St January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2017

| COLLISION TYPE | FATAL CRASHES | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NON- } \\ \text { FATAL } \\ \text { CRASHES } \end{array}$ | PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY | TOTAL CRASHES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PEOPLE } \\ & \text { KILLED } \end{aligned}$ | PEOPLE <br> INJURED | TRUCKS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DRY } \\ & \text { SURF } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WET } \\ & \text { SURF } \end{aligned}$ | DAY | DARK | INTERSECTION | INTERSECTION RELATED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF- } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

YEAR.
TOTAL
FINAL TOTAL

Disclaimers: Effective 2016, collection of "Property Damage Only" (PDO) crash data elements was reduced for vehicles and participants. Age, Gender, License, Error and other elements are no longer available for PDO crash reporting. Please keep this in mind when comparing 2016 PDO crash data to prior years.

A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not necessarily reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers may result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file. Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics. For all disclaimers,
see https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Data/documents/Crash_Data_Disclaimers.pdf.

Intersectional Crashes at 35th St \& Oak St
January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2017

| COLLISION TYPE | FATAL CRASHES | NON- <br> FATAL <br> CRASHES | PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY | TOTAL CRASHES | PEOPLE <br> KILLED | PEOPLE INJURED | TRUCKS | DRY SURF | WET <br> SURF | DAY | DARK | INTERSECTION | INTERSECTION RELATED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF- } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR: 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ANGLE | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 2016 TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ANGLE | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| TURNING MOVEMENTS | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2015 TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ANGLE | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| FINAL TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

Disclaimers: Effective 2016, collection of "Property Damage Only" (PDO) crash data elements was reduced for vehicles and participants. Age, Gender, License, Error and other elements are no longer available for PDO crash reporting. Please keep this in mind when comparing 2016 PDO crash data to prior years.

A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not necessarily reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers may result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file. Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics. For all disclaimers,
see https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Data/documents/Crash_Data_Disclaimers.pdf.


| 00239 | N N N | $01 / 17 / 2016$ |  | 17 | OAK ST |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NONE | N | Sun | 5 P | 0 | 35 TH | ST |
| NO | 43 | 59 | 48.92 | -124 | 6 | 14.29 |

No $\quad$| 43 | 59 | 48.92 | -124 | 6 | 14.29 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad 1$

$$
\text { January 1, } 2013 \text { through December 31, } 2017
$$

| Code | DESCRIPTİN | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 000 | NONE | NO ACTION OR NON-WARRANTED |
| 001 | SKIDDED | SkIDDED |
| 002 | on/off V | GEtting On OR Off Stopped or parked vehicle |
| 003 | LOAD OVR | OVERHANGING LOAD STRUCK ANOTHER VEHICLE, ETC. |
| 006 | SLOW DN | SLOWED DOWN |
| 007 | AVoiding | AVOIDING MANEUVER |
| 008 | PAR PARK | PARALLEL PARKING |
| 009 | ANG PARK | ANGLE PARKING |
| 010 | Interfere | PASSENGER Interfering with driver |
| 011 | Stopped | Stopped in traffic not waiting to make a left turn |
| 012 | STP/L TRN | Stopped because of left turn Signal or waiting, etc. |
| 013 | STP TURN | Stopped While executing A turn |
| 014 | EMR V PKD | Emergency vehicle legally parked in the roadway |
| 015 | GO A/StOP | PROCEED AFTER Stopping for a stop Sign/flashing Red. |
| 016 | TRN A/RED | TURNED ON RED AFTER STOPPING |
| 017 | LOSTCTRL | LOST CONTROL OF VEHICLE |
| 018 | EXIT DWY | Entering Street or highway from alley or dilveway |
| 019 | ENTR DWY | ENTERING ALLEY OR DRIVEWAY FROM Street or highway |
| 020 | STR ENTR | BEFORE ENTERING ROADWAY, STRUCK PEDEStrian, Etc. On SIDEWALK OR SHOULDER |
| 021 | NO DRVR | CAR RAN AWAY - NO DRIVER |
| 022 | PREV COL | Struck, OR WAS Struck by, vehicle or pedestrian in prior collision before acc. Stabilized |
| 023 | StALLed | VEHICLE StALLED OR DISABLED |
| 024 | DRVR DEAD | DEAD BY UNASSOCIATED CAUSE |
| 025 | FAtigue | FAtIGUED, SLEEPY, ASLEEP |
| 026 | SUN | DRIVER BLINDED BY SUN |
| 027 | HDLGHTS | DRIVER BLINDED BY HEADLIGHTS |
| 028 | ILLNESS | PHYSICALLY ILL |
| 029 | THRU MED | VEHICLE CROSSED, PLUNGED OVER, OR THROUGH MEDIAN BARRIER |
| 030 | PURSUIT | PURSUING OR ATtempting to Stop a vehicle |
| 031 | PASSING | PASSING SITUATION |
| 032 | PRKOFFRD | VEHICLE PARKED BEYOND CURB OR SHOULDER |
| 033 | CROS MED | VEHICLE CROSSED EARTH OR GRASS MEDIAN |
| 034 | $\mathrm{X} \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{SGNL}$ | Crossing at intersection - no traffic signal present |
| 035 | X w/ SGNL | Crossing at intersection - traffic signal present |
| 036 | DIAGONAL | CROSSING AT INTERSECTION - DIAGONALLY |
| 037 | BTWN INT | CROSSING BETWEEN INTERSECTIONS |
| 038 | DISTRACT | DRIVER'S Attention distracted |
| 039 | W/TRAF-S | WALKING, RUNNING, RIding, ETC., ON SHOULDER WITH TRAFFIC |
| 040 | A/traf-s | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON SHOULDER FACING TRAFFIC |
| 041 | W/TRAF-P | WALKING, RUNNING, RIdIng, etc., ON PAVEMENT WITH TRAFFIC |
| 042 | A/traf-p | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON PAVEMENT FACING TRAFFIC |
| 043 | PLAYINRD | PLAYing in street or road |
| 044 | push mV | PUSHING OR WORKING ON VEHICLE IN ROAD OR ON SHOULDER |
| 045 | WORK ON | WORKING In ROADWAY OR ALONG SHOULDER |
| 046 | W/ TRAFIC | NON-MOTORIST WALKING, RUNNING, RIding, ETC. WIth traffic |
| 047 | A/ TRAFIC | NON-MOTORIST WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC. FACING TRAFFIC |
| 050 | LAY ON RD | Standing or lying in roadway |
| 051 | ENT OfFRD | Entering / Starting in traffic lane from off road |

## ACTION CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| 00 | NO CODE | NO CAUSE ASSOCIATED AT THIS LEVEL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 01 | TOO-FAST | TOO FAST FOR CONDITIONS (NOT EXCEED POSTED SPEED. |
| 02 | NO-YIELD | DID NOT YIELD RIGHT-OF-WAY |
| 03 | PAS-STOP | PASSED STOP SIGN OR RED FLASHER |
| 04 | DIS SIG | DISREGARDED TRAFFIC SIGNAL |
| 05 | LEFT-CTR | DROVE LEFT OF CENTER ON TWO-WAY ROAD; STRADDLING |
| 06 | IMP-OVER | IMPROPER OVERTAKING |
| 07 | TOO-CLOS | FOLLOWED TOO CLOSELY |
| 08 | IMP-TURN | MADE IMPROPER TURN |
| 09 | DRINKING | ALCOHOL OR DRUG INVOLVED |
| 10 | OTHR-IMP | OTHER IMPROPER DRIVING |
| 11 | MECH-DEF | MECHANICAL DEFECT |
| 12 | OTHER | OTHER (NOT IMPROPER DRIVING) |
| 13 | IMP LNC | IMPROPER CHANGE OF TRAFFIC LANES |
| 14 | DIS TCD | DISREGARDED OTHER TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE |
| 15 | WRNG WAY | WRONG WAY ON ONE-WAY ROAD; WRONG SIDE DIVIDED ROi |
| 16 | FATIGUE | DRIVER DROWSY/FATIGUED/SLEEPY |
| 17 | ILLNESS | PHYSICAL ILLNESS |
| 18 | IN RDWY | NON-MOTORIST ILLEGALLY IN ROADWAY |
| 19 | NT VISBL | NON-MOTORIST NOT VISIBLE; NON-REFLECTIVE CLOTHIN |
| 20 | IMP PKNG | VEHICLE IMPROPERLY PARKED |
| 21 | DEF STER | DEFECTIVE STEERING MECHANISM |
| 22 | DEF BRKE | INADEQUATE OR NO BRAKES |
| 24 | LOADSHFT | VEHICLE LOST LOAD OR LOAD SHIFTED |
| 25 | TIREFAIL | TIRE FAILURE |
| 26 | PHANTOM | PHANTOM / NON-CONTACT VEHICLE |
| 27 | INATTENT | INATTENTION |
| 28 | NM INATT | NON-MOTORIST INATTENTION |
| 29 | FAVOID | FAILED TO AVOID VEHICLE AHEAD |
| 30 | SPEED | DRIVING IN EXCESS OF POSTED SPEED |
| 31 | RACING | SPEED RACING (PER PAR) |
| 32 | CARELESS | CARELESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 33 | RECKLESS | RECKLESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 34 | AGGRESV | AGGRESSIVE DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 35 | RDRAGE | ROAD RAGE (PER PAR) |
| 40 | VIEW OBS | VIEW OBSCURED |
| 50 | USED MDN | IMPROPER USE OF MEDIAN OR SHOULDER |
| 51 | FAIL LN | FAILED TO MAINTAIN LANE |
| 52 | OFF RD | RAN OFF ROAD |


| \& | OTH | MISCELL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - | BACK | BACKING |
| 0 | PED |  |


| 1 | ANGL | PEDESTRIA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | HEAD | ANGLE |


| 2 | HEAD | HEAD-ON |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | REAR | REAR |

3 REAR REAR-END

| 4 | SS-M | SIDESWIPE - MEETING |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

5 SS-O SIDESWIPE - OVERTAKIng
6 TURN TURNING MOVEMENT
PARK PARKING MANEUVER
8 NCOL NON-COLLISION
9 FIX FIXED OBJECT OR OTHER OBJECT

## CRASH TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

CRASH SHORT
TYPE DESCRIPTION LONG DESCRIPTION

| $\&$ | OVERTURN | OVERTURNED |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | NON-COLL | OTHER NON-COLLISIO |


| 0 | NON-COLL | OTHER NON-COLLISION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | OTH RDWY | MOTOR VEHICLE ON OTHER ROADWAY |


| 1 | OTH RDWY | MOTOR VEHICLE ON OTH |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | PRKD MV | PARKED MOTOR VEHICLE |


| LIC | SHORT |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| 0 | NONE | NOT LICENSED (HAD NEVER BEEN LICENSED) |
| 1 | OR-Y | VALID OREGON LICENSE |
| 2 | OTH-Y | VALID LICENSE, OTHER STATE OR COUNTRY |
| 3 | SUSP | SUSPENDED/REVOKED |
| 4 | EXP | EXPIRED |
| 8 | N-VAL | OTHER NON-VALID LICENSE |
| 9 | UNK | UNKNOWN IF DRIVER WAS LICENSED AT TIME OF CRASH |


| RES <br> CODE | SHORT <br> DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |

## ERROR CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| ERROR CODE | SHORT <br> DESCRIPTION | FULL DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 000 | NONE | NO ERROR |
| 001 | WIDE TRN | WIDE TURN |
| 002 | CUT CORN | CUT CORNER ON TURN |
| 003 | FAIL TRN | FAILED TO OBEY MANDATORY TRAFFIC TURN SIGNAL, SIGN OR LANE MARKINGS |
| 004 | L IN TRF | LEFT TURN IN FRONT OF ONCOMING TRAFFIC |
| 005 | L PROHIB | LEFT TURN WHERE PROHIBITED |
| 006 | FRM WRng | TURNED FROM WRONG LANE |
| 007 | TO WRONG | TURNED INTO WRONG LANE |
| 008 | ILLEG U | U-TURNED ILLEGALLY |
| 009 | IMP STOP | IMPROPERLY STOPPED IN TRAFFIC LANE |
| 010 | IMP SIG | IMPROPER SIGNAL OR FAILURE TO SIGNAL |
| 011 | IMP BACK | BACKING IMPROPERLY (NOT PARKING) |
| 012 | IMP PARK | IMPROPERLY PARKED |
| 013 | UNPARK | Improper Start leaving Parked position |
| 014 | IMP STRT | IMPROPER START FROM STOPPED POSITION |
| 015 | IMP LGHT | IMPROPER OR NO LIGHTS (VEHICLE IN TRAFFIC) |
| 016 | InAttent | INATTENTION (FAILURE TO DIM LIGHTS PRIOR TO 4/1/97) |
| 017 | UNSF VEH | DRIVING UNSAFE VEHICLE (NO OTHER ERROR APPARENT) |
| 018 | Oth PARK | ENTERING/EXITING PARKED POSITION W/ InSufficient Clearance; other improper Parking maneuver |
| 019 | DIS DRIV | DISREGARDED OTHER DRIVER'S SIGNAL |
| 020 | DIS SGNL | DISREGARDED TRAFFIC SIGNAL |
| 021 | RAN Stop | DISREGARDED Stop Sign or flashing red |
| 022 | DIS SIGN | DISREGARDED WARNING SIGN, FLARES OR FLASHING AMBER |
| 023 | DIS OFCR | DISREGARDED POLICE OFFICER OR FLAGMAN |
| 024 | DIS EMER | DISREGARDED SIREN OR WARNING OF EMERGENCY VEHICLE |
| 025 | DIS RR | DISREGARDED RR SIGNAL, RR SIGN, OR RR FLAGMAN |
| 026 | REAR-END | FAILED TO AVOID Stopped or parked vehicle ahead other than School bus |
| 027 | BIKE ROW | DID NOT HAVE RIGHT-OF-WAY OVER PEDALCYCLIST |
| 028 | No Row | DID NOT HAVE RIGHT-OF-WAY |
| 029 | PED ROW | FAILED TO YIELD RIGHT-OF-WAY to pedestrian |
| 030 | PAS CURV | PASSING ON A CURVE |
| 031 | PAS WRng | PASSING ON THE WRONG SIDE |
| 032 | PAS tANG | PASSING ON STRAIGHT ROAD UNDER UNSAFE CONDITIONS |
| 033 | PAS X -WK | PASSED VEHICLE Stopped at crosswalk for pedestrian |
| 034 | PAS INTR | PASSING AT INTERSECTION |
| 035 | PAS HILL | PASSING ON CREST Of hill |
| 036 | N/PAS ZN | PASSING IN "NO PASSING" ZONE |
| 037 | PAS TRAF | PASSING In FRONT OF ONCOMING TRAFFIC |
| 038 | CUT-IN | CUtting in (TWO LANES - TWO WAY OnLy) |
| 039 | WRNGSIDE | DRIVING ON WRONG SIDE Of the road (2-WAY UNDIVIDED ROADWAYS) |


| ERROR | SHORT DESCRIPTION | FULL DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 040 | THRU MED | DRIVING THROUGH SAFETY ZONE OR OVER ISLAND |
| 041 | F/ST BUS | FAILED TO STOP FOR SCHOOL BUS |
| 042 | F/SLO MV | FAILED TO DECREASE SPEED FOR SLOWER MOVING VEHICLE |
| 43 | too Close | FOLLOWING TOO CLOSELY (MUST BE ON OFFICER'S REPORT) |
| 044 | STRDL LN | STRADDLING OR DRIVING ON WRONG LANES |
| 045 | IMP CHG | ImPROPER CHANGE OF TRAFFIC LANES |
| 046 | WRNG WAY | WRONG WAY ON ONE-WAY ROADWAY; WRONG SIDE DIVIDED ROAD |
| 047 | BASCRULE | DRIVING TOO FAST FOR CONDITIONS (NOT EXCEEDING POSTED SPEED) |
| 048 | OPN DOOR | OPENED DOOR INTO ADJACENT TRAFFIC LANE |
| 049 | Impeding | IMPEDING TRAFFIC |
| 050 | SPEED | DRIVING In EXCESS OF POSTED SPEED |
| 051 | RECKLESS | RECKLESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 052 | CARELESS | CARELESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 053 | RACING | SPEED RACING (PER PAR) |
| 054 | X N/SGNL | CROSSING AT Intersection, NO TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRESENT |
| 055 | X W/SGNL | CROSSING AT INTERSECTION, TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRESENT |
| 056 | DIAGONAL | CROSSING AT INTERSECTION - DIAGONALLY |
| 057 | BTWN INT | CROSSING BETWEEN INTERSECTIONS |
| 059 | W/TRAF-S | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON SHOULDER WITH TRAFFIC |
| 060 | A/TRAF-S | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON SHOULDER FACING TRAFFIC |
| 061 | W/TRAF-P | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON PAVEMENT WITH TRAFFIC |
| 062 | A/TRAF-P | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON PAVEMENT FACING TRAFFIC |
| 063 | PLAYINRD | PLAYING IN STREET OR ROAD |
| 064 | PUSH MV | PUSHING OR WORKING ON VEHICLE IN ROAD OR ON SHOULDER |
| 065 | WORK IN RD | WORKING IN ROADWAY OR ALONG SHOULDER |
| 070 | LAY ON RD | Standing Or Lying in roadway |
| 071 | NM IMP USE | IMPROPER USE OF TRAFFIC LANE BY NON-MOTORIST |
| 073 | ELUDING | ELUding / Attempt to elude |
| 079 | F NEG CURV | FAILED TO NeGotiate a curve |
| 080 | FAIL LN | FAILED TO MAINTAIN LANE |
| 081 | OFF RD | RAN OFF ROAD |
| 082 | No CLEAR | DRIVER MISJUDGED CLEARANCE |
| 083 | OVRSTEER | OVER-CORRECTING |
| 084 | NOT USED | CODE NOT IN USE |
| 085 | OVRLOAD | OVERLOADING OR IMPROPER LOADING OF VEHICLE WITH CARGO OR PASSENGERS |
| 97 | UNA DIS TC | UNABLE TO DETERMINE WHICH DRIVER DISREGARDED TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE |

EVENT SHORT
CODE DESCRIPTION

| 001 | FEL/JUMP | OCCUPANT FELL, JUMPED OR WAS EJECTED FROM MOVING VEhICLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 002 | INTERFER | PASSENGER INTERFERED WITH DRIVER |
| 003 | bug inte | ANIMAL OR INSECT IN VEHICLE INTERFERED WITH DRIVER |
| 004 | INDRCT PED | PEDESTRIAN INDIRECTLY INVOLVED (NOT STRUCK) |
| 005 | SUB-PED | "SUB-PED": PEDESTRIAN INJURED SUBSEQUENT TO COLLISION, ETC. |
| 006 | INDRCT BIK | PEDALCYCLIST INDIRECTLY INVOLVED (NOT STRUCK) |
| 007 | HITCHIKR | HITCHHIKER (SOLICITING A RIDE) |
| 008 | PSNGR TOW | PASSENGER OR NON-MOTORIST BEING TOWED OR PUSHED ON CONVEYANCE |
| 009 | ON/OFF V | GEtting On/OFF Stopped/parked vehicle (OCCUPANTS Only; must have physical contact w/ vehic |
| 010 | SUB OTRN | OVERTURNED AFTER FIRST HARMFUL EVENT |
| 011 | MV PUSHD | VEHICLE BEING PUSHED |
| 012 | MV TOWED | VEHICLE TOWED OR HAD BEEN TOWING ANOTHER VEHICLE |
| 013 | FORCED | VEHICLE FORCED BY IMPACT INTO ANOTHER VEHICLE, PEDALCYCLIST OR PEDESTRIAN |
| 014 | SET MOTN | VEHICLE SET IN MOTION BY NON-DRIVER (CHILD RELEASED BRAKES, ETC.) |
| 015 | RR ROW | AT OR ON RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY (NOT LIGHT RAIL) |
| 016 | LT RL Row | AT OR ON LIGHT-RAIL RIGHT-OF-WAY |
| 017 | RR HIT V | TRAIN STRUCK VEhicle |
| 018 | V HIT RR | VEhicle struck train |
| 019 | HIT RR CAR | vehicle struck railroad car on roadway |
| 020 | JACKNIFE | JACKKNIFE; TRAILER OR TOWED VEHICLE STRUCK TOWING VEHICLE |
| 021 | TRL OTRN | TRAILER OR TOWED VEHICLE OVERTURNED |
| 022 | CN BROKE | TRAILER CONNECTION BROKE |
| 023 | DETACH TRL | DETACHED TRAILING OBJECT STRUCK OTHER VEHICLE, NON-MOTORIST, OR OBJECT |
| 024 | V DOOR OPN | VEHICLE DOOR OPENED INTO ADJACENT TRAFFIC LANE |
| 025 | WHEELOFF | WHEEL CAME OFF |
| 026 | HOOD UP | HOOD FLEW UP |
| 028 | LOAD SHIFT | LOST LOAD, LOAD MOVED OR Shifted |
| 029 | TIREFAIL | TIRE FAILURE |
| 030 | PET | PET: CAT, DOG AND SIMILAR |
| 031 | LVSTOCK | STOCK: COW, CALF, BULL, STEER, SHEEP, ETC. |
| 032 | HORSE | HORSE, MULE, OR DONKEY |
| 033 | HRSE\&RID | HORSE AND RIDER |
| 034 | GAME | WILD AnIMAL, GAME (INCLUDES BIRDS; NOT DEER OR ELK) |
| 035 | DEER ELK | DEER OR ELK, WAPITI |
| 036 | AnML Veh | ANIMAL-DRAWN VEHICLE |
| 037 | CULVERT | CULVERT, OPEN LOW OR HIGH MANHOLE |
| 038 | Atenuatn | IMPACT ATTENUATOR |
| 039 | PK METER | PARKING METER |
| 040 | CURB | CURB (ALSO NARROW SIDEWALKS ON BRIDGES) |
| 041 | JIGGLE | JIGGLE BAR OR TRAFFIC SNAKE FOR CHANNELIZATION |
| 042 | GDRL END | LEADING EDGE OF GUARDRAIL |
| 043 | GARDRAIL | GUARD RAIL (NOT METAL MEDIAN BARRIER) |
| 044 | BARRIER | MEDIAN BARRIER (RAISED OR METAL) |
| 045 | WALL | REtAINING WALL OR TUNNEL WALL |
| 046 | BR RAIL | BRIDGE RAILING OR PARAPET (ON BRIDGE OR APPROACH) |
| 047 | BR ABUTMNT | BRIDGE ABUTMENT (INCLUDED "APPROACH END" THRU 2013) |
| 048 | BR COLMN | BRIDGE PILLAR OR COLUMN |
| 049 | BR GIRDR | BRIDGE GIRDER (HORIZONTAL BRIDGE STRUCTURE OVERHEAD) |
| 050 | ISLAND | TRAFFIC RAISED ISLAND |
| 051 | GORE | GORE |
| 052 | POLE UNK | POLE - TYPE UNKNOWN |
| 053 | POLE UTL | POLE - POWER OR TELEPHONE |
| 054 | ST LIGHT | POLE - Street light only |
| 055 | TRF SGNL | POLE - TRAFFIC SIGNAL AND PED SIGNAL ONLY |
| 056 | SGN BRDG | POLE - SIGN BRIDGE |
| 057 | STOPSIGN | Stop OR YIELD SIGN |

## EVENT CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| CODE | DESCRIPTION | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 058 | OTH SIGN | OTHER SIGN, INCLUDING STREET SIGNS |
| 059 | HYDRANT | HYDRANT |
| 060 | MARKER | DELINEATOR OR MARKER (REFLECTOR POSTS) |
| 061 | MAILBOX | MAILBOX |
| 062 | tree | tree, Stump or shrubs |
| 063 | VEG OHED | tree branch or other vegetation overhead, etc. |
| 064 | WIRE/CBL | WIRE OR CABLe ACROSS OR OVER THE ROAD |
| 065 | TEMP SGN | TEMPORARY SIGN OR BARRICADE IN ROAD, ETC. |
| 066 | PERM SGN | PERMANENT SIGN OR BARRICADE IN/OFF ROAD |
| 067 | SLIDE | SLIDES, FALLEN OR FALLING ROCKS |
| 068 | FRGN OBJ | FOREIGN OBSTRUCTION/DEBRIS IN ROAD (NOT GRAVEL) |
| 069 | EQP WORK | EQUIPMENT WORKING IN/OFF ROAD |
| 070 | OTH EQP | OTHER EQUIPMENT IN OR OFF ROAD (INCLUDES PARKED TRAILER, BOAT) |
| 071 | MAIN EQP | WRECKER, STREET SWEEPER, SNOW PLOW OR SANDING EQUIPMENT |
| 072 | OTHER WALL | ROCK, BRICK OR OTHER SOLID WALL |
| 073 | IRRGL PVMT | OTHER BUMP (NOT SPEED BUMP), POTHOLE OR PAVEMENT IRREGULARITY (PER PAR) |
| 074 | OVERHD OBJ | OTHER OVERHEAD OBJECT (HIGHWAY SIGN, SIGNAL HEAD, ETC.); NOT BRIDGE |
| 075 | CAVE IN | BRIDGE OR ROAD CAVE IN |
| 076 | HI WAter | HIGH WATER |
| 077 | SNO BANK | SNOW BANK |
| 078 | LO-HI EDGE | Low OR HIGH Shoulder at Pavement edge |
| 079 | DITCH | CUT SLOPE OR DITCH EMBANKMENT |
| 080 | OBJ FRM MV | STRUCK BY ROCK OR OTHER OBJECT SET IN MOTION BY OTHER VEHICLE (INCL. LOST LOADS) |
| 081 | FLY-OBJ | STRUCK BY ROCK OR OTHER MOVING OR FLYING OBJECT (NOT SET IN MOTION BY VEHICLE) |
| 082 | VEH HID | VEhicle ObSCURED view |
| 083 | VEG HID | VEGETATION OBSCURED VIEW |
| 084 | BLDG HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY Fence, Sign, Phone booth, etc. |
| 085 | WIND GUST | WIND GUST |
| 086 | IMMERSED | VEHICLE IMMERSED IN BODY OF WATER |
| 087 | FIRE/EXP | FIRE OR EXPLOSION |
| 088 | FENC/BLD | FENCE OR BUILDING, ETC. |
| 089 | OTHR CRASH | CRASH RELATED TO ANOTHER SEPARATE CRASH |
| 090 | TO 1 SIDE | TWO-WAY traffic on divided roadway all routed to one side |
| 091 | BUILDING | BUILDING OR OTHER STRUCTURE |
| 092 | PHANTOM | OTHER (PHANTOM) NON-CONTACT VEHICLE |
| 093 | CELL PHONE | CELL PHONE (ON PAR OR DRIVER IN USE) |
| 094 | VIOL GDL | teenage driver in violation of graduated license pgm |
| 095 | GUY WIRE | GUY WIRE |
| 096 | BERM | BERM (EARTHEN OR GRAVEL MOUND) |
| 097 | GRAVEL | GRAVEL IN ROADWAY |
| 098 | ABR EDGE | ABRUPT EDGE |
| 099 | CELL WTNSD | CELL PHONE USE WITNESSED BY OTHER PARTICIPANT |
| 100 | UNK FIXD | FIXED OBJECT, UNKNOWN TYPE. |
| 101 | OTHER OBJ | NON-FIXED OBJECT, OTHER OR UNKNOWN TYPE |
| 102 | TEXTING | TEXTING |
| 103 | WZ WORKER | WORK ZONE WORKER |
| 104 | ON VEhicle | PASSENGER RIDING ON VEhICLE EXTERIOR |
| 105 | PEDAL PSGR | PASSENGER RIDING ON PEDALCYCLE |
| 106 | MAN WHLCHR | PEDESTRIAN IN NON-MOTORIZED WHEELCHAIR |
| 107 | MTR WHLCHR | PEDESTRIAN IN MOTORIZED Wheelchair |
| 108 | OFFICER | LAW ENFORCEMENT / POLICE OFFICER |
| 109 | SUB-BIKE | "SUB-BIKE": PEDALCYCLIST INJURED SUBSEQUENT TO COLLISION, ETC. |
| 110 | N-MTR | NON-MOTORIST STRUCK VEHICLE |
| 111 | S CAR VS V | Street Car/Troliey (on Rails or overhead wire system) Struck vehicle |
| 112 | v VS S CAR | VEhicle struck street Car/trolley (on Rails or overhead wire system) |
| 113 | S CAR ROW | AT OR ON STREET CAR OR TROLLEY RIGHT-OF-WAY |

# EVENT CODE TRANSLATION LIST 

SHORT
CODE DESCRIPTION LONG DESCRIPTION

| 114 | RR EQUIP | VEHICLE STRUCK RAILROAD EQUIPMENT (NOT TRAIN) ON TRACKS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 115 | DSTRCT GPS | DISTRACTED BY NAVIGATION SYSTEM OR GPS DEVICE |
| 116 | DSTRCT OTH | DISTRACTED BY OTHER ELECTRONIC DEVICE |
| 117 | RR GATE | RAIL CROSSING DROP-ARM GATE |
| 118 | EXPNSN JNT | EXPANSION JOINT |
| 119 | JERSEY BAR | JERSEY BARRIER |
| 120 | WIRE BAR | WIRE OR CABLE MEDIAN BARRIER |
| 121 | FENCE | FENCE |
| 123 | OBJ IN VEH | LOOSE OBJECT IN VEHICLE STRUCK OCCUPANT |
| 124 | SLIPPERY | SLIDING OR SWERVING DUE TO WET, ICY, SLIPPERY OR LOOSE SURFACE (NOT GRAVEL) |
| 125 | SHLDR | SHOULDER GAVE WAY |
| 126 | BOULDER | ROCK (S), BOULDER (NOT GRAVEL; NOT ROCK SLIDE) |
| 127 | LAND SLIDE | ROCK SLIDE OR LAND SLIDE |
| 128 | CURVE INV | CURVE PRESENT AT CRASH LOCATION |
| 129 | HILL INV | VERTICAL GRADE / HILL PRESENT AT CRASH LOCATION |
| 130 | CURVE HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY CURVE |
| 131 | HILL HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY VERICAL GRADE / HILL |
| 132 | WINDOW HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY VEHICLE WINDOW CONDITIONS |
| 133 | SPRAY HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY WATER SPRAY |
| 134 | TORRENTIAL | TORRENTIAL RAIN (EXCEPTIONALLY HEAVY RAIN) |



| CLASS | DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- |
| 01 | RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE |
| 02 | RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER |
| 06 | RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL |
| 07 | RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR |
| 08 | RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR |
| 09 | RURAL LOCAL |
| 11 | URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE |
| 12 | URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXP |
| 14 | URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER |
| 16 | URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL |
| 17 | URAN MAJOR COLLETOR |
| 18 | URBAN MINOR COLLETTOR |
| 19 | URBAN LOCAL |
| 78 | UNKNOWN RURAL SYSTEM |
| 79 | UNKNOWN RURAL NON-SYSTEM |
| 98 | UNKNOWN URBAN SYSTEM |
| 99 | UNKNOWN URBAN NON-SYSTEM |

## INJURY SEVERITY CODE TRANSLATION LIST

## SHORT

| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | KILL | FATAL INJURY (K) |
| 2 | INJA | SUSPECTED SERIOUS INJURY (A) |
| 3 | INJB | SUSPECTED MINOR INJURY (B) |
| 4 | INJC | POSSIBLE INJURY (C) |
| 5 | PRI | DIED PRIOR TO CRASH |
| 7 | NO<5 | NO INJURY- O TO 4 YEARS OF AGE |
| 9 | NONE | NO APPARENT INJURY (0) |

## MEDIAN TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

|  | SHORT |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| 0 | NONE | NO MEDIAN |
| 1 | RSDMD | SOLID MEDIAN BARRIER |
| 2 | DIVMD | EARTH, GRASS OR PAVED MEDIAN |

## LIGHT CONDITION CODE TRANSLATION LIST

## SHORT

| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | UNK | UNKNOWN |
| 1 | DAY | DAYLIGHT |
| 2 | DLIT | DARKNESS - WITH STREET LIGHTS |
| 3 | DARK | DARKNESS - NO STREET LIGHTS |
| 4 | DAWN | DAWN (TWILIGHT) |

5 DUSK DUSK (TWILIGHT)
mileage type code translation list

| CODE | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- |
| 0 | REGULAR MILEAGE |
| T | TEMPORARY |
| Y | SPUR |
| $Z$ | OVERLAPPING |

MOVEMENT TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | UNK | UNKNOWN |
| 1 | STRGHT | STRAIGHT AHEAD |
| 2 | TURN-R | TURNING RIGHT |
| 3 | TURN-L | TUANING LEFT |
| 4 | U-TURN | MARING A U-TURN |
| 5 | BACK | BACKING |
| 6 | STOP | STOPPED IN TRAFFIC |
| 7 | PRKD-P | PARKED - PROPERLY |
| 8 | PRKD-I | PARKED - IMPROPRLY |
| 9 | PARKNG | PARKING MANEUVER |

PARTICIPANT TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LISI

| CODE | SHORT <br> DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |

## traffic control device code translation list

| CODE | SHORT DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 000 | NONE | NO CONTROL |
| 001 | TRF SIGNAL | TRAFFIC SIGNALS |
| 002 | FLASHBCN-R | FLASHING BEACON - RED (STOP) |
| 003 | FLASHBCN-A | FLASHING BEACON - AMBER (SLOW) |
| 004 | STOP SIGN | STOP SIGN |
| 005 | SLOW SIGN | SLOW SIGN |
| 006 | REG-SIGN | REGULATORY SIGN |
| 007 | YIELD | YIELD SIGN |
| 008 | WARNING | WARNING SIGN |
| 009 | CURVE | CURVE SIGN |
| 010 | SCHL X-ING | SCHOOL CROSSING SIGN OR SPECIAL SIGNAL |
| 011 | OFCR/FLAG | POLICE OFFICER, FLAGMAN - SCHOOL PATROL |
| 012 | BRDG-GATE | BRIDGE GATE - BARRIER |
| 013 | TEMP-BARR | TEMPORARY BARRIER |
| 014 | NO-PASS-ZN | NO PASSING ZONE |
| 015 | ONE-WAY | ONE-WAY STREET |
| 016 | CHANNEL | CHANNELIZATINN |
| 017 | MEDAN BAR | MEDIAN BARRIER |
| 018 | PILOT CAR | PILOT CAR |
| 019 | SP PED SIG | SPECIAL PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL |
| 020 | X-BUCK | CROSSBUCK |
| 021 | THR-GN-SIG | THROUGH GREEN ARROW OR SIGNAL |
| 022 | L-GRN-SIG | LEFT TURN GREEN ARROW, LANE MARKINGS, OR SIGNAL |
| 023 | R-GRN-SIG | RIGHT TURN GREEN ARROW, LANE MARKINGS, OR SIGNAL |
| 024 | WIGNG | WIGWAG OR FLASHING LIGHTS W/O DROP-ARM GATE |
| 025 | X-BUCK WRN | CROSSBUCK AND ADVANCE WARNING |
| 026 | WW W/ GATE | FLASHING LIGHTS WITH DROP-ARM GATES |
| 027 | OVRHD SGNL | SUPPLEMENTAL OVERHEAD SIGNAL (RR XING ONLY) |
| 028 | SP RR STOP | SPECIAL RR STOP SIGN |
| 029 | ILUM GRD X | ILLUMINATED GRADE CROSSING |
| 037 | RAMP METER | METERED RAMPS |
| 038 | RUMBLE STR | RUMBLE STRIP |
| 090 | L-TURN REF | LEFT TURN REFUGE (WHEN REFUGE IS INVOLVED) |
| 091 | R-TURN ALL | RIGHT TURN AT ALL TIMES SIGN, ETC. |
| 092 | EMR SGN/FL | EMERGENCY SIGNS OR FLARES |
| 093 | ACCEL LANE | ACCELERATION OR DECELERATION LANES |
| 094 | R-TURN PRO | RIGHT TURN PROHIBITED ON RED AFTER STOPPING |
| 095 | BUS STPSGN | BUS STOP SIGN AND RED LIGHTS |
| 099 | UNKNOWN | UNKNOWN OR NOT DEFINITE |

