## Add the following signature blocks:

## Traffic Engineer's Statement

The attached traffic report and supporting information were prepared under my responsible charge and they comport with the standard of care. So far as is consistent with the standard of care, said report was prepared in general conformancewith the criteria established by the County for traffic reports.
[Name, P.E. \#_May 30, 2 919

## Date

Mr. Mark Phelan
KESSR
4955 Austin Bluffs Parkway
Colorado Springs, C0 80918
I, the Developer, have read and will comply with all commitments made on my behalf within this report.
Re: The Shire at Old Ranch Traffic Study Deviation Letter
[Name, Title]
El Paso County, Colorado
Date
[Business Name]
[Address] Dear Mr. Phelan:

This traffic study letter has been prepared for The Shire at Old Ranch proposed nursery to bo locatod on the northeast cornor of the Old Ranch Road and Howolls Road intorsection in El Paso County, Colorado. A vicinity map illustrating the location of the proposed development is attached as Figure 1.

Specifically, this letter has been prepared to provide a deviation request to allow access to the project along Old Ranch Road and Howells Road as directed by El Paso County staff per the El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual (El Paso ECM), 2016. A deviation is believed to be needed due to County standards identifying that access can only be granted from a lesser category street. Ridgeway Lane to the north is a local roadway whereas Howells Road to the west and Old Ranch Road to the south are collector roadways. It is understood that a deviation is a critical aspect of the review process and needs to be documented to ensure that the deviations granted are applied to a specific development application in conformance with the criteria for approval. It is our hope that this study provides the County the needed information to grant this deviation request.

The project is bound by single family residences in all directions with rural ranch style homes located to the north and the east while typical urban style single family communities are located to the south and the west. Pine Creek High School is located in the extended area further to the west. The site area is shown in attached Figure 2. A conceptual site plan for the proposed development is also attached.

This traffic study identifies the amount of project traffic associated with this proposed development and the resultant trip distribution and traffic assignment on the adjacent streets and public roadway intersection. An operational analysis was performed for the intersections of Ridgeway Lane/Howells Road and Old Ranch Road/Howells Road. In addition, the proposed project accesses located along Old Ranch Road and Howells Road were included for evaluation. One project access is proposed along the north side of Old Ranch Road while one project access is proposed along the east side of Howells Road. It is expected that project will be completed by 2020; therefore, analysis was performed for the 2020 short term build out horizon as well as the 2040 long-term twenty-year horizon.

## Existing Roadway Network and Traffic Counts

Regional access will be provided by State Highway 21 (SH-21) while primary access will be provided by Old Ranch Road. Direct access to the project is proposed from one full movement access along Old Ranch Road and one full movement access along Howells Road.

Old Ranch Road is a collector street providing one through lane in each direction, eastbound and westbound, with a 45 mile per hour speed limit east of Howells Road and a 35 mile per speed limit west of Howells Road. Howells Road is an unpaved collector street while Ridgeway Lane is an unpaved local street.

The existing T-intersection of Ridgeway Lane and Howells Road is stop controlled in the westbound Ridgeway Lane approach direction. Lane configurations are not defined at this intersection due to both roadways being unpaved. However, this intersection was analyzed with single shared movements lanes on all three approaches.

The T-intersection of Old Ranch Road and Howells Roads is unsignalized with stop control along the southbound Howells Road approach. The eastbound approach of this intersection provides a left turn lane within an existing two-way left turn lane and one through lane. The westbound approach provides one through lane and a right turn lane currently not built to County standards. The southbound approach has a paved section for approximately 50 before transitioning to an unpaved roadway. This southbound approach provides a single shared lane to serve all movements. An existing intersection lane configuration and control figure is attached as Figure 3.

Existing weekday afternoon peak hour and Saturday midday peak hour of the generator turning movement counts were conducted at the study key intersections, Ridgeway Lane/Howells Road and Old Ranch Road/Howells Road, on Thursday, March 21, 2019 and on Saturday, March 30, 2019. The weekday counts were conducted in 15-minute intervals during the afternoon peak hours of adjacent street traffic from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM. Likewise, the Saturday counts were conducted in 15-minute intervals during the peak hour of the generator traffic from 12:00 PM to 2:00 PM. Existing turning movement counts are shown in attached Figure 4 with count sheets attached as well.

