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## Executive Summary

1. The proposed Lu Pacific Development, to be located at three vacant properties to the north and east of an existing building addressed at 10005 SW Herman Road in Tualatin, Oregon, and will include the construction of two industrial buildings totaling approximately 131,600 square-feet. Specifically, approximately 40 percent of the total building square-footage will be dedicated as manufacturing space while the remaining 60 percent as warehouse.
2. The proposed development is projected to generate 46 morning peak hour trips, 50 evening peak hour trips, and 344 average weekday trips. Of these, approximately 9 morning peak hour trips, 10 evening peak hour trips, and 69 average weekday trips are projected to be trucks.
3. No significant trends or crash patterns were identified at any of the study intersections that were indicative of safety concerns. Accordingly, no safety mitigation is recommended per the crash data analysis.
4. Adequate sight distance is available at the site access to ensure safe and efficient operation of the intersection.
5. Left-turn lane warrants are currently met for the westbound approach of the site access intersection along SW Herman Road during the morning peak hour. However, warrants are met under existing conditions and the proposed development will not add left-turning traffic on the westbound approach of the intersection. Therefore, a left-turn lane for this intersection approach is not necessary or recommended as part of the proposed development.
6. Under year 2022 buildout conditions, the left-turn lane warrants are projected to be met for the eastbound approach at the site access intersection during the morning peak hour.
7. Due to insufficient main and side-street traffic volumes, traffic signal warrants are not projected to be met at the site access intersection under any of the analysis scenarios.
8. Based on a turning movement analysis, no issues were found with regard to site ingress from the west and site egress to the east. For site ingress from the east and site egress to the west, the tractor-trailer style of vehicles may need to encroach onto the opposing travel lane along SW Herman Road in order to conduct the applicable turning movement without traversing over curbs and/or off-road.
9. All study intersections are currently operating acceptably per City of Tualatin standards and are projected to continue operating acceptably through the 2022 buildout year of the site.

## Project Description

## Introduction

The proposed Lu Pacific Development, to be located at three vacant properties to the north and east of an existing building addressed at 10005 SW Herman Road in Tualatin, Oregon, and will include the construction of two industrial buildings totaling approximately 131,600 square-feet. Specifically, approximately 40 percent of the total building square-footage will be dedicated as manufacturing space while the remaining 60 percent as warehouse. This report includes safety and capacity/level of service analyses at the following intersections:

1. SW Teton Avenue at SW Herman Road;
2. Site access at SW Herman Road; and
3. SW Tualatin Road at SW Herman Road.

The purpose of this study is to determine whether the transportation system within the vicinity of the site is capable of safely and efficiently supporting the proposed development and to determine any mitigation that may be necessary to do so. Detailed information on traffic counts, trip generation calculations, safety analyses, and level of service calculations is included in the appendix to this report.

## Location Description

The subject site is located north of SW Herman Road, south/west of SW Tualatin Road, and east of SW Teton Avenue in Tualatin, Oregon. The site is located within a predominately industrial area of the City, with industrial uses to the north, south, and west, and a trailer park to the east.

The project site includes three tax lots (lots 900, 2900, and 3100) which encompass and approximate total of 8.6 acres. All three lots are currently undeveloped. Future access to the site will be provided via an existing driveway serving a building addressed at 10005 SW Herman Road.

## Vicinity Roadways

The proposed development is expected to impact four vicinity roadways near the site. Table 1 provides a description of each vicinity roadway.

Table 1: Vicinity Roadway Descriptions

| Roadway | Jurisdiction | Functional Classification | Cross- <br> Section | Speed | On-street Parking | Bicycle <br> Lanes | Curbs | Sidewalks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SW Herman Road | City of Tualatin | Major Arterial/Collect or | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { to } 3 \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | 35/45 mph Posted | Not Permitted | Partial Both Sides | Partial Both Sides | Partial Both Sides |
| SW Teton Avenue | City of Tualatin | Major Collector | 2 to 3 <br> Lanes | 35 mph Posted | Permitted Both Sides | Partial Both Sides | Both Sides | Partial Both Sides |
| Powder Court | City of Tualatin | Local Street | 2 Lanes | 15 mph Statutory | Not Permitted | None | Both <br> Sides | East Side |
| SW Tualatin Road | City of <br> Tualatin | Major Collector | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { to } 3 \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | 35 mph Posted | Permitted <br> Both Sides | Both Sides | Both <br> Sides | Partial Both Sides |

Notes: Functional Classification based on the City of Tualatin Transportation System Plan

## Study Intersections

The proposed development is expected to impact three vicinity intersections of significance. Table 2 provides a summarized description of the study intersections.

Table 2: Vicinity Intersection Descriptions

| Number | Name | Geometry | Traffic Control | Phasing/Stopped Approaches |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | SW Teton Avenue at SW Herman Road | Four-Legged | Signalized | FYA N/S \& E/W Left-turns, YieldControlled/Channelized E/W Rightturns |
| 2 | Site Access at SW Herman Road | Three-Legged | Stop Controlled | SB Stopped Approach |
| 3 | SW Tualatin Road at SW Herman Road | Three-Legged | Signalized | NB/SB Stop Controlled |

Note: Flashing-Yellow-Arrow denoted at FYA.