## VEhICLE TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIS

WEATHER CONDITION CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| CODE | SHORT DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 00 | PDO | NOT COLLECTED FOR PDO CRASHES |
| 01 | PSNGR CAR | PASSENGER CAR, PICKUP, LIGHT DELIVERY, ETC. |
| 02 | BOBTAIL | TRUCK TRACTOR WITH NO TRAILERS (BOBTAIL) |
| 03 | FARM TRCTR | FARM TRACTOR OR SELF-PROPELLED FARM EQUIPMENT |
| 04 | SEMI TOW | TRUCK TRACTOR WITH TRAILER/MOBILE HOME IN TOW |
| 05 | TRUCK | TRUCK WITH NON-DETACHABLE BED, PANEL, ETC. |
| 06 | MOPED | MOPED, MINIBIKE, SEATED MOTOR SCOOTER, MOTOR BIKE |
| 07 | SCHL BUS | SCHOOL BUS (INCLUDES VAN) |
| 08 | OTH BUS | OTHER BUS |
| 09 | MTRCYCLE | MOTORCYCLE, DIRT BIKE |
| 10 | OTHER | OTHER: FORKLIFT, BACKHOE, ETC. |
| 11 | MOTRHOME | MOTORHOME |
| 12 | TROLLEY | MOTORIZED STREET CAR/TROLLEY (NO RAILS/WIRES) |
| 13 | ATV | ATV |
| 14 | MTRSCTR | MOTORIZED SCOOTER (STANDING) |
| 15 | SNOWMOBILE | SNOWMOBILE |
| 99 | UNKNOWN | UNKNOWN VEHICLE TYPE |


| CODE | SHORT | DESC |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | LONG DESCRIPTION |  |
| 1 | CLR | UNKNOWN |
| 2 | CLD | CLEAR |
| 3 | RAIN | CLOUDY |
| 4 | RLT | SLEET |
| 5 | FOG | FOG |
| 6 | SNOW | SNOW |
| 7 | DUST | DUST |
| 8 | SMOK | SMOKE |
| 9 | ASH | ASH |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Attachment F <br> Year 2021 Total Traffic Operations Worksheets

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 33 | 110 | 59 | 49 | 218 | 121 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 33 | 110 | 59 | 49 | 218 | 121 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 21 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 43 | 145 | 78 | 64 | 287 | 159 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 843 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 110 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 733 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.61 | 6.25 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.61 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.61 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.689 | 3.345 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 310 | 935 | - | - | 1441 | - |
| Stage 1 | 869 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 443 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 242 | 935 | - | - | 1441 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 242 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 869 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 346 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 14.6 |  | 0 |  | 5.2 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 563 | 1441 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.334 | 0.199 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 14.6 | 8.1 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 1.5 | 0.7 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 355 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 355 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Fro | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 449 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 18 | 0 | 0 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 24 | 242 | 61 | 12 | 154 | 0 | 20 | 24 | 20 | 1 | 28 | 27 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 24 | 242 | 61 | 12 | 154 | 0 | 20 | 24 | 20 | 1 | 28 | 27 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 29 | 292 | 73 | 14 | 186 | 0 | 24 | 29 | 24 | 1 | 34 | 33 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 28 | 0 | 152 | 10 | 0 | 284 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 28 | 0 | 152 | 10 | 0 | 284 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 37 | 0 | 200 | 13 | 0 | 374 |




| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 629 | 218 | 0 | 0 | 223 | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | 218 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 411 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 449 | 827 | - | - | 1358 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 823 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 674 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 449 | 827 | - | - | 1358 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 449 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 823 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 674 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 13.6 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvm |  | NBT | NBR | VBLn1 | SBL | SBT |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 456 | 1358 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.084 | - | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 13.6 | 0 | - |  |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | - |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.3 | 0 | - |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 10.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 83 | 342 | 123 | 51 | 167 | 110 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 83 | 342 | 123 | 51 | 167 | 110 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Mvmt Flow | 89 | 368 | 132 | 55 | 180 | 118 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 638 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 160 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 478 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 444 | 885 | - | - | 1387 | - |
| Stage 1 | 874 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 628 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 382 | 885 | - | - | 1387 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 382 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 874 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 541 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 19.1 |  | 0 |  | 4.8 |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 704 | 1387 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.649 | 0.129 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 19.1 | 8 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | C | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 4.8 | 0.4 | - |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | F |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 242 | 31 | 47 | 420 | 1 | 77 | 1 | 83 | 15 | 4 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 242 | 31 | 47 | 420 | 1 | 77 | 1 | 83 | 15 | 4 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | 150 | - | - | 150 | - | - | 50 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 272 | 35 | 53 | 472 | 1 | 87 | 1 | 93 | 17 | 4 | 4 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 4 |  |  | \& |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 49 | 305 | 26 | 12 | 335 | 2 | 40 | 33 | 25 | 17 | 23 | 75 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 49 | 305 | 26 | 12 | 335 | 2 | 40 | 33 | 25 | 17 | 23 | 75 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 55 | 343 | 29 | 13 | 376 | 2 | 45 | 37 | 28 | 19 | 26 | 84 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 15 | 2 | 409 | 28 | 2 | 246 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 15 | 2 | 409 | 28 | 2 | 246 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 16 | 2 | 440 | 30 | 2 | 265 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 724 | 455 | 0 | 0 | 470 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 455 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 269 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.2 |  | - | 4.1 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 396 | 609 | - | - | 1102 | - |
| Stage 1 | 643 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 781 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 395 | 609 | - | - | 1102 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 395 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 643 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 779 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 14.1 |  | 0 |  | 0.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRV | VBLn1 | SBL |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 412 | 1102 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.044 | 0.002 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 14.1 | 8.3 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 16 | 1 | 436 | 29 | 0 | 261 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 16 | 1 | 436 | 29 | 0 | 261 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 17 | 1 | 469 | 31 | 0 | 281 |



## MEMORANDUM

February 11, 2020 (revised August 2020)
Project \#: 24714

To: Mike Miller
City of Florence Public Works
250 Highway 101
Florence, OR 97439
From: Amy Griffiths \& Diego Arguea, PE
Project: Florence Residential Subdivision
Subject: Traffic Impact Analysis Report

This traffic impact analysis (TIA) report has been prepared as part of the site plan application for the proposed residential development to be located on a vacant site in Florence, Oregon. A site vicinity map is shown in Figure 1. Based on the analysis provided and documented herein, the proposed residential development can be constructed while maintaining acceptable traffic operations at the study intersections. No capacity-based mitigation needs were identified at the study intersections. Additional details documenting the methodology, proposed development plan, operations results, and recommendations are provided herein.

## INTRODUCTION

The applicant proposes development of up to 31 detached single-family homes and up to 101 low-rise multi-family homes to be located on a vacant site in north Florence. The site is bounded by Rhododendron Road to the west, $35^{\text {th }}$ Street and Siano Loop Road to the south, and Royal Saint Georges Drive to the east and north. Access to the site is proposed via two full-movement new street connections, spaced approximately 340 feet and 610 feet north of $35^{\text {th }}$ Street. The proposed development is expected to be constructed and occupied in 2021. A site plan is shown in Figure 2.

## SCOPE OF WORK

This TIA has been prepared as part of the Florence Residential Subdivision development application. Pursuant to the methodology memorandum provided and the ODOT (Oregon Department of Transportation) response (included in Attachment " $A$ "), this report includes the following:

- Operational assessment of study intersections under existing traffic conditions;
- Review of latest five years of reported crash data at study intersections;


- Background traffic operations assessment for opening year 2021, not including the proposed development traffic volumes;
- Trip generation and trip distribution estimate for the proposed residential development;
- Total traffic operations assessment for opening year 2021, including the proposed development traffic volumes; and,
- Driveway operations and sight distance assessment.

The scope of work in Attachment "A" was confirmed by City of Florence and ODOT staff, which included validation of the traffic data collection methodology, timing of traffic count data, and relevant adjustments to the traffic count data. Additional detail to the methodology is provided in the following sections.

The study intersections were identified based on the project's trip generation impact on adjacent intersections within the site vicinity and include the following (also shown in Figure 1):

- Site Driveway "A"/Rhododendron Drive
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Royal St. Georges Drive
- Site Driveway "B"/Rhododendron Drive
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Kingwood Street
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Rhododendron Drive
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Oak Street

Findings and recommendations are provided at the conclusion of the report.

## ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY AND APPLICABLE STANDARDS

All operations analyses described in this report were performed in accordance with the procedures stated in the Highway Capacity Manual, $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition (HCM - Reference 1).

All intersection level-of-service evaluations used the peak 15-minute flow rate during the weekday morning and evening commuter peak hours. Using the peak 15-minute flow rate ensures that this analysis is based on a reasonable worst-case scenario. For this reason, the analysis reflects conditions that are only likely to occur for 15 minutes out of each average peak hour. A description of level-of-service criteria is contained in Attachment " $B$ ".

The City of Florence has adopted level-of-service (LOS) and volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio operating standards for signalized and unsignalized intersections as documented in the 2012 Transportation System Plan (TSP). The following operating standards apply to City intersections:

- LOS "D" is considered acceptable at signalized and all-way stop controlled intersections if the $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ratio is not higher than 1.0 for the sum of critical movements.
- LOS " E " is considered acceptable for the poorest operating approach at two-way stop intersections. LOS " F " is allowed in situations where a traffic signal is not warranted.


## EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing conditions analysis identifies the site conditions and current physical and operational characteristics of the roadways within the study area. These conditions will be compared with future conditions later in this report.

Kittelson \& Associates, Inc. (Kittelson) staff inventoried the proposed development site and surrounding study area in February 2020. At that time, Kittelson collected information regarding site conditions, adjacent land uses, existing traffic operations, and transportation facilities in the study area.

## SITE CONDITIONS AND ADJACENT LAND USES

The site is currently vacant. The land uses in the site vicinity include residential, community commercial, and recreational.

## TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of the existing transportation facilities in the study area.
Table 1: Existing Transportation Facilities

| Roadway | Functional <br> Classification | Number of <br> Lanes | Posted <br> Speed (mph) | Sidewalks | Bicycle <br> Lanes | On-Street <br> Parking |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rhododendron Drive | Minor Arterial | 2 | 40 | No | No | No? |
| $35^{\text {th Street }}$ | Collector | 2 | 25 | No | Yes | No |
| Wecoma Loop - Royal <br> Saint Georges Drive | Local | 2 | 40 | No | No | Yes |
| Kingwood Street | Local | 2 | 25 | Yes | Yes | Nos |
| Oak Street | Collector | 2 |  | Yes | No |  |

${ }^{1}$ Functional Classification from Florence Transportation System Plan (December, 2012, Reference 2).
NP: not posted

## Roadway Facilities

Figure 3 illustrates the existing lane configurations and traffic control devices at the study intersections. All of the study intersections are two-way stop-controlled (TWSC).




As shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5, traffic operations satisfy the City of Florence operating standards for unsignalized intersections.

Attachment "D" contains the year 2019 existing traffic conditions worksheets.

## TRAFFIC SAFETY

The crash history of the study intersections was reviewed to identify crash patterns. ODOT provided five years of crash data available for the study intersections, which includes all reported crashes from January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2017. Table 2 summarizes the crash data provided by ODOT.

Table 2: Study Intersection Crash Summary (January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2017)

|  | Crash Type |  |  |  | Crash Severity |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | RearEnd | Turn | Angle | Ped | PDO | Injury | Fatal | Total |
| $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/ <br> Rhododendron Drive | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $35^{\text {th }}$ Street $/$ <br> Royal St. Georges Drive-Wecoma Loop | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $35^{\text {th }}$ Street $/$ <br> Sand Pines Golf Course-Kingwood Street | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $35^{\text {th }}$ Street $/$ <br> Oak Street | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 |

PDO=Property Damage Only
As shown in Table 2, the only intersection with crashes in the study area reported over the five-year period is the $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Oak Street intersection. At this intersection, angle crashes were the most common crash type. No other intersections in the study area had reported crashes in the most recent five years. No crash patterns were identified that would warrant mitigation as a result of the proposed development.

Attachment " $E$ " contains the crash data provided by ODOT.

## TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

The TIA identifies how the study area's transportation system will operate in the year the proposed development is expected to be fully built, year 2021. The impact of traffic generated by the proposed residential subdivision during the typical weekday AM and PM peak hours was examined as follows:

- Developments and transportation improvements planned in the site vicinity were identified.
- Year 2021 and background traffic conditions were analyzed at the study intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.
- Site-generated trips were estimated for build-out of the site.
- Site trip-distribution patterns were derived based on surrounding land uses.
- Year 2021 total traffic conditions were analyzed at the study intersections and site-access points during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.
- Driveway operations and sight distance were assessed.


## YEAR 2021 BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

The year 2021 background traffic conditions analysis identifies how the study area's transportation system will operate without the proposed residential subdivision. This analysis includes traffic attributed to planned developments within the study area and to general growth in the region but does not include traffic from the proposed development.

## Planned Developments and Transportation Improvements

Planned, in-process traffic volumes include any developments not yet built that have completed the land use application process, have been issued conditions of approval, and are expected to be constructed and occupied prior to the completion of the proposed Florence Residential Subdivision project. Based on conversations and direction provided by City of Florence staff, no planned in-process developments in the area are included in the analysis. There are plans for a mixed-use path along $35^{\text {th }}$ Street, however there are no expected changes to the study intersections.

## Traffic Volumes

Regional traffic volume growth was evaluated based upon the ODOT Future Volume Tables which identify the average annual daily traffic (AADT). Two locations near the study area were identified on Oregon Coast Highway (US 101, ODOT Highway No. 009): 0.02 miles south of $36^{\text {th }}$ Street and 0.02 miles south of $29^{\text {th }}$ Street. Table 3 provides the base year (2018) and forecast year (2038) model AADTs for computation of the growth rate.

Table 3. ODOT Future Volume Table

| Highway | Milepost | Description | Year 2018 <br> AADT | Year 2038 <br> AADT | $R^{2}$ | Growth Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 009 | 188.64 | 0.02 miles south of $36^{\text {th }}$ Street | 12,500 | 12,600 | 0.4298 | 0.00040 |
| 009 | 21.34 | 0.02 miles south of $29^{\text {th }}$ Street | 14,100 | 14,200 | 0.8050 | 0.00035 |

Growth rate calculation example: $(12,600 / 12,500-1) /(2038-2018)=0.00040$
Based on the volumes in Table 3, traffic volumes along the state highway in the vicinity of the study area are anticipated to increase by approximately 100 daily vehicles over a period of 20 years. This growth is negligible, and no annual background growth rate is proposed to be applied to the existing volumes for the 2021 buildout year analysis. Similarly, no regional growth factor will be applied to local streets.

With no in-process developments and no regional growth factor, the 2021 background conditions are expected to reflect the same conditions presented in Figure 4 and Figure 5.

## Intersection Operations

As stated previously, the 2021 background traffic intersection analysis is expected to be the same as the adjusted 2019 traffic operations. Therefore, the results of the analysis match that of the 2019 existing traffic analysis and the study intersections are forecast to satisfy the TSP operating standards during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Refer to Attachment "D" for the existing (and background) traffic operations worksheets.

## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The applicant proposes to develop up to 31 detached single-family homes, 55 attached townhome-style cottages, and 46 apartments.

## Trip Generation

A trip generation estimate was prepared for the proposed residential subdivision based on information provided in the standard reference manual, Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE - Reference 4). Based on the land use data provided by ITE, the proposed townhome-style cottages and the apartments are both classified as low-rise multi-family homes. As such, ITE Land Use Code 220 (Multifamily Housing - Low Rise) is applied for the combined 101 units. Land Use Code 210 (Single-Family Detached Housing) is applied for the 31 single-family homes. Table 4 summarizes the trip generation estimate for the weekday daily, morning, and evening peak hours.





## RHODODENDRON DRIVE/35 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ STREET INTERSECTION TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS

As shown in the traffic operations analysis findings, the average weekday PM peak hour westbound delay at the $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Rhododendron Drive is forecast to increase by approximately three seconds ( 16.1 to 19.1 seconds) as a result of the added site traffic. The delay and intersection operations are expected to continue to meet City of Florence operational standards. However, to further address the intersection operations, based on a request from City of Florence staff, a signal warrant analysis was prepared for the Rhododendron Drive/ $35^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection.

The traffic signal warrant analysis was conducted consistent with ODOT requirements outlined in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD, Reference 6), and the ODOT Analysis Procedures Manual (Reference 3). The MUTCD identifies nine traffic signal warrants and notes "The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal." ${ }^{1}$ The first two volume-based warrants (\#1-Eight Hour and \#2-Four Hour) were evaluated based on the existing and future traffic volumes at the intersection ${ }^{2}$.

The weekday PM peak hour volumes were used to prepare a peak hour warrant analysis, and an assumed daily profile was assumed for the peak 4 -hour and peak 8 -hour signal warrant analyses. Based on the analysis results, signal warrants are not forecast to be met for the peak, 4 -, or 8 -hour warrants. As such,

[^5]signalization is not recommended at this time based on the impacts of the proposed development. The traffic signal warrant worksheets are included in Attachment "F."

## SIGHT DISTANCE ASSESSMENT

A preliminary sight distance analysis was conducted at the existing site accesses based on review of the proposed site plan. We recommend final sight distance certification be confirmed upon buildout. Preliminary site plan review of available sight distance indicates that both intersection and stopping sight distance (ISD and SSD) are expected to meet the design guidance presented in A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (AASHTO, Reference 5) upon buildout.