## Unspecified Development Traffic Growth

In order to obtain traffic volumes for the future build out and twenty-year study horizons, future traffic volume projections were obtained from surrounding area traffic information, including from traffic projections from the El Paso County Major Transportation Corridor Plan (El Paso MTCP) and from Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) traffic information. According to information provided on the CDOT Online Transportation Information System (OTIS) website, the 20-year growth factor along Powers Boulevard (SH21), south of Old Ranch Boulevard in the vicinity of the project, is 1.56 , which equates to an annual growth rate of approximately 2.25 percent.

Additional information provided by the El Paso MTCP was used to determine annual traffic volume growth rates along Burgess Road, Shoup Road, and Black Forest Road. The annual growth rate for Burgess Road, east of Milan Road, was determined to be 1.81 percent while the annual growth rate for Shoup Road, west of Milan Road, was found to be 3.56 percent.

Further, the annual growth rate for Black Forest Road, north of Burgess Road, was found to be 3.88 percent. An overview of both the El Paso MTCP and CDOT traffic growth information for the study area are attached with this letter.

Both El Paso MTCP and CDOT traffic projection estimates were used to calculate an overall average annual growth rate of 2.87 percent. Based on this, an annual growth projection of three percent (3\%) was used to calculate future traffic volumes within the project study area. This annual growth rate was used to estimate near term 2020 and long term 2040 traffic volume projections at the key intersections. Background traffic volumes for 2020 and 2040 are shown in attached Figures 5 and 6, respectively.

## Trin Conoration

Provide trip generation numbers for the existing residential lots and provide a section ation. relative to the Road Impact Fee. See the Road Impact Fee Implementationffic generated by Document.dUnder the Imposition of Fees it notes for zoning action where the special r trip use orvariance of use results in an increase of at least 100 more dally vehicle trips poltation than the property would be expected to generate under the previous zoning, whetherss. or not subdivision, platting or building permit is required, the development would be subject to the road impact fee. The fee would be based on the additional trips as on an generated. Provide the road impact fee estimate.
four consecutive 15-minute intervals between the hours of 4:00 pm and 6:00 pm. The Saturday peak hour is the highest one-hour time period of site traffic during four consecutive 15 -minute intervals between the hours of 12:00 pm and 2:00 pm.

For this study, ITE Trip Generation average rate equations that apply to Nursery Garden Center (ITE Code 817) were used for traffic associated with the proposed development. The following Table 1 summarizes the anticipated trip generation for the proposed project with the trip generation calculation worksheet attached.

Peak Hour of Generator
Table 1 - The Shire at Old Ranch Project Traffic Ge

| Land Use and Size | Weekday Daily Vehicle Trips | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  | Saturday Peaklof Generator |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Nursery Garden Center (ITE 817) - 20 Acres | 2,162 | 81 | 80 | 161 | 233 | 233 | 466 |



As summarized In the table, The Shire at Old Ranch project is anticipated to generate approximately 2,162 daily weekday trips with 161 of these trips occurring during the afternoon peak hour. Further, 466 project trips are expected to be generated during the peak hour on a Saturday.

During the Early Assistance the applicant identified other uses planned for the property such as: Cafe, Health \& Wellness (holistic doctor office), and other uses. Discuss all the other uses the applicant anticipates to provide and update the traffic generation accordingly.

## Kimley»Horn

## Distribution, Assignment, and Total Traffic

Distribution of site traffic was based on the area street system characteristics, existing traffic patterns and volumes, and the proposed access system for the project. The distribution of traffic is a means to quantify the percentage of site-generated traffic that approaches the site from a given direction and departs the site back to the original source. Project traffic originating from either direction can access the site. Two separate trip distributions were developed for the project due to the deviation request for allowing access along Old Ranch Road and Howells Road. Project trip distribution Scenario 1 includes providing access along Old Ranch Road and Howells Road while Scenario 2 includes access only along Ridgeway Lane to meet current County standards. Attached Figure 7 illustrates the expected trip distribution under Scenario 1 for the proposed project, while Figure 8 provides the trip distribution for Scenario 2.