A vicinity map displaying the project site, vicinity streets, and the study intersections with their associated lane configurations and control types is shown in Figure 1 on page 7.


Figure 1

## Site Trips

## Trip Generation

## Total Trips

The proposed Lu Pacific Development will include the construction of two industrial buildings totaling approximately 131,600 square-feet, where approximately 40 percent of the square-footage will be dedicated as manufacturing and approximately 60 percent as warehouse. To estimate the number of trips that will be generated by the proposed development, trip rates from the Trip Generation Manual ${ }^{1}$ were used. Specifically, data from land use codes 140, Manufacturing, and 150, Warehousing, were used based on the square-footage of the gross building floor area.

The trip generation calculations show that the proposed development is projected to generate 46 morning peak hour trips, 50 evening peak hour trips, and 344 average weekday trips. The trip generation estimates for the proposed development are summarized in Table 3. Detailed trip generation calculations are included in the technical appendix to this report.

Table 3: Trip Generation Summary (Proposed Development)

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Size/Rate | Morning Peak Hour |  |  | Evening Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |  |
| Manufacturing | 140 | 52,600 SF | 25 | 8 | 33 | 11 | 24 | 35 | 206 |
| Warehouse | 150 | 79,000 SF | 10 | 3 | 13 | 4 | 11 | 15 | 138 |
| Total |  |  | 35 | 11 | 46 | 15 | 35 | 50 | 344 |

Although the aforementioned land uses reflect what the applicant is proposing for development, City of Tualatin staff have requested that analysis be based using trip generation data from land use code 110, General Light Industrial. The reason for using this land use code is to reflect potential, conservative impacts to the transportation system which may occur due to a high traffic generating tenant(s) that could lease space within the proposed development.

Utilizing data from land use code 110, based on the square-footage of the gross building floor area, the proposed development could generate up to 92 morning peak hour trips, 83 evening peak hour trips, and 652 average weekday trips. The trip generation estimates for the proposed development, using data from land use code 110, are summarized in Table 4. Detailed trip generation calculations are included in the technical appendix to this report.

[^0]Table 4: Trip Generation Summary (Based on Land Use Code 110)

|  | ITE <br> Code | Size/Rate | Morning Peak Hour |  |  | Evening Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |  |
| General Light Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Trips | 110 | 131,600 SF | 81 | 11 | 92 | 11 | 72 | 83 | 652 |
| Truck Trips | - | 20\% | 16 | 2 | 18 | 2 | 15 | 17 | 130 |
| Standard Vehicle Trips | - | - | 65 | 9 | 74 | 9 | 57 | 66 | 522 |

For the remainder of this study, analyses are performed based on the trip generation presented in Table 4.

## Truck Trips

Per the Trip Generation Handbook², relevant data pertaining to truck trip generation is provided for land use codes 130, Industrial Park, 150, Warehousing, and 152, High-Cube Warehouse/Distribution Center. For land use code 130, truck trips accounted for an average of approximately 13 percent of site trips generated, while for code 150 were approximately 20 percent of site trips were considered truck trips. For land use code 152, the majority of truck trips generated were noted to typically occur during off-peak hours, but on average would account for between 9 to 29 percent of peak hour traffic. No specific data pertaining to manufacturing or general light industrial uses is available.

For the purposes of simplicity, it is assumed that approximately 20 percent of the total site trip generation may consist of truck trips. Accordingly, the proposed development is projected to generate 18 morning peak hour truck trips, 17 evening peak hour truck trips, and 130 average weekday truck trips, based on land use code 110. See Table 4 for details regarding the truck trip generation.

Given the surrounding site vicinity is predominately industrial in character, the nearby transportation system was constructed accordingly to best serve the needs of existing and future industrial development. As such, it is expected that a significant majority of truck trips would utilize SW Herman Road, SW Teton Avenue, and SW Tualatin Road to access the major transportation corridors of SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road and SW 124 $4^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. From SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road and SW $124^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, access to regional transportation facilities, such as SW Pacific Highway, Interstate 5, and Interstate 205, are available.

[^1]
## Trip Distribution

Based on correspondence and input from City of Tualatin staff, the following trip distribution was estimated and used for analysis:

## Standards Vehicle Trips

- Approximately 40 percent of site trips will travel to/from the east along SW Herman Road;
- Approximately 25 percent of site trips will travel to/from the west along SW Herman Road;
- Approximately 25 percent of site trips will travel from the south along SW Teton Avenue; and
- Approximately 10 percent of site trips will travel to the north along SW Teton Avenue.


## Truck Trips

- Approximately 35 percent of site trips will travel to/from the east along SW Herman Road;
- Approximately 30 percent of site trips will travel to/from the west along SW Herman Road;
- Approximately 30 percent of site trips will travel from the south along SW Teton Avenue; and
- Approximately 5 percent of site trips will travel to the north along SW Teton Avenue.

The trip distribution and assignment for the site trips generated by the proposed development during the morning and evening peak hours is shown in Figure 2 through Figure 4 . Figure 2 presents site trip assignment for standard vehicles, Figure 3 presents site trip assignment for trucks, and Figure 4 presents site trip assignment for the total trips generated.




## Traffic Volumes

## Existing Conditions

Traffic counts were conducted at the study intersections on the following days:

- Tuesday, September 11th , 2018, from 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM;
- Thursday, August 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2018$, from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM; and
- Thursday, May $7^{\text {th }}, 2020$, from 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM.