## AASHTO Design Guidelines

One of the primary inputs in determining safe sight distance metrics according to AASHTO guidelines is the design speed of the respective roadway. The posted speed along Rhododendron Drive is 40 miles per hour and the advisory speed along the frontage of the property is posted at 35 miles per hour.

For an assumed design speed of the 40 mile-per-hour facility, Table 5 below summarizes the recommended minimum design guidance.

Table 5. Sight Distance Summary (Case B1 - Left Turn from the Minor Road)

| Access Locations | Direction of Travel | AASHTO Design Guideline (feet) (ISD / SSD) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Access A (north) | Northbound (facing south from access) | 445 / 305 |
|  | Southbound <br> (facing north from access) | 445 / 305 |
| Access B (south) | Northbound (facing south from access) | 445 / 305 |
|  | Southbound <br> (facing north from access) | 445 / 305 |

ISD: Intersection Sight Distance
SSD: Stopping Sight Distance

The following Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 illustrate a preliminary sight distance triangle for up to 445 feet of intersection sight distance. The red lines indicate the sightline from a vehicle at each corresponding site access while the yellow line indicates the on-road distance ( 445 feet) recommended for a design speed of 40 miles per hour.

Exhibit 1 Sight Triangle for Driveway A (approximate)


Exhibit 2 Sight Triangle for Driveway B (approximate)


Based on the preliminary assessment in Exhibits 1 and 2, no vertical curvature or horizontal curvature of Rhododendron Drive is expected to limit sight distances. However, there may be some foliage and low hanging branches that may be partially obstructing sight lines within the right-of-way - we recommend these be cleared upon construction of the site. Site landscaping, signage or above-ground utilities along the site frontages should be installed and maintained to provide adequate sight distance per City requirements.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this analysis indicate that the proposed residential subdivision can be constructed while maintaining acceptable traffic operations at the study intersections and site-accesses. The primary findings and recommendations of this study are summarized below.

- The proposed residential development is estimated to generate approximately 1,077 net new weekday daily trips, with 75 net new trips ( $18 \mathrm{in}, 57$ out) occurring during the weekday AM peak hour and 93 net new trips ( $59 \mathrm{in}, 34$ out) occurring during the weekday PM peak hour.
- All study intersections were found to operate acceptably under existing and forecast future conditions.
- No transportation capacity or safety-related mitigations are recommended as a result of the proposed development impacts.
- Landscaping, signage or above-ground utilities along the site frontages should be installed and maintained to provide adequate sight distance.

We trust this report adequately addresses the traffic impacts associated with the proposed residential subdivision. Please contact us if you have any questions.
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## Attachment A

Scoping Memorandum

## MEMORANDUM - DRAFT

To: Mike Miller, Public Works Director
City of Florence Public Works
250 Highway 101
Florence, OR 97439
Cc: $\quad$ Matt Caswell, PE, ODOT
From: Diego Arguea, PE \& Amy Griffiths
Project: Florence Residential Subdivision
Subject: Traffic Impact Study Scoping

This memorandum documents the methodology and key assumptions to be used in preparation of the traffic impact analysis (TIA) for a residential development in Florence, Oregon.

## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The applicant proposes development of 91 single-family homes and up to 48 low-rise ${ }^{1}$ apartments to be located on a vacant site in north Florence, Oregon. The site is bounded by Rhododendron Road to the west, $35^{\text {th }}$ Street and Siano Loop Road to the south, and Royal Saint Georges Drive to the east and north. Access to the site is proposed via two driveways, spaced at approximately 340 feet and 610 feet north of $35^{\text {th }}$ Street. A site vicinity map is shown in Figure 1.

The proposed development is expected to be constructed in 2021. A site plan is shown in Figure 2.

## TRIP GENERATION AND DISTRIBUTION

Table 1 summarizes the estimated site-generated trips for the proposed development. Trip generation rates for the single-family and apartment land uses are based on the standard reference Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition. For each land use, the regression equation is used to estimate trip generation if there are more than 20 data points and the coefficient of correlation ( $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ value) is 0.75 or higher. If these criteria are not met, the average rate is used.

[^6]
Florence Residential Subdivision
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Table 1. Proposed Land Use Trip Generation

| Land Use | ITE Code | Units | Daily <br> Trips | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Single Family Detached Housing | 210 | 91 | 953 | 69 | 17 | 52 | 93 | 59 | 34 |
| Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 220 | 48 | 322 | 24 | 6 | 18 | 31 | 19 | 12 |
| Total Net New |  |  | 1,275 | 93 | 23 | 70 | 124 | 78 | 46 |

Figure 3 and Figure 4 display a preliminary trip distribution and assignment based on review of surrounding land uses and the roadway network. The trip distribution pattern used in the formal traffic impact analysis may be revised based on traffic volume data to be collected at the study intersections as well as agency review comments.

## STUDY INTERSECTIONS

Proposed study intersections were identified based on the project's anticipated trip generation impact on adjacent intersections within the site vicinity. One intersection under ODOT ${ }^{2}$ jurisdiction was identified to be impacted - however, under both weekday AM and PM peak hours, this intersection is forecast to be impacted by fewer than 50 trips (see Figures 3 and 4). As such, the intersection of $35^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Oregon Coast Highway (Hwy 101) has been included in the study area to address City requirements. All proposed study intersections are summarized below.

- Site Driveway " A "/Rhododendron Drive
- Site Driveway "B"/Rhododendron Drive
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Rhododendron Drive
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Royal St. Georges Drive
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Kingwood Street
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Oak Street
- $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Oregon Coast Highway (Hwy 101)

[^7]


## OPERATIONS ANALYSIS

The traffic operations analysis will include evaluation of the following performance measures for the study intersections:

- Turning movement counts;
- Volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio;
- Level-of-service (LOS) and delay; and,
- $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queuing.

Individual study intersection performance will be documented in tables, figures, and/or technical appendices using the measures of effectiveness listed above. Study intersection performance will then be compared to applicable City and ODOT performance thresholds.

## Analysis Years

We will report performance measures for the following analysis years:

- Existing year 2019 traffic analysis;
- Opening year 2021 background traffic analysis (without added trips from the proposed development); and,
- Forecast year 2021 total traffic analysis (including added trips from the proposed development).


## Mobility Standards

ODOT assesses intersection operations based on v/c ratio. Table 6 of the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) provides $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio targets statewide. These OHP ratios are used to evaluate existing and future no-build conditions, and the mobility standard is based on characteristics of the state highway.

Within the study area, the Oregon Coast Highway (Hwy 101) is classified as a statewide highway (not a freight route), located within the urban growth boundary (non-MPO), and has a posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour. As such, the ODOT required mobility standard for the $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Oregon Coast Highway (Hwy 101) intersection is a v/c ratio of 0.90.

Table 6 of the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) is shown on the following page.

| VOLUME TO CAPACITY RATIO TARGETS OUTSIDE METRO ${ }^{17 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}, \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway Category | Inside Urban Growth Boundary |  |  |  |  | Outside Urban Growth Boundary |  |
|  | STA ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | MPO | Non-MPO Outside of STAs where non- freeway posted speed $<=35$ mph, or a Designated UBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Non-MPO } \\ \text { outside of } \\ \text { STAs where } \\ \text { non-freeway } \\ \text { speed }>35 \\ \text { mph but }<45 \\ \text { mph } \end{gathered}$ | Non-MPO where nonfreeway speed limit $>=45 \mathrm{mph}$ | Unincorporated Communities ${ }^{F}$ | Rural <br> Lands |
| Interstate Highways | N/A | 0.85 | N/A | N/A | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| Statewide Expressways | N/A | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| Freight Route on a Statewide Highway | 0.90 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| Statewide (not a Freight Route) | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.85 | 0.80 | 0.75 | 0.70 |
| Freight Route on a regional or District Highway | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.75 | 0.70 |
| Expressway on a Regional or District Highway | N/A | 0.90 | N/A | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.75 | 0.70 |
| Regional Highways | 1.0 | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.75 | 0.70 |
| District/Local Interest Roads | 1.0 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.80 | 0.75 |

Table 6: Volume to Capacity Ratio Targets for Peak Hour Operating Conditions

We request that the City of Florence provide us with the applicable mobility standards for the other study intersections.

## SEASONAL ADJUSTMENT FACTOR

Peak hour traffic counts will be collected in December 2019 and will subsequently be adjusted to reflect $30^{\text {th }}$ highest hour design volumes, based on applicable adjustment factors. Version 2 of the APM identifies three methods for identifying seasonal adjustment factors for highway traffic volumes:

- On-Site ATR Method
- ATR Characteristic Table Method
- Seasonal Trend Method

All three methods utilize information provided by Automatic Traffic Recorders (ATRs) situated in select locations throughout the State Highway System that collect traffic data 24 -hours a day/365 days a year.

The On-Site ATR Method meets the criteria that the ATR be located within or near the project area. ATR Florence (20-026) was identified on Highway 101 and located 0.77 miles north of Heceta Beach Road, and 2.21 miles north of the $35^{\text {th }}$ Street/Highway 101 study intersection. No major intersections that would impact seasonal trends are located between the study intersection and the ATR location. As such, we propose using ATR 20-026 data to seasonally adjust traffic volume data collected in December 2019.

Table 2 displays the ATR data used to develop the seasonal adjustment factor for the study area.
Table 2. Seasonal Adjustment Factor Calculation (weekday daily data)

| Year | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Month (July) \% of ADT | $136 \%$ | $136 \%$ | $134 \%$ | $142 \%$ | $140 \%$ | $137 \%$ |
| Month of Data Collection (December) \% of ADT | $76 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $77 \%$ |

Note: Shaded values removed from average calculation per ODOT methodology.

Cells highlighted in grey reflect the highest and lowest values and were excluded from the average per ODOT guidelines. From this data, the seasonal factor can be computed as $137 \% \div 77 \%=1.78$.

Based on direction provided in the ODOT Analysis Procedures Manual, a seasonal adjustment greater than $30 \%$ should not be used. To supplement the ATR methodology, the most up-to-date seasonal trend tables ${ }^{3}$ were reviewed - for the count month December, the seasonal adjustments shown for the following routes are as follows:

- Coastal Destination: 1.1636
- Coastal Destination Route: 1.2836

Averaging the seasonal trend table values for December results in a 1.2236 seasonal adjustment.
We welcome you providing historic traffic count data that may be available for the study intersections that could help further inform the seasonal adjustment. If no additional data is available, and subject to ODOT and City feedback, we propose to adjust the through movements on Highway 101 by a factor of 1.22 to reflect the $30^{\text {th }}$ highest hour volumes.

## CRASH DATA REVIEW

The most-recent three-year period of reported crash data (January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2018) will be reviewed at the study intersections. Any study intersections that are identified as a Safety Priority Index System sites (top 5- or 10-percent) will be included in the crash data and highlighted in the analysis.

[^8]The data will be analyzed for a variety of factors to include type, severity, general conditions, and location to identify potential crash patterns or anomalies.

## FORECAST YEAR VOLUME DEVELOPMENT

Growth rates for opening year background traffic volumes will be based upon the ODOT Future Volume Tables. Two locations near the study area were identified on Oregon Coast Highway (US 101, ODOT Highway No. 009): 0.02 miles south of $36^{\text {th }}$ Street and 0.02 miles south of $29^{\text {th }}$ Street. Table 3 provides the base year (2018) and forecast year (2038) model AADTs for computation of the growth rate.

Table 3. ODOT Future Volume Table

| Highway | Milepost | Description | 2018 | 2038 | $R^{2}$ | Growth Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 009 | 188.64 | 0.02 miles south of $36^{\text {th }}$ Street | 12,500 | 12,600 | 0.4298 | 0.00040 |
| 009 | 21.34 | 0.02 miles south of $29^{\text {th }}$ Street | 14,100 | 14,200 | 0.8050 | 0.00035 |

Growth rate calculation example: $(12,600 / 12,500-1) /(2038-2018)=0.00040$
Based on the volumes in Table 3, traffic volumes along the state highway in the vicinity of the study area are anticipated to increase by approximately 100 daily vehicles over a period of 20 years. This growth is negligible and suggests it may not be necessary to apply an annual background growth rate to the existing volumes for the 2021 buildout year analysis. We would appreciate receipt of in-process development and/or annual growth rate data that may be available. In the absence of additional data, we propose to not apply a regional growth factor to the local streets.

## NEXT STEPS

Please review the information presented in this memorandum and provide us your feedback regarding the study assumptions and methodology. Please also provide confirmation of the City of Florence mobility standards. We would be pleased to schedule a conference call to discuss if desired.

| From: | BLAIR Keith P [Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, January 3, 2020 7:19 AM |
| To: | BAUMGARTNER Douglas G; Diego Arguea |
| Cc: | Mike.Miller@ci.florence.or.us; Amy Griffiths; UPTON Dorothy J; NELSON Brian S * Scott |
| Subject: | RE: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5 |

Doug and Diego:
Thank you for passing along this scoping letter. My comments are:

1. Traffic study should be consistent with ODOT's Analysis Procedures Manual (APM) https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Pages/APM.aspx
2. Does the City concur with the proposed Trip Distribution? It appears the assumed $30 \%(10 \%$ to/from north, $20 \%$ to/from south) of the total trips accessing the US- $101 / 35^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is low, but I concur that it appears this intersection will not trigger ODOT's 50 peak hour net trip increase threshold to recommend study of the intersection. That said, I am still available and willing to review the draft traffic study as a resource for the City.
3. The OHP mobility target for the US-101/35 $5^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is actually 0.85 rather than 0.90 as cited within the scoping letter (statewide highway, non-OHP freight route, 40 MPH ).
4. The citation within ODOT's APM about avoiding the use of seasonal adjustments above $30 \%$ is not intended to limit the adjustment itself, but rather identify the least appropriate months during the year to conduct traffic counts. Due to the seasonal trending nature of the local transportation network, traffic counts at the US-101/35 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection should be collected between March 1 and November 15. However, if the City will accept December counts for the purpose of this traffic study, Region Traffic recommends a seasonal adjustment of 1.76 for the US-101/35 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection based on an average of the following trends:
a. 1.84 using Florence ATR 20-026 and the Average Daily Traffic method (as opposed to the Average Weekday Traffic method)
b. 1.49 using the Coastal Destination trend (the proposed calculation must have included an error)
c. 1.96 using the Coastal Destination Route trend (the proposed calculation must have included an error)
5. Per Table 3.3 of ODOT's Development Review Guidelines, for a development of this size ( $1,000-$ 2,999 ADT), Region Traffic recommends the following analysis scenario years:
a. Existing (2019)
b. Opening Year (2021)
i. Background
ii. Total
c. Opening Year +5 Years (2026)
i. Background
ii. Total

I hope the above information will help, but please let me know if there are any more questions or if I may be of any further assistance. Thanks!

Keith P. Blair, P.E.
Interim Traffic Analysis Engineer | ODOT Region 2

ODOT's mission is to provide a safe and reliable multimodal transportation system that connects people and helps Oregon's communities and economy thrive.

From: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Sent: Friday, December 27, 2019 3:24 PM
To: NELSON Brian S * Scott [Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us)
Cc: BAUMGARTNER Douglas G [Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us); Mike.Miller@ci.florence.or.us; Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com); BLAIR Keith P [Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us)
Subject: RE: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5

## Hi Scott -

Thanks for email. I was also told that Keith Blair is someone who has been involved in development review? We are currently scoping, but we are on a fast track to deliver this project by end of January. I have included the scoping memorandum attached for your reference. Note that the only intersection under ODOT jurisdiction is $35^{\text {th }}$ Ave/Hwy 101, but we do not estimate more than 50 peak hour trips to this intersection, so, ultimately, it may even not be required for study - I will defer to you. If it is required, please confirm the seasonal adjustment methodology.

Thanks!
Diego

Diego Arguea, P.E. | Associate Engineer | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc. d: 503.535.7462-1462 (ext) | o: 503.228.5230 | c: 503.334.3183

From: NELSON Brian S * Scott [Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us)
Sent: Thursday, December 26, 2019 2:57 PM
To: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Cc: BAUMGARTNER Douglas G [Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us)
Subject: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5
Hello Diego, I here you are working on a TIS in Florence. Doug Baumgartner is our development review coordinator for that area, however Doug is out until January $6^{\text {th }}$. In the meantime I can help you get started. Are you looking for a scope or are you beyond that?
thanks

B Scott Nelson, P.E.<br>Region 2 Access Management Engineer

455 Airport Rd SE, Bldg. B
Salem, OR 97301
Office 503.986.2882

## Amy Griffiths

| From: | Mike Miller [mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us](mailto:mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, January 9, 2020 9:49 AM |
| To: | BLAIR Keith P; Diego Arguea |
| Cc: | Amy Griffiths; BAUMGARTNER Douglas G; Wendy Farley-Campbell |
| Subject: | RE: Florence - revision in site plan |

Thanks Keith! I agree, since we know what the mix is using ITE codes 210 and 220 will be more accurate.

Mike

From: BLAIR Keith P [Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us)
Sent: Thursday, January 9, 2020 9:07 AM
To: 'Diego Arguea' [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com); Mike Miller [mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us](mailto:mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us)
Cc: Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com); BAUMGARTNER Douglas G [Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us)
Subject: RE: Florence - revision in site plan
Diego and Mike:
My recommendation would be to utilize trip generation for land uses 210 and 220 as opposed to 270 for the combination of the following reasons:

- it appears the proposed land use mix is known, as opposed to a general PUD application
- ITE data sample sizes for land uses 210 and 220 are significantly larger than that for 270 and, as a result, likely more accurate
- trip generation results for land uses 210 and 220 are slightly larger (more conservative) for the daily and PM peak hour

Please let me know if I may be of further assistance. Thanks!