Traffic assignment was obtained by applying the project trip distribution to the estimated project traffic generation of the development shown in the trip generation table. The traffic assignment for project traffic Scenario 1 is shown in Figure 9 while project traffic for Scenario 2 is shown in Figure 10. Site traffic volumes were added to the 2020 and 2040 background volumes to represent estimated build-out year and long-term traffic conditions. These total traffic volumes for 2020 are illustrated in Figure 11 for Scenario 1 and Figure 12 for Scenario 2. Likewise, the 2040 total traffic volumes are shown in Figure 13 for Scenario 1 and Figure 14 for Scenario 2.

## Traffic Operations Analysis

Kimley-Horn's analysis of traffic operations in the site vicinity was conducted to determine potential capacity deficiencies at the project key intersections for the 2020 build-out and 2040 long term horizons. The acknowledged source for determining overall capacity is the Highway Capacity Manual.

Capacity analysis results are listed in terms of Level of Service (LOS). LOS is a qualitative term describing operating conditions a driver will experience while traveling on a particular street or highway during a specific time interval. It ranges from A (very little delay) to F (long delays and congestion). For intersections and roadways in this study area, typical traffic study practice identifies overall intersection LOS D and movements or approaches LOS E as the minimum thresholds for acceptable operations. The following Table 2 shows the definition of level of service for signalized and unsignalized intersections. Intersection level of service capacity analysis outputs are attached.

Table 2 - Level of Service Definitions

| Level of <br> Service | Signalized Intersection <br> Average Total Delay <br> (sec/veh) | Unsignalized Intersection <br> Average Total Delay <br> (sec/veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | $\leq 10$ | $\leq 10$ |
| B | $>10$ and $\leq 20$ | $>10$ and $\leq 15$ |
| C | $>20$ and $\leq 35$ | $>15$ and $\leq 25$ |
| D | $>35$ and $\leq 55$ | $>25$ and $\leq 35$ |
| E | $>55$ and $\leq 80$ | $>35$ and $\leq 50$ |
| F | $>80$ | $>50$ |

Definitions provided from the Highway Capacity Manual, Sixth Edition, Transportation Research Board, 2016.

## Kimley»"Horn

## Ridgeway Lane and Howells Road

The existing T-intersection of Ridgeway Lane and Howells Road operates with stop control on the westbound Ridgeway Lane approach. All movements at this intersection currently operate acceptably with LOS A during the morning and afternoon peak hours. With addition of project traffic and accesses allowed along Howells Road and Old Ranch Road (Scenario 1), all movements at this intersection are expected to continue to operate acceptably with LOS A during the peak hours throughout the 2040 horizon. With an access only located along Ridgeway Lane (Scenario 2), all movements at this intersection are expected to operate acceptably during the peak hours in 2020 and 2040, however the westbound approach degrades to a LOS B. Table 3 provides the results of the level of service analysis for this intersection.

Table 3 - Ridgeway Lane and Howells Road LOS Results

| Scenario | PM Peak Hour |  | Saturday Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay (sec/veh) | LOS | Delay (sec/veh) | LOS |
| 2019 Existing |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach | 8.8 | A | 8.8 | A |
| Southbound Left | - | A | - | A |
| 2020 Background |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach | 8.8 | A | 8.8 | A |
| Southbound Left | - | A | - | A |
| 2020 Total Traffic (Scenario 1) |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach | 8.9 | A | 9.0 | A |
| Southbound Left | - | A | - | A |
| 2020 Total Traffic (Scenario 2) |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach | 9.9 | A | 13.3 | B |
| Southbound Left | 7.5 | A | 7.9 | A |
| 2040 Background |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound Left | 9.1 | A | 9.0 | A |
| Southbound Approach | - | A | - | A |
| 2040 Total Traffic (Scenario 1) |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach | 9.1 | A | 9.2 | A |
| Southbound Left | - | A | - | A |
| 2040 Total Traffic (Scenario 2) |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Approach | 10.3 | B | 13.6 | B |
| Southbound Left | 7.7 | A | 8.0 | A |