Data corresponding to each intersection's respective morning and evening peak hour was used for analysis.
For the collected 2018 count data, in order to reflect existing year 2020 conditions, a compounded growth rate of two percent per year over a two-year period was applied to the traffic volumes.

Traffic counts at the site access intersection along SW Herman Road were collected on May $7^{\text {th }}, 2020$, while the COVID-19 viral pandemic was considered a significant public health concern throughout the State of Oregon. Subsequently, traffic volumes had been significantly depressed statewide as of mid-March and into May. In order to reflect normal travel conditions at the intersection, adjustment factors for the morning and evening peak hours were calculated utilizing the count data collected prior to March 2020. The adjustment factors were calculated utilizing the following methodology:

- Eastbound and westbound volumes along SW Herman Road were balanced with the study intersections of SW Teton Avenue and SW Tualatin Road at SW Herman Road.
- The pre-COVID-19 balanced volumes along SW Herman Road were compared to the collected access intersection volumes. Based on the difference in volumes along SW Herman Road, adjustments factors of 2.3980 and 1.6870 were calculated for the morning and evening peak hours, respectively.
- The adjustment factors were applied to the site access intersection volumes, as a whole.

Figure 5 on page 16 shows the existing traffic volumes at the study intersections during the morning and evening peak hours.

## Background Conditions

To provide an analysis of the impact of the proposed development on the nearby transportation facilities, an estimate of future traffic volumes is required. In order to calculate the future traffic volumes, a compounded growth rate of two percent per year for an assumed buildout condition of two years was applied to the measured existing traffic volumes to approximate year 2022 background conditions.
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In addition to the traffic volume growth described above, trips associated with two in-process developments within the site vicinity, that are currently approved but not yet fully constructed or occupied, were added to the existing volumes in addition to the calculated volume growth. The following projects were assumed to be completed and occupied by year 2022:

- LMC Teton Building (19200 SW Teton Avenue); and
- Tualatin City Operations Site (10699 SW Herman Road).

A figure depicting trip assignment associated with the in-process developments is included within the appendix to this report.

Figure 6 on page 17 shows the background traffic volumes at the study intersections during the morning and evening peak hours.

## Buildout Conditions

Peak hour trips calculated to be generated by the proposed development, as described earlier within the Site Trips section, were added to the projected year 2022 background traffic volumes to obtain the expected 2022 buildout volumes. Figure 7 on page 18 shows the buildout traffic volumes at the study intersections during the morning and evening peak hours.




## Safety Analysis

## Crash History Review

Using data obtained from ODOT's Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit, a review was performed of the most recent five years of available crash data at the study intersections (January 2013 through December 2017). The crash data was evaluated based on the number of crashes, the type of collisions, the severity of the collisions, and the resulting crash rate for each intersection. Crash rates provide the ability to compare safety risks at different intersections by accounting for both the number of crashes that have occurred during the study period and the number of vehicles that typically travel through the intersection. Crash rates were calculated under the common assumption that traffic counted during the evening peak hour represents approximately ten percent of annual average daily traffic (AADT) at each intersection. Crash rates in excess of 1.00 crashes per million entering vehicles (CMEV) may be indicative of design deficiencies and therefore require a need for further investigation and possible mitigation.

With regard to crash severity, ODOT classifies crashes in the following categories:

- Property Damage Only (PDO);
- Possible Injury - Complaint of Pain (Injury C);
- Non-Incapacitating Injury (Injury B);
- Incapacitating Injury - Bleeding, Broken Bones (Injury A); and
- Fatality or Fatal Injury.

Table 5 provides a summary of crash types while Table 6 summarizes crash severities and rates for each of the study intersections. Detailed crash reports are included in the technical appendix to this report.

|  | Intersection | Crash Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Rear End | Turn | Angle | Fixed Object | Side <br> Swipe | Head On | Other | Ped | Bike |  |
| 1 | SW Teton Avenue at SW Herman Road | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 |
| 2 | Site Access at SW Herman Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | SW Tualatin Road at SW Herman Road | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

Table 6: Crash Severity and Rate Summary

|  | Intersection | Crash Severity |  |  |  |  | Total <br> Crashes | AADT | Crash Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PDO | C | B | A | Fatal |  |  |  |
| 1 | SW Teton Avenue at SW Herman Road | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 17,040 | 0.32 |
| 2 | Site Access at SW Herman Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,530 | 0.00 |
| 3 | SW Tualatin Road at SW Herman Road | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 18,870 | 0.23 |

As detailed in Table 5, there was one crash at the intersection of SW Teton Avenue at SW Herman Road that involved a vulnerable roadway user, specifically a bicyclist. The crash occurred when the driver of an eastbound right-turning passenger car collided with a southbound bicyclist who was traveling on the road. Travel conditions were foggy and during the night (with streetlights present) whereby visibility was poor. The bicyclist sustained injuries consistent with Injury C classification.

Based on the review of the crash data, no significant trends or crash patterns were identified at any of the study intersections that were indicative of safety concerns. Accordingly, no safety mitigation is recommended per the crash data analysis.