## Keith Blair

(503) 986-2857

From: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Sent: Wednesday, January 8, 2020 6:01 PM
To: Mike Miller [mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us](mailto:mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us); BLAIR Keith P [Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us)
Cc: Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com)
Subject: Florence - revision in site plan

Mike, Keith,

Thank you both for your time in coordination and working through the project assumptions. We have recently had a change (reduction) in the site plan units, and I wanted to share an updated trip generation prior to moving forward with our analysis. Please review and let us know if you are comfortable using the PUD trip generation rate.

In our scoping memorandum, the site plan identified 91 single family home lots and 48 apartments. The revised unit mix is as follows:

31 single family lots

46 apartments
55 attached townhome/cottage 2-story homes (owner occupied not rentals)

## 132 total units

The $9^{\text {th }}$ edition of Trip Generation included a category for 'townhomes' which does not exist in the $10^{\text {th }}$ edition. Rather, the townhome data has been lumped together with the rate in the Low Rise Residential data. As such, one potential trip generation estimate shown below includes 31 single family lots and 101 low rise residential ( 46 apartments +55 attached homes).

| Land Use | $\begin{gathered} \text { ITE } \\ \text { Code } \end{gathered}$ | Units | Daily Trips | Weekday AM |  |  | Weekday PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Family Detached Housing (AVG) | 210 | 31 | 354 | 27 | 7 | 20 | 33 | 21 | 12 |
| Internal Trips (0\% Daily, 0\% AM, Saturday 0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 220 | 101 | 723 | 48 | 11 | 37 | 60 | 38 | 22 |
| Internal Trips (0\% Daily, O\% AM, Saturday 0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Trip Generation |  |  | 1,077 | 75 | 18 | 57 | 93 | 58 | 34 |

Alternatively, the $10^{\text {th }}$ edition also has a new land use category called PUD Residential (Land Use 270). This rate is intended for developments that are PUDs and the final land use mix may or may not be known. The second table represents the revised trip generation assuming all 132 units are run as PUD.

| Land Use | ITE Code | Units | Daily Trips | Weekday AM |  |  | Weekday PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Planned Unit Development (PUD) Average Rate | 270 | 132 | 974 | 75 | 17 | 59 | 91 | 59 | 32 |
| Internal Trips (0\% Daily, 0\% AM, Saturday 0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Trip Generation |  |  | 974 | 75 | 17 | 59 | 91 | 59 | 32 |

As you'll note, the differences in net trip generation are very marginal - please review and let us know if you are both more comfortable with one over the other. Because this development application is going in as a PUD, I am comfortable with the trip generation and it seems appropriate to use this land use. But, given that we know the land use mix, I am open to either approach. Thanks in advance - please let us know your thoughts.

Thanks in advance,
Diego and Amy

Diego Arguea, P.E. | Associate Engineer | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.
d: 503.535.7462-1462 (ext) | o: 503.228.5230 | c: 503.334.3183

From: Mike Miller [mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us](mailto:mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us)
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2020 10:21 AM
To: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Cc: Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com)
Subject: RE: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5
Hi Diego,
Just left you a message. Sorry that yesterday did not work. I was just stepping into a meeting when you called and then I had an executive session with City Council plus our regular Council meeting last night.

I will be on the road traveling to Eugene to meet with Lane County at 11am and will be back in Florence after 3:30pm. I have a meeting scheduled with the City Manager, but should be available later after 4:30pm today.

If that doesn't work, I do have time available after 10am Wednesday.

Thank you,

Mike

From: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Sent: Monday, January 6, 2020 2:44 PM
To: Mike Miller [mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us](mailto:mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us)
Cc: Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com)
Subject: FW: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5

Hi Mike,

Just left a message with Sandy (receptionist?) regarding our transportation work in Florence. I am available the rest of the afternoon and have some flexibility tomorrow afternoon. Please let me know when is a good time to chat about the scope of the transportation work - thanks in advance!

Thanks,
Diego

Diego Arguea, P.E. | Associate Engineer | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.
d: 503.535.7462-1462 (ext) | o: 503.228.5230 | c: 503.334.3183

From: BLAIR Keith P [Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us)
Sent: Friday, January 03, 2020 7:19 AM
To: BAUMGARTNER Douglas G [Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us); Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Cc: Mike.Miller@ci.florence.or.us; Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com); UPTON Dorothy J
[Dorothy.J.UPTON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Dorothy.J.UPTON@odot.state.or.us); NELSON Brian S * Scott [Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us)
Subject: RE: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5

Doug and Diego:
Thank you for passing along this scoping letter. My comments are:

1. Traffic study should be consistent with ODOT's Analysis Procedures Manual (APM) https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Pages/APM.aspx
2. Does the City concur with the proposed Trip Distribution? It appears the assumed $30 \%(10 \%$ to/from north, $20 \%$ to/from south) of the total trips accessing the US-101/35 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is low, but I concur that it appears this intersection will not trigger ODOT's 50 peak hour net trip increase threshold to recommend study of the intersection. That said, I am still available and willing to review the draft traffic study as a resource for the City.
3. The OHP mobility target for the US-101/35 $5^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is actually 0.85 rather than 0.90 as cited within the scoping letter (statewide highway, non-OHP freight route, 40 MPH ).
4. The citation within ODOT's APM about avoiding the use of seasonal adjustments above $30 \%$ is not intended to limit the adjustment itself, but rather identify the least appropriate months during the year to conduct traffic counts. Due to the seasonal trending nature of the local transportation network, traffic counts at the US-101/35 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection should be collected between March 1 and November 15. However, if the City will accept December counts for the purpose of this traffic
study, Region Traffic recommends a seasonal adjustment of 1.76 for the US-101/35 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection based on an average of the following trends:
a. 1.84 using Florence ATR 20-026 and the Average Daily Traffic method (as opposed to the Average Weekday Traffic method)
b. 1.49 using the Coastal Destination trend (the proposed calculation must have included an error)
c. 1.96 using the Coastal Destination Route trend (the proposed calculation must have included an error)
5. Per Table 3.3 of ODOT's Development Review Guidelines, for a development of this size ( $1,000-$ 2,999 ADT), Region Traffic recommends the following analysis scenario years:
a. Existing (2019)
b. Opening Year (2021)
i. Background
ii. Total
c. Opening Year +5 Years (2026)
i. Background
ii. Total

I hope the above information will help, but please let me know if there are any more questions or if I may be of any further assistance. Thanks!

Keith P. Blair, P.E.
Interim Traffic Analysis Engineer | ODOT Region 2
455 Airport Rd SE, Bldg. A | Salem, Oregon 97301
(503) 986-2857 | Keith.P.Blair@odot.state.or.us

ODOT's mission is to provide a safe and reliable multimodal transportation system that connects people and helps Oregon's communities and economy thrive.

From: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Sent: Friday, December 27, 2019 3:24 PM
To: NELSON Brian S * Scott [Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us)
Cc: BAUMGARTNER Douglas G [Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us); Mike.Miller@ci.florence.or.us; Amy Griffiths [agriffiths@kittelson.com](mailto:agriffiths@kittelson.com); BLAIR Keith P [Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Keith.P.BLAIR@odot.state.or.us)
Subject: RE: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5

## Hi Scott -

Thanks for email. I was also told that Keith Blair is someone who has been involved in development review? We are currently scoping, but we are on a fast track to deliver this project by end of January. I have included the scoping memorandum attached for your reference. Note that the only intersection under ODOT jurisdiction is $35^{\text {th }}$ Ave/Hwy 101, but we do not estimate more than 50 peak hour trips to this intersection, so, ultimately, it may even not be required for study - I will defer to you. If it is required, please confirm the seasonal adjustment methodology.

Thanks!
Diego

Diego Arguea, P.E. | Associate Engineer | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.
d: 503.535.7462-1462 (ext) | o: 503.228.5230 | c: 503.334.3183

From: NELSON Brian S * Scott [Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Brian.S.NELSON@odot.state.or.us)
Sent: Thursday, December 26, 2019 2:57 PM
To: Diego Arguea [darguea@kittelson.com](mailto:darguea@kittelson.com)
Cc: BAUMGARTNER Douglas G [Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us](mailto:Douglas.G.BAUMGARTNER@odot.state.or.us)
Subject: Development Review Contact for ODOT Region 2 District 5

Hello Diego, I here you are working on a TIS in Florence. Doug Baumgartner is our development review coordinator for that area, however Doug is out until January 6 th. In the meantime I can help you get started. Are you looking for a scope or are you beyond that?
thanks

## B Scott Nelson, P.E.

Region 2 Access Management Engineer

455 Airport Rd SE, Bldg. B
Salem, OR 97301
Office 503.986.2882
Cell 503.602.0703

## Attachment B <br> Level-of-Service Criteria

## DESCRIPTION OF LEVEL OF SERVICE

Level of service (LOS) is a concept developed to quantify the degree of comfort (including such elements as travel time, number of stops, total amount of stopped delay, and impediments caused by other vehicles) afforded to drivers as they travel through an intersection or roadway segment. Six grades are used to denote the various level of service from " $A$ " to " $F$ ". ${ }^{1}$

## SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

The six level-of-service grades are described qualitatively for signalized intersections in Table B1. Additionally, Table B2 identifies the relationship between level of service and average control delay per vehicle. Control delay is defined to include initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. Using this definition, Level of Service " $D$ " is generally considered to represent the minimum acceptable design standard.

Table B1: Level-of-Service Definitions (Signalized Intersections)

| Level of Service | Average Delay per Vehicle |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | Very low average control delay, less than 10 seconds per vehicle. This occurs when progression is extremely favorable, and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay. |
| B | Average control delay is greater than 10 seconds per vehicle and less than or equal to 20 seconds per vehicle. This generally occurs with good progression and/or short cycle lengths. More vehicles stop than for a level of service A, causing higher levels of average delay. |
| C | Average control delay is greater than 20 seconds per vehicle and less than or equal to 35 seconds per vehicle. These higher delays may result from fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at this level, although many still pass through the intersection without stopping. |
| D | Average control delay is greater than 35 seconds per vehicle and less than or equal to 55 seconds per vehicle. The influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle length, or high volume/capacity ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable. |
| E | Average control delay is greater than 55 seconds per vehicle and less than or equal to 80 seconds per vehicle. This is usually considered to be the limit of acceptable delay. These high delay values generally (but not always) indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high volume/capacity ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences. |
| F | Average control delay is more than 80 seconds per vehicle. This is considered to be unacceptable to most drivers. This condition often occurs with oversaturation. It may also occur at high volume/capacity ratios below 1.0 with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also contribute to such high delay values. |

[^9]Table B2: Level-of-Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections

| Level of <br> Service | Average Control Delay per Vehicle (Seconds) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $<10.0$ |
| B | $>10$ and $\leq 20$ |
| C | $>20$ and $\leq 35$ |
| D | $>35$ and $\leq 55$ |
| E | $>55$ and $\leq 80$ |
| F | $>80$ |

## UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

Unsignalized intersections include two-way stop-controlled (TWSC) and all-way stop-controlled (AWSC) intersections. The Highway Capacity Manual, $6^{\text {th }}$ edition (HCM) provides models for estimating control delay at both TWSC and AWSC intersections. A qualitative description of the various service levels associated with an unsignalized intersection is presented in Table B3. A quantitative definition of level of service for unsignalized intersections is presented in Table B4. Using this definition, Level of Service "E" is generally considered to represent the minimum acceptable design standard.

Table B3: Level-of-Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections

| Level of Service | Average Delay per Vehicle to Minor Street |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | - Nearly all drivers find freedom of operation. <br> - Very seldom is there more than one vehicle in queue. |
| B | - Some drivers begin to consider the delay an inconvenience. <br> - Occasionally there is more than one vehicle in queue. |
| C | - Many times there is more than one vehicle in queue. <br> - Most drivers feel restricted, but not objectionably so. |
| D | - Often there is more than one vehicle in queue. <br> - Drivers feel quite restricted. |
| E | - Represents a condition in which the demand is near or equal to the probable maximum number of vehicles that can be accommodated by the movement. <br> - There is almost always more than one vehicle in queue. <br> - Drivers find the delays approaching intolerable levels. |
| F | - Forced flow. <br> - Represents an intersection failure condition that is caused by geometric and/or operational constraints external to the intersection. |

Table B4: Level-of-Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections

| Level of <br> Service | Average Control Delay per Vehicle (Seconds) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $<10.0$ |
| B | $>10.0$ and $\leq 15.0$ |
| C | $>15.0$ and $\leq 25.0$ |
| D | $>25.0$ and $\leq 35.0$ |
| E | $>35.0$ and $\leq 50.0$ |
| F | $>50.0$ |

It should be noted that the level-of-service criteria for unsignalized intersections are somewhat different than the criteria used for signalized intersections. The primary reason for this difference is that drivers expect different levels of performance from different kinds of transportation facilities. The expectation is that a signalized intersection is designed to carry higher traffic volumes than an unsignalized intersection. Additionally, there are a number of driver behavior considerations that combine to make delays at signalized intersections less galling than at unsignalized intersections. For example, drivers at signalized intersections are able to relax during the red interval, while drivers on the minor street approaches to TWSC intersections must remain attentive to the task of identifying acceptable gaps and vehicle conflicts. Also, there is often much more variability in the amount of delay experienced by individual drivers at unsignalized intersections than signalized intersections. For these reasons, it is considered that the control delay threshold for any given level of service is less for an unsignalized intersection than for a signalized intersection. While overall intersection level of service is calculated for AWSC intersections, level of service is only calculated for the minor approaches and the major street left turn movements at TWSC intersections. No delay is assumed to the major street through movements. For TWSC intersections, the overall intersection level of service remains undefined: level of service is only calculated for each minor street lane.

In the performance evaluation of TWSC intersections, it is important to consider other measures of effectiveness (MOEs) in addition to delay, such as $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios for individual movements, average queue lengths, and $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue lengths. By focusing on a single MOE for the worst movement only, such as delay for the minor-street left turn, users may make inappropriate traffic control decisions. The potential for making such inappropriate decisions is likely to be particularly pronounced when the HCM level-of-service thresholds are adopted as legal standards, as is the case in many public agencies.

## Attachment C

Traffic Count Data


Comments:



Comments:



Comments:


Comments:

| $\begin{array}{r} 121 \div 21 \\ 131 \\ 207 \Rightarrow 55 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | k-Hou <br> 15-M <br> Qua <br> DATA TH <br> $d$ | 7: | AM <br> AM <br> Co <br> COM | 8:35 $-8: 10$ | M AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Min Count Period Beginning At | Oak St(Northbound) |  |  |  | Oak St(Southbound) |  |  |  | 35th St(Eastbound) |  |  |  | 35th St(Westbound) |  |  |  | $\text { Total }\left\|\begin{array}{l} \text { Hourly } \\ \text { Totals } \end{array}\right\|$ |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 13 |  |
| 7:05 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 |  |
| 7:10 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 14 |  |
| 7:15 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 |  |
| 7:20 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 21 |  |
| 7:25 AM | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 |  |
| 7:35 AM | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 27 |  |
| 7:40 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 25 |  |
| 7:45 AM | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 45 |  |
| 7:50 AM | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 30 |  |
| 7:55 AM | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 275 |
| 8:00 AM | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 304 |
| 8:05 AM | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 334 |
| 8:10 AM | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 362 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 379 |
| 8:20 AM | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 396 |
| 8:25 AM | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 400 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 413 |
| 8:35 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 407 |
| 8:40 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 402 |
| 8:45 AM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 382 |
| 8:50 AM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 392 |
| 8:55 AM | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 372 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 20 | 36 | 24 | 0 | 4 | 36 | 44 | 0 | 12 | 144 | 100 | 0 | 8 | 68 | 0 | 0 |  | 96 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses Pedestrians Bicycles Scooters | 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 |  | 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 |  | 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 8 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 8 1 |  | 0 0 | 8 0 0 | 0 0 |  |  | 6 8 1 |

Comments:


Comments:

## Attachment D

## Existing Traffic Operations

Worksheets

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 33 | 102 | 49 | 49 | 192 | 92 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 33 | 102 | 49 | 49 | 192 | 92 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 21 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 43 | 134 | 64 | 64 | 253 | 121 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 723 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 128 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 96 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 627 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.61 | 6.25 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.61 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.61 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.689 | 3.345 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 366 | 952 | - | - | 1458 | - |
| Stage 1 | 882 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 498 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 298 | 952 | - | - | 1458 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 298 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 882 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 405 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 13.1 |  | 0 |  | 5.4 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 620 | 1458 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.287 | 0.173 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 13.1 | 8 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 1.2 | 0.6 | - |








| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | r |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 284 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 284 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 374 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | r |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 284 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 284 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 374 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | ajor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 573 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 199 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 199 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 374 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 484 | 847 | - | - | 1385 | - |
| Stage 1 | 839 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 700 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 484 | 847 | - | - | 1385 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 484 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 839 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 700 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | - | 1385 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | - | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 9.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 83 | 315 | 93 | 51 | 153 | 93 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 83 | 315 | 93 | 51 | 153 | 93 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Mvmt Flow | 89 | 339 | 100 | 55 | 165 | 100 |







| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 47 | 299 | 23 | 12 | 323 | 2 | 34 | 33 | 25 | 17 | 23 | 72 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 47 | 299 | 23 | 12 | 323 | 2 | 34 | 33 | 25 | 17 | 23 | 72 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 53 | 336 | 26 | 13 | 363 | 2 | 38 | 37 | 28 | 19 | 26 | 81 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 246 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 246 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 439 | 0 | 0 | 265 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | MF |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 246 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 246 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 439 | 0 | 0 | 265 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 704 | 439 | 0 | 0 | 439 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 439 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 265 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 406 | 622 | - | - | 1132 | - |
| Stage 1 | 654 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 784 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 406 | 622 | - | - | 1132 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 406 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 654 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 784 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | - | 1132 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | - | 0 | - |

## Attachment E Crash Data

Intersectional Crashes at 35th St \& Rhododendron Dr January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2017

| COLLISION TYPE | FATAL CRASHES | $\begin{gathered} \text { NON- } \\ \text { FATAL } \\ \text { CRASHES } \end{gathered}$ | PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY | TOTAL CRASHES | PEOPLE <br> KILLED | PEOPLE INJURED | TRUCKS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DRY } \\ \text { SURF } \end{gathered}$ | WET SURF | DAY | DARK | INTERSECTION | INTERSECTION RELATED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF- } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

YEAR.
TOTAL
FINAL TOTAL

Disclaimers: Effective 2016, collection of "Property Damage Only" (PDO) crash data elements was reduced for vehicles and participants. Age, Gender, License, Error and other elements are no longer available for PDO crash reporting. Please keep this in mind when comparing 2016 PDO crash data to prior years.