Scenario 1: Includes one access each along Old Ranch Road and Howells Road
Scenario 2: Includes one access along Ridgeway Lane only

## Kimley»Horn

## Old Ranch Road and Howells Road

The existing T-intersection of Old Ranch Road and Howells Road operates with stop control on the southbound Howells Road approach. All movements at this intersection currently operate acceptably with LOS B or better during the morning and afternoon peak hours. With addition of project traffic and with access along Old Ranch Road and Howells Road (Scenario 1), all movements at this intersection are expected to continue to operate acceptably with LOS B or better during the peak hours throughout the 2040 horizon. With addition of project traffic and with access only along Ridgeway Lane (Scenario 2), all movements are expected to operate acceptably during the peak hours throughout the 2040 horizon; however, the southbound approach degrades to LOS C in 2040. Table 4 provides the results of the level of service analysis for this intersection.

Table 4 - Old Ranch Road and Howells Road LOS Results

| Scenario | PM Peak Hour |  | Saturday Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay (sec/veh) | LOS | Delay (sec/veh) | LOS |
| 2019 Existing |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound Left | 7.8 | A | 7.6 | A |
| Southbound Approach | 10.1 | B | 9.4 | A |
| 2020 Background |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound Left | 7.8 | A | 7.6 | A |
| Southbound Approach | 10.2 | B | 9.5 | A |
| 2020 Total Traffic (Scenario 1) |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound Left | 8.1 | A | 8.3 | A |
| Southbound Approach | 10.8 | B | 11.4 | B |
| 2020 Total Traffic (Scenario 2) |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound Left | 8.0 | A | 8.2 | A |
| Southbound Approach | 12.0 | B | 14.3 | B |
| 2040 Background |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound Left | 8.4 | A | 8.0 | A |
| Southbound Approach | 13.4 | B | 10.9 | B |
| 2040 Total Traffic (Scenario 1) |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound Left | 8.7 | A | 8.8 | A |
| Southbound Approach | 13.4 | B | 13.1 | B |
| 2040 Total Traffic (Scenario 2) |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound Left | 8.7 | A | 8.7 | A |
| Southbound Approach | 18.1 | C | 24.6 | C |

Scenario 1: Includes one access each along Old Ranch Road and Howells Road
Scenario 2: Includes one access along Ridgeway Lane only

## Kimley»Horn

## Project Access Operational Analysis

With completion of The Shire at Old Ranch development, the site proposes two new full movement access locations. One access is proposed along the east side of Howells Road while the second access is proposed along the north side of Old Ranch Road. These two accesses should be stop controlled with the installation of a R1-1 "STOP" sign on the exiting access approaches. The access along Howells Road should include a northbound right turn lane while the access along Old Ranch Road should include an eastbound left turn lane. The lane configuration and control recommendations for these two accesses are shown in Figure 15. With the Scenario 1 recommended lane configurations, all movements at the accesses along Howells Road and Old Ranch Road are expected to operate acceptably with LOS B or better during the peak hours throughout the 2040 horizon.

A scenario with one full movement access along the south side of Ridgeway Lane was also evaluated due to El Paso County guidelines of not allowing access along major collectors. An access analysis is discussed and evaluated later in this study to allow access along Old Ranch Road and Howells Road per a deviation request. With access only allowed along Ridgeway Lane, all movements at the Ridgeway Lane access are expected to operate with LOS A during the peak hours in 2020 and 2040.

The operational analysis at the proposed project driveways is summarized in Table 5 for the short-term 2020 horizon and for the long-term 2040 horizon. Detailed results of the operational analysis are also attached.