## Sight Distance Evaluation

Sight distance was measured at the site access intersection along SW Herman Road and evaluated in accordance with the standards established in A Policy of Geometric Design of Highways and Streets ${ }^{3}$. According to AASHTO, the driver's eye is assumed to be 15 feet from the near edge of the nearest travel lane of the intersecting street and at a height of 3.5 feet above the minor-street approach pavement. The vehicle driver's eye height along the major-street approach is assumed to be 3.5 feet above the cross-street pavement.

Based on the posted speed of 35 mph , the minimum recommended intersection sight distance is 390 feet to the east and west of the access along SW Herman Road. Sight distances were measured to be in excess of 400 feet to the east and west of the access intersection. Therefore, adequate sight distance is available at the site access to ensure safe and efficient operation of the intersection. Accordingly, no sight distance related mitigation is necessary or recommended.

## Warrant Analysis

Left-turn lane and preliminary traffic signal warrants were examined for the site access intersection along SW Herman Road.

## Left-Turn Lane Warrants

A left-turn refuge lane is primarily a safety consideration for the major-street, removing left-turning vehicles from the through traffic stream. The left-turn lane warrants used were developed from the National Cooperative Highway Research Project's (NCHRP) Report 457. Turn lane warrants were evaluated based on the number of advancing and opposing vehicles as well as the number of turning vehicles, the travel speed, and the number of through lanes.

Left-turn lane warrants are currently met for the westbound approach of the site access intersection along SW Herman Road during the morning peak hour. However, warrants are met under existing conditions and the proposed development will not add left-turning traffic on the westbound approach of the intersection. Therefore, no new left-turn lane is necessary or recommended on this intersection approach as part of the proposed development.

Under year 2022 buildout conditions, the left-turn lane warrants are projected to be met for the eastbound approach at the site access intersection during the morning peak hour. It should be noted that left-turn lane warrants are only projected to be met assuming the proposed development generates trips at levels similar to that of ITE Code 110, General Light Industrial, and will not be met if the proposed use generates trips at levels comparable to the proposed warehouse/manufacturing use.

## Preliminary Traffic Signal Warrants

Preliminary traffic signal warrants were examined for the site access intersection to determine whether the installation of a new traffic signal will be warranted at the intersection upon completion of the proposed development. Due to insufficient main and side-street traffic volumes, traffic signal warrants are not projected to be met at the site access intersection under any of the analysis scenarios.

[^2]Detailed warrant analyses for are included in the technical appendix to this report.

## Turning Movement Analysis

At the direction of City of Tualatin staff, a turning movement analysis was conducted depicting vehicle ingress and egress from the project site via the proposed access driveway. The turning movement analysis was conducted using AutoTurn software and referencing an AASHTO "WB-67" design vehicle. At a length of approximately 70 feet, the "WB-67" design vehicle is considered one of the largest tractor-trailer vehicle types that may travel to/from the site. Diagrams depicting analysis scenarios are included within the appendix to this report and are listed below:

- Figure B - Eastbound Site Ingress
- Figure C - Westbound Site Ingress
- Figure D - Westbound Site Egress
- Figure E - Eastbound Site Egress

Based on the turning movement analysis (as depicted in the above listed figures), no issues were found with regard to site ingress from the west and site egress. For site ingress from the east, the design vehicle will need to encroach onto the opposing travel lane along SW Herman Road in order to conduct the applicable turning movement without traversing over curbs and/or off-road.

## Operational Analysis

A capacity and delay analysis was conducted for each of the study intersections per the unsignalized intersection analysis methodologies in the Highway Capacity Manual ${ }^{4}$ (HCM). Intersections are generally evaluated based on the average control delay experienced by vehicles and are assigned a grade according to their operation. The level of service (LOS) of an intersection can range from LOS A, which indicates very little or no delay experienced by vehicles, to LOS F, which indicates a high degree of congestion and delay. The volume-to-capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) ratio is a measure that compares the traffic volumes (demand) against the available capacity of an intersection.

## Performance Standards

The City of Tualatin requires intersections to operate at a minimum LOS E or better. For both LOS and delay related to the analysis of unsignalized intersections, the reported result applies to the worst minor-street approach lane.

## Delay \& Capacity Analysis

The $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$, delay, and LOS results of the capacity analysis are shown in Table 7 for the morning and evening peak hours. Detailed calculations as well as tables showing the relationship between delay and LOS are included in the appendix to this report.

[^3]Table 7: Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary

|  | Morning Peak Hour |  |  | Evening Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS | Delay (s) | v/c | LOS | Delay (s) | v/c |
| 1 SW Teton Avenue at SW Herman Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 Existing Conditions | B | 18 | - | B | 17 | - |
| 2022 Background Conditions | C | 20 | - | B | 19 | - |
| 2022 Buildout Conditions | C | 21 | - | B | 19 | - |
| 2 Site Access/Powder Court at SW Herman Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 Existing Conditions | C | 18 | 0.16 | D | 31 | 0.60 |
| 2022 Background Conditions | C | 20 | 0.19 | E | 36 | 0.68 |
| 2022 Buildout Conditions | C | 25 | 0.24 | E | 45 | 0.76 |
| 3 SW Tualatin Road at SW Herman Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 Existing Conditions | C | 27 | - | B | 13 | - |
| 2022 Background Conditions | C | 33 | - | B | 13 | - |
| 2022 Buildout Conditions | C | 37 | - | B | 13 | - |

BOLDED results indicate operation above acceptable jurisdictional standards.