A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not necessarily reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers may result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file. Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics. For all disclaimers,
see https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Data/documents/Crash_Data_Disclaimers.pdf.

Intersectional Crashes at 35th St \& Royal St Georges Dr / Wecoma Lp
January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2017


YEAR.
TOTAL
FINAL TOTAL

Disclaimers: Effective 2016, collection of "Property Damage Only" (PDO) crash data elements was reduced for vehicles and participants. Age, Gender, License, Error and other elements are no longer available for PDO crash reporting. Please keep this in mind when comparing 2016 PDO crash data to prior years.

A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not necessarily reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers may result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file. Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics. For all disclaimers,
see https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Data/documents/Crash_Data_Disclaimers.pdf.

Intersectional Crashes at 35th St \& Kingwood St January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2017

| COLLISION TYPE | FATAL CRASHES | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NON- } \\ \text { FATAL } \\ \text { CRASHES } \end{array}$ | PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY | TOTAL CRASHES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PEOPLE } \\ & \text { KILLED } \end{aligned}$ | PEOPLE <br> INJURED | TRUCKS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DRY } \\ & \text { SURF } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WET } \\ & \text { SURF } \end{aligned}$ | DAY | DARK | INTERSECTION | INTERSECTION RELATED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF- } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

YEAR.
TOTAL
FINAL TOTAL

Disclaimers: Effective 2016, collection of "Property Damage Only" (PDO) crash data elements was reduced for vehicles and participants. Age, Gender, License, Error and other elements are no longer available for PDO crash reporting. Please keep this in mind when comparing 2016 PDO crash data to prior years.

A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not necessarily reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers may result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file. Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics. For all disclaimers,
see https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Data/documents/Crash_Data_Disclaimers.pdf.

Intersectional Crashes at 35th St \& Oak St
January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2017

| COLLISION TYPE | FATAL CRASHES | NON- <br> FATAL <br> CRASHES | PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY | TOTAL CRASHES | PEOPLE <br> KILLED | PEOPLE INJURED | TRUCKS | DRY SURF | WET <br> SURF | DAY | DARK | INTERSECTION | INTERSECTION RELATED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF- } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR: 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ANGLE | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 2016 TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ANGLE | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| TURNING MOVEMENTS | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2015 TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ANGLE | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| FINAL TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

Disclaimers: Effective 2016, collection of "Property Damage Only" (PDO) crash data elements was reduced for vehicles and participants. Age, Gender, License, Error and other elements are no longer available for PDO crash reporting. Please keep this in mind when comparing 2016 PDO crash data to prior years.

A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not necessarily reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers may result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file. Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics. For all disclaimers,
see https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Data/documents/Crash_Data_Disclaimers.pdf.


| 00239 | N N N | $01 / 17 / 2016$ |  | 17 | OAK ST |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NONE | N | Sun | 5 P | 0 | 35 TH | ST |
| NO | 43 | 59 | 48.92 | -124 | 6 | 14.29 |

No $\quad$| 43 | 59 | 48.92 | -124 | 6 | 14.29 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad 1$

$$
\text { January 1, } 2013 \text { through December 31, } 2017
$$

| Code | DESCRIPTİN | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 000 | NONE | NO ACTION OR NON-WARRANTED |
| 001 | SKIDDED | SkIDDED |
| 002 | on/off V | GEtting On OR Off Stopped or parked vehicle |
| 003 | LOAD OVR | OVERHANGING LOAD STRUCK ANOTHER VEHICLE, ETC. |
| 006 | SLOW DN | SLOWED DOWN |
| 007 | AVoiding | AVOIDING MANEUVER |
| 008 | PAR PARK | PARALLEL PARKING |
| 009 | ANG PARK | ANGLE PARKING |
| 010 | Interfere | PASSENGER Interfering with driver |
| 011 | Stopped | Stopped in traffic not waiting to make a left turn |
| 012 | STP/L TRN | Stopped because of left turn Signal or waiting, etc. |
| 013 | STP TURN | Stopped While executing A turn |
| 014 | EMR V PKD | Emergency vehicle legally parked in the roadway |
| 015 | GO A/StOP | PROCEED AFTER Stopping for a stop Sign/flashing Red. |
| 016 | TRN A/RED | TURNED ON RED AFTER STOPPING |
| 017 | LOSTCTRL | LOST CONTROL OF VEHICLE |
| 018 | EXIT DWY | Entering Street or highway from alley or dilveway |
| 019 | ENTR DWY | ENTERING ALLEY OR DRIVEWAY FROM Street or highway |
| 020 | STR ENTR | BEFORE ENTERING ROADWAY, STRUCK PEDEStrian, Etc. On SIDEWALK OR SHOULDER |
| 021 | NO DRVR | CAR RAN AWAY - NO DRIVER |
| 022 | PREV COL | Struck, OR WAS Struck by, vehicle or pedestrian in prior collision before acc. Stabilized |
| 023 | StALLed | VEHICLE StALLED OR DISABLED |
| 024 | DRVR DEAD | DEAD BY UNASSOCIATED CAUSE |
| 025 | FAtigue | FAtIGUED, SLEEPY, ASLEEP |
| 026 | SUN | DRIVER BLINDED BY SUN |
| 027 | HDLGHTS | DRIVER BLINDED BY HEADLIGHTS |
| 028 | ILLNESS | PHYSICALLY ILL |
| 029 | THRU MED | VEHICLE CROSSED, PLUNGED OVER, OR THROUGH MEDIAN BARRIER |
| 030 | PURSUIT | PURSUING OR ATtempting to Stop a vehicle |
| 031 | PASSING | PASSING SITUATION |
| 032 | PRKOFFRD | VEHICLE PARKED BEYOND CURB OR SHOULDER |
| 033 | CROS MED | VEHICLE CROSSED EARTH OR GRASS MEDIAN |
| 034 | $\mathrm{X} \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{SGNL}$ | Crossing at intersection - no traffic signal present |
| 035 | X w/ SGNL | Crossing at intersection - traffic signal present |
| 036 | DIAGONAL | CROSSING AT INTERSECTION - DIAGONALLY |
| 037 | BTWN INT | CROSSING BETWEEN INTERSECTIONS |
| 038 | DISTRACT | DRIVER'S Attention distracted |
| 039 | W/TRAF-S | WALKING, RUNNING, RIding, ETC., ON SHOULDER WITH TRAFFIC |
| 040 | A/traf-s | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON SHOULDER FACING TRAFFIC |
| 041 | W/TRAF-P | WALKING, RUNNING, RIdIng, etc., ON PAVEMENT WITH TRAFFIC |
| 042 | A/traf-p | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON PAVEMENT FACING TRAFFIC |
| 043 | PLAYINRD | PLAYing in street or road |
| 044 | push mV | PUSHING OR WORKING ON VEHICLE IN ROAD OR ON SHOULDER |
| 045 | WORK ON | WORKING In ROADWAY OR ALONG SHOULDER |
| 046 | W/ TRAFIC | NON-MOTORIST WALKING, RUNNING, RIding, ETC. WIth traffic |
| 047 | A/ TRAFIC | NON-MOTORIST WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC. FACING TRAFFIC |
| 050 | LAY ON RD | Standing or lying in roadway |
| 051 | ENT OfFRD | Entering / Starting in traffic lane from off road |

## ACTION CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| 00 | NO CODE | NO CAUSE ASSOCIATED AT THIS LEVEL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 01 | TOO-FAST | TOO FAST FOR CONDITIONS (NOT EXCEED POSTED SPEED. |
| 02 | NO-YIELD | DID NOT YIELD RIGHT-OF-WAY |
| 03 | PAS-STOP | PASSED STOP SIGN OR RED FLASHER |
| 04 | DIS SIG | DISREGARDED TRAFFIC SIGNAL |
| 05 | LEFT-CTR | DROVE LEFT OF CENTER ON TWO-WAY ROAD; STRADDLING |
| 06 | IMP-OVER | IMPROPER OVERTAKING |
| 07 | TOO-CLOS | FOLLOWED TOO CLOSELY |
| 08 | IMP-TURN | MADE IMPROPER TURN |
| 09 | DRINKING | ALCOHOL OR DRUG INVOLVED |
| 10 | OTHR-IMP | OTHER IMPROPER DRIVING |
| 11 | MECH-DEF | MECHANICAL DEFECT |
| 12 | OTHER | OTHER (NOT IMPROPER DRIVING) |
| 13 | IMP LNC | IMPROPER CHANGE OF TRAFFIC LANES |
| 14 | DIS TCD | DISREGARDED OTHER TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE |
| 15 | WRNG WAY | WRONG WAY ON ONE-WAY ROAD; WRONG SIDE DIVIDED ROi |
| 16 | FATIGUE | DRIVER DROWSY/FATIGUED/SLEEPY |
| 17 | ILLNESS | PHYSICAL ILLNESS |
| 18 | IN RDWY | NON-MOTORIST ILLEGALLY IN ROADWAY |
| 19 | NT VISBL | NON-MOTORIST NOT VISIBLE; NON-REFLECTIVE CLOTHIN |
| 20 | IMP PKNG | VEHICLE IMPROPERLY PARKED |
| 21 | DEF STER | DEFECTIVE STEERING MECHANISM |
| 22 | DEF BRKE | INADEQUATE OR NO BRAKES |
| 24 | LOADSHFT | VEHICLE LOST LOAD OR LOAD SHIFTED |
| 25 | TIREFAIL | TIRE FAILURE |
| 26 | PHANTOM | PHANTOM / NON-CONTACT VEHICLE |
| 27 | INATTENT | INATTENTION |
| 28 | NM INATT | NON-MOTORIST INATTENTION |
| 29 | FAVOID | FAILED TO AVOID VEHICLE AHEAD |
| 30 | SPEED | DRIVING IN EXCESS OF POSTED SPEED |
| 31 | RACING | SPEED RACING (PER PAR) |
| 32 | CARELESS | CARELESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 33 | RECKLESS | RECKLESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 34 | AGGRESV | AGGRESSIVE DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 35 | RDRAGE | ROAD RAGE (PER PAR) |
| 40 | VIEW OBS | VIEW OBSCURED |
| 50 | USED MDN | IMPROPER USE OF MEDIAN OR SHOULDER |
| 51 | FAIL LN | FAILED TO MAINTAIN LANE |
| 52 | OFF RD | RAN OFF ROAD |


| \& | OTH | MISCELL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - | BACK | BACKING |
| 0 | PED |  |


| 1 | ANGL | PEDESTRIA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | HEAD | ANGLE |


| 2 | HEAD | HEAD-ON |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | REAR | REAR |

3 REAR REAR-END

| 4 | SS-M | SIDESWIPE - MEETING |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

5 SS-O SIDESWIPE - OVERTAKIng
6 TURN TURNING MOVEMENT
PARK PARKING MANEUVER
8 NCOL NON-COLLISION
9 FIX FIXED OBJECT OR OTHER OBJECT

## CRASH TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

CRASH SHORT
TYPE DESCRIPTION LONG DESCRIPTION

| $\&$ | OVERTURN | OVERTURNED |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | NON-COLL | OTHER NON-COLLISIO |


| 0 | NON-COLL | OTHER NON-COLLISION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | OTH RDWY | MOTOR VEHICLE ON OTHER ROADWAY |


| 1 | OTH RDWY | MOTOR VEHICLE ON OTH |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | PRKD MV | PARKED MOTOR VEHICLE |


| LIC | SHORT |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| 0 | NONE | NOT LICENSED (HAD NEVER BEEN LICENSED) |
| 1 | OR-Y | VALID OREGON LICENSE |
| 2 | OTH-Y | VALID LICENSE, OTHER STATE OR COUNTRY |
| 3 | SUSP | SUSPENDED/REVOKED |
| 4 | EXP | EXPIRED |
| 8 | N-VAL | OTHER NON-VALID LICENSE |
| 9 | UNK | UNKNOWN IF DRIVER WAS LICENSED AT TIME OF CRASH |


| RES <br> CODE | SHORT <br> DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |

## ERROR CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| ERROR CODE | SHORT <br> DESCRIPTION | FULL DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 000 | NONE | NO ERROR |
| 001 | WIDE TRN | WIDE TURN |
| 002 | CUT CORN | CUT CORNER ON TURN |
| 003 | FAIL TRN | FAILED TO OBEY MANDATORY TRAFFIC TURN SIGNAL, SIGN OR LANE MARKINGS |
| 004 | L IN TRF | LEFT TURN IN FRONT OF ONCOMING TRAFFIC |
| 005 | L PROHIB | LEFT TURN WHERE PROHIBITED |
| 006 | FRM WRng | TURNED FROM WRONG LANE |
| 007 | TO WRONG | TURNED INTO WRONG LANE |
| 008 | ILLEG U | U-TURNED ILLEGALLY |
| 009 | IMP STOP | IMPROPERLY STOPPED IN TRAFFIC LANE |
| 010 | IMP SIG | IMPROPER SIGNAL OR FAILURE TO SIGNAL |
| 011 | IMP BACK | BACKING IMPROPERLY (NOT PARKING) |
| 012 | IMP PARK | IMPROPERLY PARKED |
| 013 | UNPARK | Improper Start leaving Parked position |
| 014 | IMP STRT | IMPROPER START FROM STOPPED POSITION |
| 015 | IMP LGHT | IMPROPER OR NO LIGHTS (VEHICLE IN TRAFFIC) |
| 016 | InAttent | INATTENTION (FAILURE TO DIM LIGHTS PRIOR TO 4/1/97) |
| 017 | UNSF VEH | DRIVING UNSAFE VEHICLE (NO OTHER ERROR APPARENT) |
| 018 | Oth PARK | ENTERING/EXITING PARKED POSITION W/ InSufficient Clearance; other improper Parking maneuver |
| 019 | DIS DRIV | DISREGARDED OTHER DRIVER'S SIGNAL |
| 020 | DIS SGNL | DISREGARDED TRAFFIC SIGNAL |
| 021 | RAN Stop | DISREGARDED Stop Sign or flashing red |
| 022 | DIS SIGN | DISREGARDED WARNING SIGN, FLARES OR FLASHING AMBER |
| 023 | DIS OFCR | DISREGARDED POLICE OFFICER OR FLAGMAN |
| 024 | DIS EMER | DISREGARDED SIREN OR WARNING OF EMERGENCY VEHICLE |
| 025 | DIS RR | DISREGARDED RR SIGNAL, RR SIGN, OR RR FLAGMAN |
| 026 | REAR-END | FAILED TO AVOID Stopped or parked vehicle ahead other than School bus |
| 027 | BIKE ROW | DID NOT HAVE RIGHT-OF-WAY OVER PEDALCYCLIST |
| 028 | No Row | DID NOT HAVE RIGHT-OF-WAY |
| 029 | PED ROW | FAILED TO YIELD RIGHT-OF-WAY to pedestrian |
| 030 | PAS CURV | PASSING ON A CURVE |
| 031 | PAS WRng | PASSING ON THE WRONG SIDE |
| 032 | PAS tANG | PASSING ON STRAIGHT ROAD UNDER UNSAFE CONDITIONS |
| 033 | PAS X -WK | PASSED VEHICLE Stopped at crosswalk for pedestrian |
| 034 | PAS INTR | PASSING AT INTERSECTION |
| 035 | PAS HILL | PASSING ON CREST Of hill |
| 036 | N/PAS ZN | PASSING IN "NO PASSING" ZONE |
| 037 | PAS TRAF | PASSING In FRONT OF ONCOMING TRAFFIC |
| 038 | CUT-IN | CUtting in (TWO LANES - TWO WAY OnLy) |
| 039 | WRNGSIDE | DRIVING ON WRONG SIDE Of the road (2-WAY UNDIVIDED ROADWAYS) |


| ERROR | SHORT DESCRIPTION | FULL DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 040 | THRU MED | DRIVING THROUGH SAFETY ZONE OR OVER ISLAND |
| 041 | F/ST BUS | FAILED TO STOP FOR SCHOOL BUS |
| 042 | F/SLO MV | FAILED TO DECREASE SPEED FOR SLOWER MOVING VEHICLE |
| 43 | too Close | FOLLOWING TOO CLOSELY (MUST BE ON OFFICER'S REPORT) |
| 044 | STRDL LN | STRADDLING OR DRIVING ON WRONG LANES |
| 045 | IMP CHG | ImPROPER CHANGE OF TRAFFIC LANES |
| 046 | WRNG WAY | WRONG WAY ON ONE-WAY ROADWAY; WRONG SIDE DIVIDED ROAD |
| 047 | BASCRULE | DRIVING TOO FAST FOR CONDITIONS (NOT EXCEEDING POSTED SPEED) |
| 048 | OPN DOOR | OPENED DOOR INTO ADJACENT TRAFFIC LANE |
| 049 | Impeding | IMPEDING TRAFFIC |
| 050 | SPEED | DRIVING In EXCESS OF POSTED SPEED |
| 051 | RECKLESS | RECKLESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 052 | CARELESS | CARELESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 053 | RACING | SPEED RACING (PER PAR) |
| 054 | X N/SGNL | CROSSING AT Intersection, NO TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRESENT |
| 055 | X W/SGNL | CROSSING AT INTERSECTION, TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRESENT |
| 056 | DIAGONAL | CROSSING AT INTERSECTION - DIAGONALLY |
| 057 | BTWN INT | CROSSING BETWEEN INTERSECTIONS |
| 059 | W/TRAF-S | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON SHOULDER WITH TRAFFIC |
| 060 | A/TRAF-S | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON SHOULDER FACING TRAFFIC |
| 061 | W/TRAF-P | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON PAVEMENT WITH TRAFFIC |
| 062 | A/TRAF-P | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON PAVEMENT FACING TRAFFIC |
| 063 | PLAYINRD | PLAYING IN STREET OR ROAD |
| 064 | PUSH MV | PUSHING OR WORKING ON VEHICLE IN ROAD OR ON SHOULDER |
| 065 | WORK IN RD | WORKING IN ROADWAY OR ALONG SHOULDER |
| 070 | LAY ON RD | Standing Or Lying in roadway |
| 071 | NM IMP USE | IMPROPER USE OF TRAFFIC LANE BY NON-MOTORIST |
| 073 | ELUDING | ELUding / Attempt to elude |
| 079 | F NEG CURV | FAILED TO NeGotiate a curve |
| 080 | FAIL LN | FAILED TO MAINTAIN LANE |
| 081 | OFF RD | RAN OFF ROAD |
| 082 | No CLEAR | DRIVER MISJUDGED CLEARANCE |
| 083 | OVRSTEER | OVER-CORRECTING |
| 084 | NOT USED | CODE NOT IN USE |
| 085 | OVRLOAD | OVERLOADING OR IMPROPER LOADING OF VEHICLE WITH CARGO OR PASSENGERS |
| 97 | UNA DIS TC | UNABLE TO DETERMINE WHICH DRIVER DISREGARDED TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE |

EVENT SHORT
CODE DESCRIPTION

| 001 | FEL/JUMP | OCCUPANT FELL, JUMPED OR WAS EJECTED FROM MOVING VEhICLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 002 | INTERFER | PASSENGER INTERFERED WITH DRIVER |
| 003 | bug inte | ANIMAL OR INSECT IN VEHICLE INTERFERED WITH DRIVER |
| 004 | INDRCT PED | PEDESTRIAN INDIRECTLY INVOLVED (NOT STRUCK) |
| 005 | SUB-PED | "SUB-PED": PEDESTRIAN INJURED SUBSEQUENT TO COLLISION, ETC. |
| 006 | INDRCT BIK | PEDALCYCLIST INDIRECTLY INVOLVED (NOT STRUCK) |
| 007 | HITCHIKR | HITCHHIKER (SOLICITING A RIDE) |
| 008 | PSNGR TOW | PASSENGER OR NON-MOTORIST BEING TOWED OR PUSHED ON CONVEYANCE |
| 009 | ON/OFF V | GEtting On/OFF Stopped/parked vehicle (OCCUPANTS Only; must have physical contact w/ vehic |
| 010 | SUB OTRN | OVERTURNED AFTER FIRST HARMFUL EVENT |
| 011 | MV PUSHD | VEHICLE BEING PUSHED |
| 012 | MV TOWED | VEHICLE TOWED OR HAD BEEN TOWING ANOTHER VEHICLE |
| 013 | FORCED | VEHICLE FORCED BY IMPACT INTO ANOTHER VEHICLE, PEDALCYCLIST OR PEDESTRIAN |
| 014 | SET MOTN | VEHICLE SET IN MOTION BY NON-DRIVER (CHILD RELEASED BRAKES, ETC.) |
| 015 | RR ROW | AT OR ON RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY (NOT LIGHT RAIL) |
| 016 | LT RL Row | AT OR ON LIGHT-RAIL RIGHT-OF-WAY |
| 017 | RR HIT V | TRAIN STRUCK VEhicle |
| 018 | V HIT RR | VEhicle struck train |
| 019 | HIT RR CAR | vehicle struck railroad car on roadway |
| 020 | JACKNIFE | JACKKNIFE; TRAILER OR TOWED VEHICLE STRUCK TOWING VEHICLE |
| 021 | TRL OTRN | TRAILER OR TOWED VEHICLE OVERTURNED |
| 022 | CN BROKE | TRAILER CONNECTION BROKE |
| 023 | DETACH TRL | DETACHED TRAILING OBJECT STRUCK OTHER VEHICLE, NON-MOTORIST, OR OBJECT |
| 024 | V DOOR OPN | VEHICLE DOOR OPENED INTO ADJACENT TRAFFIC LANE |
| 025 | WHEELOFF | WHEEL CAME OFF |
| 026 | HOOD UP | HOOD FLEW UP |
| 028 | LOAD SHIFT | LOST LOAD, LOAD MOVED OR Shifted |
| 029 | TIREFAIL | TIRE FAILURE |
| 030 | PET | PET: CAT, DOG AND SIMILAR |
| 031 | LVSTOCK | STOCK: COW, CALF, BULL, STEER, SHEEP, ETC. |
| 032 | HORSE | HORSE, MULE, OR DONKEY |
| 033 | HRSE\&RID | HORSE AND RIDER |
| 034 | GAME | WILD AnIMAL, GAME (INCLUDES BIRDS; NOT DEER OR ELK) |
| 035 | DEER ELK | DEER OR ELK, WAPITI |
| 036 | AnML Veh | ANIMAL-DRAWN VEHICLE |
| 037 | CULVERT | CULVERT, OPEN LOW OR HIGH MANHOLE |
| 038 | Atenuatn | IMPACT ATTENUATOR |
| 039 | PK METER | PARKING METER |
| 040 | CURB | CURB (ALSO NARROW SIDEWALKS ON BRIDGES) |
| 041 | JIGGLE | JIGGLE BAR OR TRAFFIC SNAKE FOR CHANNELIZATION |
| 042 | GDRL END | LEADING EDGE OF GUARDRAIL |
| 043 | GARDRAIL | GUARD RAIL (NOT METAL MEDIAN BARRIER) |
| 044 | BARRIER | MEDIAN BARRIER (RAISED OR METAL) |
| 045 | WALL | REtAINING WALL OR TUNNEL WALL |
| 046 | BR RAIL | BRIDGE RAILING OR PARAPET (ON BRIDGE OR APPROACH) |
| 047 | BR ABUTMNT | BRIDGE ABUTMENT (INCLUDED "APPROACH END" THRU 2013) |
| 048 | BR COLMN | BRIDGE PILLAR OR COLUMN |
| 049 | BR GIRDR | BRIDGE GIRDER (HORIZONTAL BRIDGE STRUCTURE OVERHEAD) |
| 050 | ISLAND | TRAFFIC RAISED ISLAND |
| 051 | GORE | GORE |
| 052 | POLE UNK | POLE - TYPE UNKNOWN |
| 053 | POLE UTL | POLE - POWER OR TELEPHONE |
| 054 | ST LIGHT | POLE - Street light only |
| 055 | TRF SGNL | POLE - TRAFFIC SIGNAL AND PED SIGNAL ONLY |
| 056 | SGN BRDG | POLE - SIGN BRIDGE |
| 057 | STOPSIGN | Stop OR YIELD SIGN |

## EVENT CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| CODE | DESCRIPTION | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 058 | OTH SIGN | OTHER SIGN, INCLUDING STREET SIGNS |
| 059 | HYDRANT | HYDRANT |
| 060 | MARKER | DELINEATOR OR MARKER (REFLECTOR POSTS) |
| 061 | MAILBOX | MAILBOX |
| 062 | tree | tree, Stump or shrubs |
| 063 | VEG OHED | tree branch or other vegetation overhead, etc. |
| 064 | WIRE/CBL | WIRE OR CABLe ACROSS OR OVER THE ROAD |
| 065 | TEMP SGN | TEMPORARY SIGN OR BARRICADE IN ROAD, ETC. |
| 066 | PERM SGN | PERMANENT SIGN OR BARRICADE IN/OFF ROAD |
| 067 | SLIDE | SLIDES, FALLEN OR FALLING ROCKS |
| 068 | FRGN OBJ | FOREIGN OBSTRUCTION/DEBRIS IN ROAD (NOT GRAVEL) |
| 069 | EQP WORK | EQUIPMENT WORKING IN/OFF ROAD |
| 070 | OTH EQP | OTHER EQUIPMENT IN OR OFF ROAD (INCLUDES PARKED TRAILER, BOAT) |
| 071 | MAIN EQP | WRECKER, STREET SWEEPER, SNOW PLOW OR SANDING EQUIPMENT |
| 072 | OTHER WALL | ROCK, BRICK OR OTHER SOLID WALL |
| 073 | IRRGL PVMT | OTHER BUMP (NOT SPEED BUMP), POTHOLE OR PAVEMENT IRREGULARITY (PER PAR) |
| 074 | OVERHD OBJ | OTHER OVERHEAD OBJECT (HIGHWAY SIGN, SIGNAL HEAD, ETC.); NOT BRIDGE |
| 075 | CAVE IN | BRIDGE OR ROAD CAVE IN |
| 076 | HI WAter | HIGH WATER |
| 077 | SNO BANK | SNOW BANK |
| 078 | LO-HI EDGE | Low OR HIGH Shoulder at Pavement edge |
| 079 | DITCH | CUT SLOPE OR DITCH EMBANKMENT |
| 080 | OBJ FRM MV | STRUCK BY ROCK OR OTHER OBJECT SET IN MOTION BY OTHER VEHICLE (INCL. LOST LOADS) |
| 081 | FLY-OBJ | STRUCK BY ROCK OR OTHER MOVING OR FLYING OBJECT (NOT SET IN MOTION BY VEHICLE) |
| 082 | VEH HID | VEhicle ObSCURED view |
| 083 | VEG HID | VEGETATION OBSCURED VIEW |
| 084 | BLDG HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY Fence, Sign, Phone booth, etc. |
| 085 | WIND GUST | WIND GUST |
| 086 | IMMERSED | VEHICLE IMMERSED IN BODY OF WATER |
| 087 | FIRE/EXP | FIRE OR EXPLOSION |
| 088 | FENC/BLD | FENCE OR BUILDING, ETC. |
| 089 | OTHR CRASH | CRASH RELATED TO ANOTHER SEPARATE CRASH |
| 090 | TO 1 SIDE | TWO-WAY traffic on divided roadway all routed to one side |
| 091 | BUILDING | BUILDING OR OTHER STRUCTURE |
| 092 | PHANTOM | OTHER (PHANTOM) NON-CONTACT VEHICLE |
| 093 | CELL PHONE | CELL PHONE (ON PAR OR DRIVER IN USE) |
| 094 | VIOL GDL | teenage driver in violation of graduated license pgm |
| 095 | GUY WIRE | GUY WIRE |
| 096 | BERM | BERM (EARTHEN OR GRAVEL MOUND) |
| 097 | GRAVEL | GRAVEL IN ROADWAY |
| 098 | ABR EDGE | ABRUPT EDGE |
| 099 | CELL WTNSD | CELL PHONE USE WITNESSED BY OTHER PARTICIPANT |
| 100 | UNK FIXD | FIXED OBJECT, UNKNOWN TYPE. |
| 101 | OTHER OBJ | NON-FIXED OBJECT, OTHER OR UNKNOWN TYPE |
| 102 | TEXTING | TEXTING |
| 103 | WZ WORKER | WORK ZONE WORKER |
| 104 | ON VEhicle | PASSENGER RIDING ON VEhICLE EXTERIOR |
| 105 | PEDAL PSGR | PASSENGER RIDING ON PEDALCYCLE |
| 106 | MAN WHLCHR | PEDESTRIAN IN NON-MOTORIZED WHEELCHAIR |
| 107 | MTR WHLCHR | PEDESTRIAN IN MOTORIZED Wheelchair |
| 108 | OFFICER | LAW ENFORCEMENT / POLICE OFFICER |
| 109 | SUB-BIKE | "SUB-BIKE": PEDALCYCLIST INJURED SUBSEQUENT TO COLLISION, ETC. |
| 110 | N-MTR | NON-MOTORIST STRUCK VEHICLE |
| 111 | S CAR VS V | Street Car/Troliey (on Rails or overhead wire system) Struck vehicle |
| 112 | v VS S CAR | VEhicle struck street Car/trolley (on Rails or overhead wire system) |
| 113 | S CAR ROW | AT OR ON STREET CAR OR TROLLEY RIGHT-OF-WAY |

# EVENT CODE TRANSLATION LIST 

SHORT
CODE DESCRIPTION LONG DESCRIPTION

| 114 | RR EQUIP | VEHICLE STRUCK RAILROAD EQUIPMENT (NOT TRAIN) ON TRACKS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 115 | DSTRCT GPS | DISTRACTED BY NAVIGATION SYSTEM OR GPS DEVICE |
| 116 | DSTRCT OTH | DISTRACTED BY OTHER ELECTRONIC DEVICE |
| 117 | RR GATE | RAIL CROSSING DROP-ARM GATE |
| 118 | EXPNSN JNT | EXPANSION JOINT |
| 119 | JERSEY BAR | JERSEY BARRIER |
| 120 | WIRE BAR | WIRE OR CABLE MEDIAN BARRIER |
| 121 | FENCE | FENCE |
| 123 | OBJ IN VEH | LOOSE OBJECT IN VEHICLE STRUCK OCCUPANT |
| 124 | SLIPPERY | SLIDING OR SWERVING DUE TO WET, ICY, SLIPPERY OR LOOSE SURFACE (NOT GRAVEL) |
| 125 | SHLDR | SHOULDER GAVE WAY |
| 126 | BOULDER | ROCK (S), BOULDER (NOT GRAVEL; NOT ROCK SLIDE) |
| 127 | LAND SLIDE | ROCK SLIDE OR LAND SLIDE |
| 128 | CURVE INV | CURVE PRESENT AT CRASH LOCATION |
| 129 | HILL INV | VERTICAL GRADE / HILL PRESENT AT CRASH LOCATION |
| 130 | CURVE HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY CURVE |
| 131 | HILL HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY VERICAL GRADE / HILL |
| 132 | WINDOW HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY VEHICLE WINDOW CONDITIONS |
| 133 | SPRAY HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY WATER SPRAY |
| 134 | TORRENTIAL | TORRENTIAL RAIN (EXCEPTIONALLY HEAVY RAIN) |



| CLASS | DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- |
| 01 | RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE |
| 02 | RURAL PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER |
| 06 | RURAL MINOR ARTERIAL |
| 07 | RURAL MAJOR COLLECTOR |
| 08 | RURAL MINOR COLLECTOR |
| 09 | RURAL LOCAL |
| 11 | URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - INTERSTATE |
| 12 | URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER FREEWAYS AND EXP |
| 14 | URBAN PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL - OTHER |
| 16 | URBAN MINOR ARTERIAL |
| 17 | URAN MAJOR COLLETOR |
| 18 | URBAN MINOR COLLETTOR |
| 19 | URBAN LOCAL |
| 78 | UNKNOWN RURAL SYSTEM |
| 79 | UNKNOWN RURAL NON-SYSTEM |
| 98 | UNKNOWN URBAN SYSTEM |
| 99 | UNKNOWN URBAN NON-SYSTEM |

## INJURY SEVERITY CODE TRANSLATION LIST

## SHORT

| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | KILL | FATAL INJURY (K) |
| 2 | INJA | SUSPECTED SERIOUS INJURY (A) |
| 3 | INJB | SUSPECTED MINOR INJURY (B) |
| 4 | INJC | POSSIBLE INJURY (C) |
| 5 | PRI | DIED PRIOR TO CRASH |
| 7 | NO<5 | NO INJURY- O TO 4 YEARS OF AGE |
| 9 | NONE | NO APPARENT INJURY (0) |

## MEDIAN TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

|  | SHORT |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| 0 | NONE | NO MEDIAN |
| 1 | RSDMD | SOLID MEDIAN BARRIER |
| 2 | DIVMD | EARTH, GRASS OR PAVED MEDIAN |

## LIGHT CONDITION CODE TRANSLATION LIST

## SHORT

| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | UNK | UNKNOWN |
| 1 | DAY | DAYLIGHT |
| 2 | DLIT | DARKNESS - WITH STREET LIGHTS |
| 3 | DARK | DARKNESS - NO STREET LIGHTS |
| 4 | DAWN | DAWN (TWILIGHT) |

5 DUSK DUSK (TWILIGHT)
mileage type code translation list

| CODE | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- |
| 0 | REGULAR MILEAGE |
| T | TEMPORARY |
| Y | SPUR |
| $Z$ | OVERLAPPING |

MOVEMENT TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | UNK | UNKNOWN |
| 1 | STRGHT | STRAIGHT AHEAD |
| 2 | TURN-R | TURNING RIGHT |
| 3 | TURN-L | TUANING LEFT |
| 4 | U-TURN | MARING A U-TURN |
| 5 | BACK | BACKING |
| 6 | STOP | STOPPED IN TRAFFIC |
| 7 | PRKD-P | PARKED - PROPERLY |
| 8 | PRKD-I | PARKED - IMPROPRLY |
| 9 | PARKNG | PARKING MANEUVER |