Table 5 - Project Access LOS Results


Scenario 1: One Access along Howells Road and One Access along Old Ranch Road Only

| Howells Road Access (Scenario 1) | 8.9 | A | 9.1 | A | 9.2 | A | 9.3 | A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Westbound Approach | 7.4 | A | 7.5 | A | 7.4 | A | 7.5 | A |
| Southbound Left |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$\quad$| Old Ranch Road Access (Scenario 1) |
| :--- |
| Eastbound Left |
| Southbound Approach |

## Kimley»Horn

## Deviation Request Access Analysis

A deviation to allow access along Old Ranch Road and Howells Road as directed by El Paso County staff is evaluated in this section per the EI Paso ECM. A deviation is a critical aspect of the review process and needs to be documented to ensure that the deviations granted are applied to a specific development application in conformance with the criteria for approval.

Table 2-5 from the El Paso ECM indicates that access along major collectors is not permitted if access from a lower category street is available. According to the EI Paso ECM, accesses may be permitted as a deviation if they meet the criteria for sight distances and grades turn lane reauirements and do not negatively imnact traffic operations or safety. The Revise. Use ECM criteriafor access sight distance to queuing or blocking of lane entr (ECM Section 2.4.1.D) and designevehicle selection per Table 2-36.

It is recommended that sight triangles be provided at all site access points to give drivers exiting the site a clear view of oncoming traffic. Landscaping and objects within sight triangles must not obstruct drivers' views of the adjacent travel lanes. AASHTO design intersection sight distances for left turn from stop and right turn from stop were evaluated at the accesses along Howells Road and Old Ranch Road.

With a speed limit of 45 miles per hour along Old Ranch Road, the intersection sight distance for a vehicle turning left from stop is 500 feet, while the sight distance for a vehicle turning right from stop is 335 feet. Likewise, with a speed limit of 25 miles per hour along Howells Road, the intersection sight distance for a vehicle turning left from stop is 280 feet, while the sight distance for a vehicle turning right from stop is 240 feet.
Therefore, all obstructions for Vertex is 10 feet per ECM should be clear to the right w thin the triangle created with a vertdx point located $\rightarrow 4.5$ feet from the edge of the major road traveled way (typical position of the minor road driver's eye when stopped) and a line of sight distance of 500 feet located in the middle of the eastbound Old Ranch Road lane. Likewise, all obstructions for right turning vehicles from stop should be clear to the left within the triangle created with a vertex point located 14.5 feet from the edge of the major road traveled way and a line of sight distance of 335 feet located in the middle of the westbound Old Ranch Road lane.

All obstructions for left turn vehicles from stop at the Howells Road access should be clear to the right within the triangle created from the vertex point and a line of sight distance 280 feet located in the middle of the southbound Howells Road lane. All obstructions for right turning vehicles from stop should be clear to the left within the triangle created with the vertex point and a line of sight distance of 240 feet located in the middle of the northbound Howells Road lane.

Auxiliary Turn Lane Warrants and Length Criteria
A left turn lane is required with a projected peak hour ingress turning volume of 25 vehicles per hour (vph) or greater for any access along a minor arterial or lower classification roadway per the El Paso ECM. A right turn lane is required with a projected peak hour

## Kimley»Horn


ingress turning volume of 50 classification roadway. An ao

For Scenario 1, redirect taper criteria and recommendation would be required along Old Ranch Road due to the required left turn lane. However, based on discussion with the engineering review manager, the County Engineer will not approve access from Old Ranch Road. Therefore either revise scenario 1 or provide an analysis for a third scenario such as two access on Howells Road or a single access in Howells and Ridgeway. Bottom line is to provide an analysis with no access from Old Ranch Roadaccess along a minor arterial or lower An eastbound left turn lane eleration lane is generally not required.

An eastbound left turn lane
based on an estimated left turning volume of 105 vph during the Saturday peak hour with a threshold of $\not 25 \mathrm{vph}$. Further, a northbound right turn lane will be required at the project access along Howells Road based on a projected 93 vph right turn movements during the Saturday peak hour with a threshold of 50 vph .