Based on the results of the operational analysis, all study intersections are currently operating acceptably per City of Tualatin standards and are projected to continue operating acceptably through the 2022 buildout year of the site. No operational mitigation is necessary or recommended at these intersections.

## Conclusions

No significant trends or crash patterns were identified at any of the study intersections that were indicative of safety concerns. Accordingly, no safety mitigation is recommended per the crash data analysis.

Adequate sight distance is available at the site access to ensure safe and efficient operation of the intersection.
Left-turn lane warrants are currently met for the westbound approach of the site access intersection along SW Herman Road during the morning peak hour. However, warrants are met under existing conditions and the proposed development will not add left-turning traffic on the westbound approach of the intersection. Therefore, a left-turn lane for this intersection approach is not necessary or recommended as part of the proposed development.

Under year 2022 buildout conditions, the left-turn lane warrants are projected to be met for the eastbound approach at the site access intersection during the morning peak hour.

Due to insufficient main and side-street traffic volumes, traffic signal warrants are not projected to be met at the site access intersection under any of the analysis scenarios.

Based on a turning movement analysis, no issues were found with regard to site ingress from the west and site egress to the east. For site ingress from the east and site egress to the west, the tractor-trailer style of vehicles may need to encroach onto the opposing travel lane along SW Herman Road in order to conduct the applicable turning movement without traversing over curbs and/or off-road.

All study intersections are currently operating acceptably per City of Tualatin standards and are projected to continue operating acceptably through the 2022 buildout year of the site.

## Appendix



# TRIP GENERATION CALCULATIONS 

Land Use: General Light Industrial
Land Use Code: 110
Setting/Location General Urban/Suburban
Variable: 1,000 Square Feet of Gross Floor Area
Variable Quantity: 131.6

## AM PEAK HOUR

Trip Rate: 0.70

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional <br> Distribution | $88 \%$ | $12 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | $\mathbf{8 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 2}$ |

## WEEKDAY

Trip Rate: 4.96

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional <br> Distribution | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | $\mathbf{3 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 2}$ |

PM PEAK HOUR
Trip Rate: 0.63

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional <br> Distribution | $13 \%$ | $87 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 3}$ |

## SATURDAY

Trip Rate: 1.99

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional <br> Distribution | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 2}$ |

TRIP GENERATION CALCULATIONS

Land Use: Manufacturing<br>Land Use Code: 140<br>Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban<br>Variable: 1,000 Square Feet<br>Variable Quantity: 52.6

AM PEAK HOUR
Trip Rate: 0.62

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional <br> Distribution | $77 \%$ | $23 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | 33 |

WEEKDAY
Trip Rate: 3.93

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional <br> Distribution | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | $\mathbf{1 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 6}$ |

PM PEAK HOUR
Trip Rate: 0.67

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional <br> Distribution | $31 \%$ | $69 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 11 | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | 35 |

## SATURDAY

Trip Rate: 6.42

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional <br> Distribution | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | $\mathbf{1 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 8}$ |

# TRIP GENERATION CALCULATIONS 

Land Use: Warehousing
Land Use Code: 150
Variable: 1,000 Square Feet
Variable Quantity: 79

## AM PEAK HOUR

Trip Rate: 0.17

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional <br> Distribution | $77 \%$ | $23 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ |

WEEKDAY
Trip Rate: 1.74

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional <br> Distribution | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | $\mathbf{6 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 8}$ |






Comments:

| LOCATION: SW Tualatin Rd -- SW Herman Rd | QC JOB \#: 14768947 |
| :--- | ---: |
| CITY/STATE: Washington, OR | DATE: Tue, Sep 112018 |



QC JOB \#: 14768938
CITY/STATE: Tualatin, OR DATE: Thu, Aug 162018



TRAFFIC VOLUMES
In-Process Development Trips
AM \& PM Peak Hours

Figure A

## CDS380

## 05/06/2020

City of tualatin, washington count
oregon.. department of transportation - transportation development division
transportation data section - Crash anaylysis and reporting unit
URban non-System crash listing
HERMAN RD at TETON AVE, City of Tualatin, Washington County, 01/01/2013 to 12/31/2017
1-5 of 10 Crash records shown.




## CDS380

## 05/06/2020

City of tualatin, washington county
oregon.. department of transportation - transportation development division
transportation data section - Crash anaylysis and reporting unit
URbAN Non-System Crash listing
herman rd at teton ave, city of Tualatin, Washington County, 01/01/2013 to 12/31/2017
6-9 of 10 Crash records shown.





## CDS380

05/06/2020
City of tualatin, washington county



HERMAN RD at tUALATIN RD, City of Tualatin, washington County, 01/01/2013 to 12/31/2017

$$
\text { 6-8 of } 8 \text { Crash records shown. }
$$



## Left-Turn Lane Warrant Analysis

Project: Lu Pacific Development
Intersection: Site Access at SW Herman Road
Date: 7/17/2020
Scenario: 2022 Buildout Conditions - AM Peak Hour (EB)

2-lane roadway (English)
INPUT

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| $5^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed, $\mathrm{mph}:$ | 35 |
| Percent of left-turns in advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right), \%:$ | $14 \%$ |
| Advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$, veh/h: | 394 |
| Opposing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{O}}\right)$, veh $/ \mathrm{h}:$ | 409 |

OUTPUT

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Limiting advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$, veh/h: | 332 |

Guidance for determining the need for a major-road left-turn bay:
Left-turn treatment warranted.