PARTICIPANT TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LISI

| CODE | SHORT <br> DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |

## traffic control device code translation list

| CODE | SHORT DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 000 | NONE | NO CONTROL |
| 001 | TRF SIGNAL | TRAFFIC SIGNALS |
| 002 | FLASHBCN-R | FLASHING BEACON - RED (STOP) |
| 003 | FLASHBCN-A | FLASHING BEACON - AMBER (SLOW) |
| 004 | STOP SIGN | STOP SIGN |
| 005 | SLOW SIGN | SLOW SIGN |
| 006 | REG-SIGN | REGULATORY SIGN |
| 007 | YIELD | YIELD SIGN |
| 008 | WARNING | WARNING SIGN |
| 009 | CURVE | CURVE SIGN |
| 010 | SCHL X-ING | SCHOOL CROSSING SIGN OR SPECIAL SIGNAL |
| 011 | OFCR/FLAG | POLICE OFFICER, FLAGMAN - SCHOOL PATROL |
| 012 | BRDG-GATE | BRIDGE GATE - BARRIER |
| 013 | TEMP-BARR | TEMPORARY BARRIER |
| 014 | NO-PASS-ZN | NO PASSING ZONE |
| 015 | ONE-WAY | ONE-WAY STREET |
| 016 | CHANNEL | CHANNELIZATINN |
| 017 | MEDAN BAR | MEDIAN BARRIER |
| 018 | PILOT CAR | PILOT CAR |
| 019 | SP PED SIG | SPECIAL PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL |
| 020 | X-BUCK | CROSSBUCK |
| 021 | THR-GN-SIG | THROUGH GREEN ARROW OR SIGNAL |
| 022 | L-GRN-SIG | LEFT TURN GREEN ARROW, LANE MARKINGS, OR SIGNAL |
| 023 | R-GRN-SIG | RIGHT TURN GREEN ARROW, LANE MARKINGS, OR SIGNAL |
| 024 | WIGNG | WIGWAG OR FLASHING LIGHTS W/O DROP-ARM GATE |
| 025 | X-BUCK WRN | CROSSBUCK AND ADVANCE WARNING |
| 026 | WW W/ GATE | FLASHING LIGHTS WITH DROP-ARM GATES |
| 027 | OVRHD SGNL | SUPPLEMENTAL OVERHEAD SIGNAL (RR XING ONLY) |
| 028 | SP RR STOP | SPECIAL RR STOP SIGN |
| 029 | ILUM GRD X | ILLUMINATED GRADE CROSSING |
| 037 | RAMP METER | METERED RAMPS |
| 038 | RUMBLE STR | RUMBLE STRIP |
| 090 | L-TURN REF | LEFT TURN REFUGE (WHEN REFUGE IS INVOLVED) |
| 091 | R-TURN ALL | RIGHT TURN AT ALL TIMES SIGN, ETC. |
| 092 | EMR SGN/FL | EMERGENCY SIGNS OR FLARES |
| 093 | ACCEL LANE | ACCELERATION OR DECELERATION LANES |
| 094 | R-TURN PRO | RIGHT TURN PROHIBITED ON RED AFTER STOPPING |
| 095 | BUS STPSGN | BUS STOP SIGN AND RED LIGHTS |
| 099 | UNKNOWN | UNKNOWN OR NOT DEFINITE |

## VEhICLE TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIS

WEATHER CONDITION CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| CODE | SHORT DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 00 | PDO | NOT COLLECTED FOR PDO CRASHES |
| 01 | PSNGR CAR | PASSENGER CAR, PICKUP, LIGHT DELIVERY, ETC. |
| 02 | BOBTAIL | TRUCK TRACTOR WITH NO TRAILERS (BOBTAIL) |
| 03 | FARM TRCTR | FARM TRACTOR OR SELF-PROPELLED FARM EQUIPMENT |
| 04 | SEMI TOW | TRUCK TRACTOR WITH TRAILER/MOBILE HOME IN TOW |
| 05 | TRUCK | TRUCK WITH NON-DETACHABLE BED, PANEL, ETC. |
| 06 | MOPED | MOPED, MINIBIKE, SEATED MOTOR SCOOTER, MOTOR BIKE |
| 07 | SCHL BUS | SCHOOL BUS (INCLUDES VAN) |
| 08 | OTH BUS | OTHER BUS |
| 09 | MTRCYCLE | MOTORCYCLE, DIRT BIKE |
| 10 | OTHER | OTHER: FORKLIFT, BACKHOE, ETC. |
| 11 | MOTRHOME | MOTORHOME |
| 12 | TROLLEY | MOTORIZED STREET CAR/TROLLEY (NO RAILS/WIRES) |
| 13 | ATV | ATV |
| 14 | MTRSCTR | MOTORIZED SCOOTER (STANDING) |
| 15 | SNOWMOBILE | SNOWMOBILE |
| 99 | UNKNOWN | UNKNOWN VEHICLE TYPE |


| CODE | SHORT | DESC |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | LONG DESCRIPTION |  |
| 1 | CLR | UNKNOWN |
| 2 | CLD | CLEAR |
| 3 | RAIN | CLOUDY |
| 4 | RLT | SLEET |
| 5 | FOG | FOG |
| 6 | SNOW | SNOW |
| 7 | DUST | DUST |
| 8 | SMOK | SMOKE |
| 9 | ASH | ASH |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Attachment F <br> Year 2021 Total Traffic Operations Worksheets

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 33 | 110 | 59 | 49 | 218 | 121 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 33 | 110 | 59 | 49 | 218 | 121 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 21 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 43 | 145 | 78 | 64 | 287 | 159 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 843 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 110 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 733 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.61 | 6.25 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.61 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.61 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.689 | 3.345 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 310 | 935 | - | - | 1441 | - |
| Stage 1 | 869 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 443 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 242 | 935 | - | - | 1441 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 242 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 869 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 346 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 14.6 |  | 0 |  | 5.2 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 563 | 1441 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.334 | 0.199 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 14.6 | 8.1 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 1.5 | 0.7 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 355 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 355 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Fro | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 | 79 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 449 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 18 | 0 | 0 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 24 | 242 | 61 | 12 | 154 | 0 | 20 | 24 | 20 | 1 | 28 | 27 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 24 | 242 | 61 | 12 | 154 | 0 | 20 | 24 | 20 | 1 | 28 | 27 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 29 | 292 | 73 | 14 | 186 | 0 | 24 | 29 | 24 | 1 | 34 | 33 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 28 | 0 | 152 | 10 | 0 | 284 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 28 | 0 | 152 | 10 | 0 | 284 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 37 | 0 | 200 | 13 | 0 | 374 |




| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 629 | 218 | 0 | 0 | 223 | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | 218 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 411 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 449 | 827 | - | - | 1358 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 823 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 674 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 449 | 827 | - | - | 1358 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 449 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 823 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 674 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 13.6 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvm |  | NBT | NBR | VBLn1 | SBL | SBT |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 456 | 1358 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.084 | - | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 13.6 | 0 | - |  |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | - |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.3 | 0 | - |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 10.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 83 | 342 | 123 | 51 | 167 | 110 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 83 | 342 | 123 | 51 | 167 | 110 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Mvmt Flow | 89 | 368 | 132 | 55 | 180 | 118 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 638 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 160 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 478 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 444 | 885 | - | - | 1387 | - |
| Stage 1 | 874 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 628 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 382 | 885 | - | - | 1387 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 382 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 874 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 541 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 19.1 |  | 0 |  | 4.8 |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 704 | 1387 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.649 | 0.129 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 19.1 | 8 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | C | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 4.8 | 0.4 | - |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | F |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 242 | 31 | 47 | 420 | 1 | 77 | 1 | 83 | 15 | 4 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 242 | 31 | 47 | 420 | 1 | 77 | 1 | 83 | 15 | 4 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | 150 | - | - | 150 | - | - | 50 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 272 | 35 | 53 | 472 | 1 | 87 | 1 | 93 | 17 | 4 | 4 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 4 |  |  | \& |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 49 | 305 | 26 | 12 | 335 | 2 | 40 | 33 | 25 | 17 | 23 | 75 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 49 | 305 | 26 | 12 | 335 | 2 | 40 | 33 | 25 | 17 | 23 | 75 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 55 | 343 | 29 | 13 | 376 | 2 | 45 | 37 | 28 | 19 | 26 | 84 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 15 | 2 | 409 | 28 | 2 | 246 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 15 | 2 | 409 | 28 | 2 | 246 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 16 | 2 | 440 | 30 | 2 | 265 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 724 | 455 | 0 | 0 | 470 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 455 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 269 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.2 |  | - | 4.1 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 396 | 609 | - | - | 1102 | - |
| Stage 1 | 643 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 781 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 395 | 609 | - | - | 1102 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 395 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 643 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 779 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 14.1 |  | 0 |  | 0.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRV | VBLn1 | SBL |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 412 | 1102 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.044 | 0.002 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 14.1 | 8.3 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 16 | 1 | 436 | 29 | 0 | 261 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 16 | 1 | 436 | 29 | 0 | 261 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 17 | 1 | 469 | 31 | 0 | 281 |



## Signal Warrant Assessment

Based on 2009 Edition of the MUTCD

| Project \#: | 24714 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Name: | Florence Residential Subdivision |
| Analyst: | AEG |
| Date: | $8 / 6 / 2020$ |
| Intersection: | Rhododendron Drive/35th Street |
| Scenario: | 2021 Future PM |


| Volume Adjustment Factor $=$ | 1.0 |
| :--- | :---: |
| North-South Approach $=$ | Major |
| East-West Approach $=$ | Minor |
| Major Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Minor Street Thru Lanes $=$ | 1 |
| Speed $>40 \mathrm{mph}$ ? | No |
| Population $<10,000$ ? | No |
| Warrant Factor | $100 \%$ |
| Peak Hour or Daily Count? | Peak Hour |



Table 1: Existing Transportation Facilities

| Roadway | Functional <br> Classification |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rhododendron Drive | Minor Arterial | Number of <br> Lanes | Posted <br> Speed (mph) |
| $35^{\text {th }}$ Street | Collector | 2 | 40 |
| ... . . |  | 25 |  |


| Warrant Summary |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Warrant | Name | Analyzed? | Met? |
| $\# 1$ | Eight-Highest | Yes | No |
| $\# 2$ | Four-Hour | Yes | No |
| $\# 3$ | Peak Hour | Yes | No |

$\qquad$ Select Type Of Minor Street Approach From Dropdown Menu

Rural Minor Arterial Rural Major Collector

Note: traffic volume profile for weekday (if weekend is desired, tab "vol profile" needs to be adjusted)

| Traffic Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hour | Major Street |  | Minor Street |  | Major St. Adj. Factor | Minor St. Adj. Factor |
| Begin End | NB | SB | ев | WB |  |  |
| 4:00 PM 5:00 PM | 144 | 246 | 0 | 398 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 2nd Highest Hour | 142 | 243 | 0 | 355 | 0.99 | 0.89 |
| 3rd Highest Hour | 129 | 221 | 0 | 308 | 0.90 | 0.77 |
| 4th Highest Hour | 116 | 199 | 0 | 304 | 0.81 | 0.76 |
| 5th Highest Hour | 97 | 166 | 0 | 270 | 0.67 | 0.68 |
| 6th Highest Hour | 95 | 163 | 0 | 265 | 0.66 | 0.67 |
| 7 th Highest Hour | 91 | 155 | 0 | 257 | 0.63 | 0.65 |
| 8th Highest Hour | 81 | 138 | 0 | 235 | 0.56 | 0.59 |
| 9 9th Highest Hour | 79 | 135 | 0 | 223 | 0.55 | 0.56 |
| 10th Highest Hour | 78 | 133 | 0 | 214 | 0.54 | 0.54 |
| 11th Highest Hour | 74 | 127 | 0 | 210 | 0.52 | 0.53 |
| 12th Highest Hour | 73 | 124 | 0 | 210 | 0.51 | 0.53 |
| 13th Highest Hour | 71 | 122 | 0 | 205 | 0.49 | 0.52 |
| 14th Highest Hour | 71 | 122 | 0 | 171 | 0.49 | 0.43 |
| 15th Highest Hour | 58 | 100 | 0 | 167 | 0.40 | 0.42 |
| 16th Highest Hour | 50 | 86 | 0 | 120 | 0.35 | 0.30 |
| 17th Highest Hour | 42 | 72 | 0 | 120 | 0.29 | 0.30 |
| 18th Highest Hour | 32 | 55 | 0 | 81 | 0.22 | 0.20 |
| 19th Highest Hour | 29 | 50 | 0 | 51 | 0.20 | 0.13 |
| 20th Highest Hour | 19 | 33 | 0 | 43 | 0.13 | 0.11 |
| 21st Highest Hour | 10 | 17 | 0 | 21 | 0.07 | 0.05 |
| 22nd Highest Hour | 8 | 14 | 0 | 17 | 0.06 | 0.04 |
| 23rd Highest Hour | 5 | 8 | 0 | 17 | 0.03 | 0.04 |
| $\underline{\text { 24th Highest Hour }}$ | 5 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 0.03 | 0.03 |



Wendy FarleyCampbell
Planning Director, City of Florence
250 Highway 101
Florence, Oregon 97439

## Subject: Review of Rhododendron Drive - 35 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street PUD Traffic Impact Analysis Report

Dear Ms. FarleyCampbell:
At your request, I have completed a review of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the for the Rhododendron Drive - 35 Street Planned Unit Development (PUD). I recommend that further analysis be completed, as described below, to assure that the TIA accurately describes the impacts of the development.

## Estimation of Future Background Traffic:

Background Traffic in the TIA is based on an ODOT projection that, between now and the year 2035, there will be virtually no traffic growth on Highway 101 near the $35^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection. In discussions with ODOT Staff, they stated that their projections are not indicative of traffic on nearby local streets.

The ODOT traffic projections used in the TIA are not intended to project for traffic growth on other facilities. They do not use land-use growth but rather rely on historic traffic trends. In newly developing areas, such as north Florence, historical data does not apply. In these newly developing areas, a no growth history is not an indicator of future growth. Even zero traffic growth on Highway 101 does not seem to be credible. There are projects under construction or approved that would increase traffic on Highway 101 beyond their projection for 2035.

Roads do not generate traffic. Development does. The model used for the ODOT projections do include growth or development input. The City has a number of approved
projects that affect the TIA analysis area. Florence has been growing at a rate of about 40 homes a year. The City's 2017 Buildable Lands Inventory projects that there will be about 1024 additional building units in the City by the year 2035. A significant portion of this growth will occur in the vacant land near the PUD. All of this development will affect traffic.

On the other hand, future traffic volumes projected in the Florence Transportation System Plan (TSP) take planned future development into account. The TSP is based directly on growth potential, what size developments will be, and when they will happen.

The TIA should be revised to reflect expected background growth. In the absence of anything else, the consultants preparing the TIA should review Traffic Impact Studies of projects near-by and use growth rates that are more plausible that zero. Traffic from approved, but not yet constructed should be added.

## Use of December Counts for Traffic Analysis:

Intersection counts in the TIA were taken in early December of 2019 and then seasonally adjusted to reflect peak traffic - known by traffic engineers as the $30^{\text {th }}$-hour volume. In Florence, this peak volume occurs in the summer. Traffic counts taken between Thanksgiving and the first full week in January are generally inappropriate for use in TIA's unless holiday traffic itself is the subject for analysis. Traffic fluctuates from day to day differently in the holiday season than in other times of the year, so turning movements and traffic flows vary unpredictably and cannot be accurately seasonally adjusted. It would be useful for the consultants preparing the Rhododendron Drive $-35^{\text {th }}$ Street TIA to compare their counts with other TIA's covering the same locations to see if adjustments to their seasonal adjustments are appropriate.

## Right and Left Turn Lanes:

All right and left turns onto and off of Rhododendron Drive and $35^{\text {th }}$ Street should be evaluated for the need for right and left turn lanes.

## Additional Analysis May Be Needed:

Depending of the extent of changes in background or peak traffic discussed above, Signal warrant analysis may be needed.

A related, but slightly different, issue involves meeting the City's Level-of-Service (LOS) standard. Additional traffic may result in a different LOS. In the TIA technical modeling analysis, there are a number of intersection approaches that are projected to operate at LOS "D". LOS on minor-street left-turns is very sensitive to traffic volumes.

LOS "E" is the adopted standard for those approaches; however, they can exceed LOS " F " (this actually means that there is no standard) if the intersection does not warrant a signal. This means that if an approach is projected to exceed LOS "F" a signal warrant study will be required to see if it is acceptable or mitigation is required.

## Closure:

Thank you for asking me to perform this review. I would be happy to answer any questions or provide additional information you may request.

Very truly yours,


James R, Hanks, PE


[^0]:    Growth rate calculation example: $(12,600 / 12,500-1) /(2038-2018)=0.00040$

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Defined by ITE Trip Generation as containing one or two floors of residential units.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ Oregon Department of Transportation

[^3]:    ${ }^{3}$ Updated June 26, 2019

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Most of the material in this appendix is adapted from the Transportation Research Board, Highway Capacity Manual, (2010).

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ ODOT's Analysis Procedures Manual similarly states "Traffic signal warrants must be met and the State Traffic Engineer's approval obtained before a traffic signal can be installed on a state highway. However, approval of a signal depends on more than just a warrant analysis. Meeting a warrant is necessary to install a signal, but it does not mean a signal should be recommended or guarantee its installation. Considerations to be evaluated include safety concerns, alternatives to signalization, signal systems, delay, queuing, bike and pedestrian needs, railroads, access, consistency with local plans, local agency support and others."
    ${ }^{2}$ All eight warrants were considered but only Warrants 1 and 2 and 3 are described in full detail in this report. Warrant 4 involves pedestrian volumes and is not met based on local pedestrian volumes. Warrant 5 is intended for application where the fact that schoolchildren cross the major street is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal and is not appliable at the intersection. Warrant 6 is intended to facilitate progressed traffic flow within a coordinated traffic signal and is not applicable. Warrant 7 is intended for application where the severity and frequency of crashes are the principal reasons to consider traffic signal installation. Amongst other considerations, the warrant requires five or more reported crashes of a type susceptible to correction by a traffic control signal within a 12-month period. As shown in Table 2, there were no recorded crashes at the intersection. Warrant 8 involves installing a traffic signal at an intersection to encourage concentration and organization of traffic flow on a roadway network and is not applicable. Warrant 9 is intended for use at a location where Warrants $1-8$ are not shown to be met but where the proximity of the intersection to a railroad grade crossing would be the principal reason to consider installing a traffic signal. Warrant 9 is not appliable.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Defined by ITE Trip Generation as containing one or two floors of residential units.

[^7]:    ${ }^{2}$ Oregon Department of Transportation

[^8]:    ${ }^{3}$ Updated June 26, 2019

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ Most of the material in this appendix is adapted from the Transportation Research Board, Highway Capacity Manual, (2010).