The eastbound left turn lane at the Old Ranch Road access should be constructed with 235 feet of lane length plus a 200 -foot taper based on a design speed of 50 miles per hour per Table 2-25 of the El Paso ECM. Likewise, the northbound right turn lane at the
Howells Road should provide a lane length of 115 feet plus a 120-foot taper. Identify the queue at Hovells Road should provide a lane length of 115 feet plus a 120-foot taper.

## Intersection Operations, Vehicle Queuing and Progression

As indicated in the Traffic Operations Analysis section, the intersections Road/Howells Road and Ridgeway Lane/Howells Road are expected to ope LOS and lower vehicle delays when access is proposed along Howells Road Road compared to only allowing access along Ridgeway Lane. Additionally, the eastbound approach of the Howells and Old Ranch Road intersection: at the project accesses along Howells Road and Old Ranch Road are expected to oper acceptably with LOS B or better during the peak hours throughout the 2040 horizon.

As documented in the LOS outputs (attached), all vehicles queues are expected to be one (1) vehicle or less at all study area intersections and access intersections puith access allowed along Howells Road and Old Ranch Road. Meanwhile, with access only allowed along Ridgeway Lane, vehicles queues are reported with five (5) vehicles at the southbound approach of the Old Ranch Road and Howells Road intersection, and three (3) vehicles at the westbound approach of the Ridgeway Lane and Howells Road intersection. These are significantly longer queues with this access Scenario 2 condition.

Progression of traffic will not be impacted at the proposed access locations along Howells Road and Old Ranch Road because these access intersections will not warrant or require signalization.

## Additional Deviation Request Factors

Access granted only along Ridgeway Lane will change the character of the local street. Ridgeway Lane is classified as a local street and local streets can typically support approximately 750 vehicles per day while maintaining the local character with residential driveways. Based on this project with access only provided along Ridgeway Lane (Scenario 2), weekday and weekend daily project traffic volumes are expected be approximately 2,200 and 3,100 vehicles per day, respectively. These volumes would all have to be directed to Ridgeway Lane if access was only permitted on Ridgeway Lane. These volumes alone would exceed the 750 vehicles per day typical threshold along a local street. Traffic volumes are currently very low along Ridgeway Lane and homeowners along this local street will not desire all traffic from this project routed onto their street.

Additionally, access only along Ridgeway Lane would increase vehicle miles traveled (VMT), travel time, vehicle emissions, and reduce air quality.

## Kimley»Horn

It is respectfully being requested that access be allowed along Howells Road and Old Ranch Road. If granted, it is recommended that the access along Howells Road be located a minimum of 330 feet (measured center to center) north of Old Ranch Road based on the deviation request analysis. Likewise, the access along Old Ranch Road should be located a minimum of 500 feet east of Howells Road. These spacing distances have been based on evaluation of minimum spacing, turn lane requirements, and sight distances.

## Recommendations and Conclusions

It is respectfully requested that access be allowed along Howells Road and Old Ranch Road to serve The Shire at Old Ranch project. If granted, the following provides recommendations and conclusions based on this requested access condition:

- It is recommended that the access along Howells Road be located a minimum of 330 feet (measured center to center) north of Old Ranch Road based on the deviation request analysis. Likewise, access along Old Ranch Road should be located a minimum of 500 feet east of Howells Road.
- An eastbound left turn lane is recommended at the Old Ranch Road access and should be constructed with 235 feet of lane length plus a 200 -foot taper
- A northbound right turn lane should be provided at the access along Howells Road and be constructed with a lane length of 115 feet plus a 120 -foot taper.
- The two proposed project accesses, one along Howells Road and one along Old Ranch Road, should be stop controlled with the installation of R1-1 "STOP" signs on the exiting access approaches.

The recommended intersection lane configurations and control for the project intersections and accesses is illustrated in attached Figure 15.

In summary, this traffic study deviation letter provides deviation request to allow access along Old Ranch Road and Howells Road. Kimley-Horn believes The Shire at Old Ranch project will be successfully incorporated into the existing and future roadway network. We respectfully request that El Paso County consider approval of this deviation request to allow access along Old Ranch Road and Howells Road. If you have any questions or require anything further, please feel free to call me at (303) 228-2304.