CALIBRATION CONSTANTS

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Average time for making left-turn, s: | 3.0 |
| Critical headway, s: | 5.0 |
| Average time for left-turn vehicle to clear the advancing lane, s: | 1.9 |

## Left-Turn Lane Warrant Analysis

Project: Lu Pacific Development
Intersection: Site Access at SW Herman Road
Date: 7/17/2020
Scenario: 2022 Existing Conditions - AM Peak Hour (WB)

2-lane roadway (English)
INPUT

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed, $\mathrm{mph}:$ | 35 |
| Percent of left-turns in advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right), \%:$ | $15 \%$ |
| Advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$, veh/h: | 405 |
| Opposing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{O}}\right)$, veh $/ \mathrm{h}:$ | 317 |

OUTPUT

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Limiting advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$, veh/h: | 355 |

Guidance for determining the need for a major-road left-turn bay:
Left-turn treatment warranted.


CALIBRATION CONSTANTS

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Average time for making left-turn, s: | 3.0 |
| Critical headway, $\mathrm{s}:$ | 5.0 |
| Average time for left-turn vehicle to clear the advancing lane, $\mathrm{s}:$ | 1.9 |

## Left-Turn Lane Warrant Analysis

Project: Lu Pacific Development
Intersection: Site Access at SW Herman Road
Date: 7/17/2020
Scenario: 2022 Buildout Conditions - PM Peak Hour (EB)

2-lane roadway (English)
INPUT

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed, $\mathrm{mph}:$ | 35 |
| Percent of left-turns in advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right), \%:$ | $1 \%$ |
| Advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$, veh/h: | 446 |
| Opposing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{O}}\right)$, veh/h: | 291 |

OUTPUT

| Variable | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| Limiting advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$, veh/h: | 1142 |

Guidance for determining the need for a major-road left-turn bay:
Left-turn treatment NOT warranted.


CALIBRATION CONSTANTS

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Average time for making left-turn, s: | 3.0 |
| Critical headway, s: | 5.0 |
| Average time for left-turn vehicle to clear the advancing lane, s: | 1.9 |

## Left-Turn Lane Warrant Analysis

Project: Lu Pacific Development
Intersection: Site Access at SW Herman Road
Date: 7/17/2020
Scenario: 2022 Buildout Conditions - PM Peak Hour (WB)

2-lane roadway (English)
INPUT

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed, $\mathrm{mph}:$ | 35 |
| Percent of left-turns in advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right), \%:$ | $6 \%$ |
| Advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$, veh/h: | 309 |
| Opposing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{O}}\right)$, veh/h: | 440 |

OUTPUT

| Variable | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| Limiting advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$, veh/h: | 479 |

Guidance for determining the need for a major-road left-turn bay:
Left-turn treatment NOT warranted.


CALIBRATION CONSTANTS

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Average time for making left-turn, s: | 3.0 |
| Critical headway, s: | 5.0 |
| Average time for left-turn vehicle to clear the advancing lane, s: | 1.9 |

## Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

| Project: | Lu Pacific Development |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date: | 7/17/2020 |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario: 2022 Buildout Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major Street: | SW Herman Road |  | Minor Street: | Access Driveway |  |
| Number of Lanes: | 1 |  | Number of Lanes: | 1 |  |
| PM Peak Hour Volumes: | 755 |  | PM Peak Hour Volumes: | 140 |  |
| Warrant Used: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 70 percent of standard warrants used due to 85th percentile speed in excess |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Lanes for Moving Traffic on Each Approach: |  | ADT on Major St. (total of both approaches) |  | ADT on Minor St. (higher-volume approach) |  |
| WARRANT 1, CONDITION A |  | 100\% | 70\% | 100\% | 70\% |
| Major St. | Minor St. | Warrants | Warrants | Warrants | Warrants |
| 1 | 1 | 8,850 | 6,200 | 2,650 | 1,850 |
| 2 or more | 1 | 10,600 | 7,400 | 2,650 | 1,850 |
| 2 or more | 2 or more | 10,600 | 7,400 | 3,550 | 2,500 |
| 1 | 2 or more | 8,850 | 6,200 | 3,550 | 2,500 |
| WARRANT 1, CONDITION B |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 13,300 | 9,300 | 1,350 | 950 |
| 2 or more | 1 | 15,900 | 11,100 | 1,350 | 950 |
| 2 or more | 2 or more | 15,900 | 11,100 | 1,750 | 1,250 |
| 1 | 2 or more | 13,300 | 9,300 | 1,750 | 1,250 |
|  |  | Note: ADT volumes assume 8th highest hour is $5.6 \%$ of the daily volume |  |  |  |
|  |  | Approach | Minimum | Is Signal |  |
|  |  | Volumes | Volumes | Warrant Met? |  |
| Warrant 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condition A: Minimum Vehicular Volume |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major Street |  | 7,550 | 8,850 |  |  |
| Minor Street* |  | 1,400 | 2,650 | No |  |
| Condition B: Interruption of Continuous Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major Street |  | 7,550 | 13,300 |  |  |
| Minor Street* |  | 1,400 | 1,350 | No |  |
| Combination Warrant |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major Street |  | 7,550 | 10,640 |  |  |
| Minor Street* |  | 1,400 | 2,120 | No |  |

Note: Minor street right-turning traffic volumes reduced by $25 \%$.