Discuss/provide recommendation regarding ECM Section 2.2.7.B.2 \& 2.2.7.B.3.
Based on the trip generation, this development will have to pave Howells Road up to the furthest proposed access on Howells Rd or Ridgeway Lane.

Discuss the intent for the existing residential homes and provide conclusion regarding the existing driveways. Per the Early Assistance Meeting it seems that the existing dwellings will be converted from single family residence to care taker, staff office or rental. Staff is anticipating the existing driveways to be removed with this proposed development. Update the site exhibit accordingly.
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Ridgeview Data

El Paso County, CO
The Shire at Old Ranch
PM Peak
Ridgeway Ln and Howells Rd

File Name : Ridgeway and Howells PM
Site Code : IPO 422
Start Date : 3/21/2019
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Automobiles

|  | Ridgeway Ln Westbound |  |  |  | Howells Rd Northbound |  |  |  | Howells Rd Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Thru | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Left | Thru | U Turn | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 04:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 04:30 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 04:45 PM | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 13 |
| Total | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 31 |


| 05:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 17 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $05: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| $05: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 11 |
| $05: 45 \mathrm{PM}$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| Total | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 22 | 6 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 51 |


| Grand Total | 9 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 36 | 11 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Apprch \% | 81.8 | 18.2 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 82.6 | 23.4 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 |
| Total \% | 11 | 2.4 | 0 | 13.4 | 43.9 | 13.4 | 0 | 57.3 | 0 | 29.3 | 0 | 29.3 |

El Paso County, CO
The Shire at Old Ranch
PM Peak
Ridgeway Ln and Howells Rd

File Name : Ridgeway and Howells PM
Site Code : IPO 422
Start Date : 3/21/2019
Page No : 2


Ridgeview Data

El Paso County, CO
The Shire at Old Ranch
PM Peak
Ridgeway Ln and Howells Rd

File Name : Ridgeway and Howells PM
Site Code : IPO 422
Start Date : 3/21/2019
Page No : 3

|  | Ridgeway Ln Westbound |  |  |  | Howells Rd <br> Northbound |  |  |  | Howells Rd Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Thru | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Left | Thru | U Turn | App. Total | Int. Total |

Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:45 PM

| 04:45 PM | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 05:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 17 |
| 05:15 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| 05:30 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 11 |
| Total Volume | 7 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 22 | 8 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 55 |
| \% App. Total | 87.5 | 12.5 | 0 |  | 73.3 | 26.7 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 583 | . 250 | . 000 | . 500 | . 611 | . 500 | . 000 | . 750 | . 000 | . 708 | . 000 | . 708 | . 809 |



Ridgeview Data
Collection

El Paso County, CO
The Shire at Old Ranch
Saturday Noon Peak
Ridgeway Ln and Howells Rd

File Name : Ridgeway and Howells Sat Noon
Site Code : IPO 422
Start Date : 3/30/2019
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Automobiles

|  | Ridgeway Ln Westbound |  |  |  | Howells Rd Northbound |  |  |  | Howells Rd Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Thru | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Left | Thru | U Turn | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 12:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 10 |
| 12:15 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| 12:30 PM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 12 |
| 12:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Total | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 34 |


| $01: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 7 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $01: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 10 |
| $01: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 8 |
| $01: 45 \mathrm{PM}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 8 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 23 | 33 |


| Grand Total | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 4 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 36 | 67 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Apprch \% | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 85.2 | 14.8 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 34.3 | 6 | 0 | 40.3 | 0 | 53.7 | 0 | 53.7 |  |

Ridgeview Data
Collection

El Paso County, CO
The Shire at Old Ranch
Saturday Noon Peak
Ridgeway Ln and Howells Rd

File Name : Ridgeway and Howells Sat Noon
Site Code : IPO 422
Start Date : 3/30/2019
Page No : 2


Ridgeview Data
Collection

El Paso County, CO
The Shire at Old Ranch
Saturday Noon Peak
Ridgeway Ln and Howells Rd