\section*{| AUTOTURN ANALYSIS |
| :--- |
| Eastbound Site Ingress | <br> }






## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.




## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for [WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

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

Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement EBL | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | * |  |  | ¢ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 395 | 12 | 17 | 265 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 113 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 395 | 12 | 17 | 265 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 113 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 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 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% |  | 4 | 4 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Mvmt Flow |  | 549 | 17 | 24 | 368 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 157 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |




## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for [WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\dagger$ | - |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | * | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | ${ }^{7}$ | \% | $\hat{\square}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\square}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 7 | 307 | 310 | 69 | 293 | 26 | 284 | 140 | 32 | 19 | 222 | 7 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 7 | 307 | 310 | 69 | 293 | 26 | 284 | 140 | 32 | 19 | 222 | 7 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1707 | 1707 | 1707 | 1796 | 1796 | 1796 | 1767 | 1767 | 1767 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 8 | 353 | 0 | 79 | 337 | 0 | 326 | 161 | 37 | 22 | 255 | 8 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 13 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 7 |  | 9 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 312 | 440 |  | 324 | 564 |  | 403 | 393 | 90 | 416 | 356 | 11 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.03 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1626 | 1707 | 1447 | 1711 | 1796 | 1522 | 1682 | 1389 | 319 | 1781 | 1803 | 57 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 8 | 353 | 0 | 79 | 337 | 0 | 326 | 0 | 198 | 22 | 0 | 263 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1626 | 1707 | 1447 | 1711 | 1796 | 1522 | 1682 | , | 1708 | 1781 | 0 | 1860 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.2 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 7.8 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 6.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 0.2 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 7.8 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 6.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.19 | 1.00 |  | 0.03 |
| Lane Grp Cap (c), veh/h | 312 | 440 |  | 324 | 564 |  | 403 | 0 | 483 | 416 | 0 | 367 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.03 | 0.80 |  | 0.24 | 0.60 |  | 0.81 | 0.00 | 0.41 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.72 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 460 | 625 |  | 384 | 658 |  | 403 | , | 660 | 550 | 0 | 700 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 13.5 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 12.6 | 14.2 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 18.4 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 2.6 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 0.1 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 13.5 | 22.1 | 0.0 | 13.0 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 27.7 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 21.1 |
| LnGrp LOS | B | C |  | B | B |  | C | A | B | B | A | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 361 | A |  | 416 | A |  | 524 |  |  | 285 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 21.9 |  |  | 14.9 |  |  | 22.8 |  |  | 20.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 5.8 | 18.4 | 7.8 | 17.2 | 10.0 | 14.2 | 5.0 | 19.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 5.0 | 19.0 | 5.0 | 18.0 | 5.5 | 18.5 | 5.0 | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s | 2.5 | 6.6 | 3.6 | 11.5 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 2.2 | 9.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 20.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | * |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 5 | 263 | 75 | 65 | 377 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 5 | 263 | 75 | 65 | 377 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 23 | 23 | 23 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 50 | 50 | 50 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 6 | 313 | 89 | 77 | 449 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  |




## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for [WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 1 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 6 | 322 | 318 | 44 | 343 | 21 | 312 | 250 | 41 | 26 | 127 | 16 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 6 | 322 | 318 | 44 | 343 | 21 | 312 | 250 | 41 | 26 | 127 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1841 | 1841 | 1841 | 1796 | 1796 | 1796 | 1826 | 1826 | 1826 | 1796 | 1796 | 1796 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 7 | 370 | 0 | 51 | 394 | 0 | 359 | 287 | 47 | 30 | 146 | 18 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Cap, veh/h | 282 | 478 |  | 323 | 544 |  | 464 | 381 | 62 | 297 | 251 | 31 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1753 | 1841 | 1560 | 1711 | 1796 | 1522 | 1739 | 1530 | 251 | 1711 | 1563 | 193 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 7 | 370 | 0 | 51 | 394 | 0 | 359 | 0 | 334 | 30 | 0 | 164 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1753 | 1841 | 1560 | 1711 | 1796 | 1522 | 1739 | 0 | 1780 | 1711 | 0 | 1756 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.1 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 3.9 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.1 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 3.9 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.14 | 1.00 |  | 0.11 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 282 | 478 |  | 323 | 544 |  | 464 | 0 | 443 | 297 | 0 | 282 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.02 | 0.77 |  | 0.16 | 0.72 |  | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.75 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.58 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 462 | 744 |  | 425 | 726 |  | 464 | 0 | 759 | 430 | 0 | 729 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 12.5 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 11.7 | 13.9 | 0.0 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 15.5 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 17.3 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 12.5 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 11.9 | 16.3 | 0.0 | 23.0 | 0.0 | 18.1 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 19.2 |
| LnGrp LOS | B | B |  | B | B |  | C | A | B | B | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 377 | A |  | 445 | A |  | 693 |  |  | 194 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 17.9 |  |  | 15.8 |  |  | 20.6 |  |  | 18.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 6.1 | 15.6 | 6.8 | 16.1 | 10.0 | 11.6 | 4.9 | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 5.0 | 19.0 | 5.0 | 18.0 | 5.5 | 18.5 | 5.0 | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 2.6 | 9.7 | 2.9 | 10.3 | 7.5 | 5.9 | 2.1 | 10.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th CtrI Delay |  |  | 18.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 6.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | \$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 428 | 12 | 18 | 286 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 118 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 428 | 12 | 18 | 286 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 118 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 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 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 | 72 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 4 | 4 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 594 | 17 | 25 | 397 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 164 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |




## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for [WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | 7 | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{\square}$ |  | ${ }_{1}$ | $\hat{\square}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 7 | 329 | 310 | 72 | 295 | 27 | 284 | 140 | 54 | 26 | 222 | 7 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 7 | 329 | 310 | 72 | 295 | 27 | 284 | 140 | 54 | 26 | 222 | 7 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1707 | 1707 | 1707 | 1796 | 1796 | 1796 | 1767 | 1767 | 1767 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 8 | 378 | 0 | 83 | 339 | 0 | 326 | 161 | 62 | 30 | 255 | 8 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 13 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 319 | 458 |  | 316 | 585 |  | 401 | 336 | 129 | 393 | 351 | 11 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.03 | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1626 | 1707 | 1447 | 1711 | 1796 | 1522 | 1682 | 1213 | 467 | 1781 | 1803 | 57 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 8 | 378 | 0 | 83 | 339 | 0 | 326 | 0 | 223 | 30 | 0 | 263 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1626 | 1707 | 1447 | 1711 | 1796 | 1522 | 1682 | 0 | 1681 | 1781 | 0 | 1860 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.2 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 6.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.2 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 6.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.28 | 1.00 |  | 0.03 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 319 | 458 |  | 316 | 585 |  | 401 | 0 | 465 | 393 | 0 | 362 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.03 | 0.82 |  | 0.26 | 0.58 |  | 0.81 | 0.00 | 0.48 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.73 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 461 | 603 |  | 367 | 634 |  | 401 | 0 | 626 | 507 | 0 | 660 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 13.6 | 17.5 | 0.0 | 12.8 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 16.5 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 19.2 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.1 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 13.6 | 24.6 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 28.4 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 22.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | B | C |  | B | B |  | C | A | B | B | A | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 386 | A |  | 422 | A |  | 549 |  |  | 293 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 24.3 |  |  | 15.0 |  |  | 23.4 |  |  | 21.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 6.2 | 18.6 | 8.0 | 18.2 | 10.4 | 14.4 | 5.0 | 21.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 5.0 | 19.0 | 5.0 | 18.0 | 5.9 | 18.1 | 5.0 | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s | 2.7 | 7.6 | 3.7 | 12.6 | 7.9 | 8.8 | 2.2 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr Delay |  |  | 21.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.




## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for [WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \% | 7 | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | F | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | $\stackrel{7}{ }$ | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 6 | 324 | 318 | 63 | 362 | 28 | 312 | 250 | 44 | 27 | 127 | 16 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 6 | 324 | 318 | 63 | 362 | 28 | 312 | 250 | 44 | 27 | 127 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1841 | 1841 | 1841 | 1796 | 1796 | 1796 | 1826 | 1826 | 1826 | 1796 | 1796 | 1796 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 7 | 372 | 0 | 72 | 416 | 0 | 359 | 287 | 51 | 31 | 146 | 18 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Cap, veh/h | 276 | 475 |  | 337 | 565 |  | 459 | 376 | 67 | 290 | 258 | 32 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.04 | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1753 | 1841 | 1560 | 1711 | 1796 | 1522 | 1739 | 1509 | 268 | 1711 | 1563 | 193 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 7 | 372 | 0 | 72 | 416 | 0 | 359 | 0 | 338 | 31 | 0 | 164 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1753 | 1841 | 1560 | 1711 | 1796 | 1522 | 1739 | 0 | 1777 | 1711 | 0 | 1756 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.1 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 4.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.1 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 4.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.15 | 1.00 |  | 0.11 |
| Lane Grp Cap (c), veh/h | 276 | 475 |  | 337 | 565 |  | 459 | 0 | 443 | 290 | 0 | 290 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.03 | 0.78 |  | 0.21 | 0.74 |  | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.76 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.57 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 450 | 721 |  | 411 | 703 |  | 459 | 0 | 734 | 416 | 0 | 706 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 12.9 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 11.8 | 14.1 | 0.0 | 15.7 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 17.7 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 12.9 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 12.1 | 17.2 | 0.0 | 24.3 | 0.0 | 18.8 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 19.4 |
| LnGrp LOS | B | B |  | B | B |  | C | A | B | B | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 379 | A |  | 488 | A |  | 697 |  |  | 195 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 18.9 |  |  | 16.4 |  |  | 21.6 |  |  | 18.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 6.1 | 16.0 | 7.5 | 16.4 | 10.0 | 12.1 | 4.9 | 19.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 5.0 | 19.0 | 5.0 | 18.0 | 5.5 | 18.5 | 5.0 | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c +11 ), s | 2.7 | 10.1 | 3.4 | 10.6 | 7.5 | 6.0 | 2.1 | 11.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 19.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.




## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for [WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.
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