File Name : Ridgeway and Howells Sat Noon
Site Code : IPO 422
Start Date : 3/30/2019
Page No : 3

|  | Ridgeway Ln Westbound |  |  |  | Howells Rd <br> Northbound |  |  |  | Howells Rd Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Thru | Right | U Turn | App. T | Left | Thru | U Turn | App. T | Int. Total |

Peak Hour Analysis From 12:00 PM to 01:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 12:00 PM

| 12:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:15 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| 12:30 PM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 12 |
| 12:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Total Volume | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 34 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 82.4 | 17.6 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 333 | . 000 | . 000 | . 333 | . 583 | . 750 | . 000 | . 607 | . 000 | . 650 | . 000 | . 650 | . 708 |



Ridgeview Data

El Paso County, CO
The Shire at Old Ranch
PM Peak
Old Ranch Rd and Howells Rd

File Name : Old Ranch and Howells PM
Site Code : IPO 422
Start Date : 3/21/2019
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Automobiles

|  | Old Ranch Rd Eastbound |  |  |  | Old Ranch Rd Westbound |  |  |  | Howells Rd Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | U Turn | App. Total | Thru | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Left | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 8 | 75 | 0 | 83 | 40 | 1 | 0 | 41 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 128 |
| 04:15 PM | 2 | 85 | 0 | 87 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 117 |
| 04:30 PM | 4 | 68 | 0 | 72 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 102 |
| 04:45 PM | 6 | 90 | 0 | 96 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 125 |
| Total | 20 | 318 | 0 | 338 | 122 | 1 | 0 | 123 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 472 |


| $05: 00 ~ P M$ | 11 | 94 | 0 | 105 | 54 | 1 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 169 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $05: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ | 9 | 92 | 0 | 101 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 145 |
| $05: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ | 5 | 91 | 0 | 96 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 132 |
| $05: 45 \mathrm{PM}$ | 4 | 81 | 0 | 85 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 126 |
| Total | 29 | 358 | 0 | 387 | 158 | 1 | 0 | 159 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 26 | 572 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand Total | 49 | 676 | 0 | 725 | 280 | 2 | 0 | 282 | 3 | 34 | 0 | $37 \mid$ | 1044 |
| Apprch \% | 6.8 | 93.2 | 0 |  | 99.3 | 0.7 | 0 |  | 8.1 | 91.9 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 4.7 | 64.8 | 0 | 69.4 | 26.8 | 0.2 | 0 | 27 | 0.3 | 3.3 | 0 | 3.5 |  |

Ridgeview Data Collection

El Paso County, CO
The Shire at Old Ranch
PM Peak
Old Ranch Rd and Howells Rd

File Name : Old Ranch and Howells PM
Site Code : IPO 422
Start Date : 3/21/2019
Page No : 2


Ridgeview Data
Collection

El Paso County, CO
The Shire at Old Ranch
PM Peak
Old Ranch Rd and Howells Rd

File Name : Old Ranch and Howells PM
Site Code : IPO 422
Start Date : 3/21/2019
Page No : 3

|  | Old Ranch Rd Eastbound |  |  |  | Old Ranch Rd Westbound |  |  |  | Howells Rd Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | U Turn | App. Total | Thru | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Left | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Int. Total |

Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 05:00 PM

| 05:00 PM | 11 | 94 | 0 | 105 | 54 | 1 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 169 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 05:15 PM | 9 | 92 | 0 | 101 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 145 |
| 05:30 PM | 5 | 91 | 0 | 96 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 132 |
| 05:45 PM | 4 | 81 | 0 | 85 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 126 |
| Total Volume | 29 | 358 | 0 | 387 | 158 | 1 | 0 | 159 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 26 | 572 |
| \% App. Total | 7.5 | 92.5 | 0 |  | 99.4 | 0.6 | 0 |  | 3.8 | 96.2 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 659 | . 952 | . 000 | . 921 | . 731 | . 250 | . 000 | . 723 | . 250 | . 694 | . 000 | . 722 | . 846 |



Ridgeview Data
Collection

El Paso County, CO
The Shire at Old Ranch
Saturday Noon Peak
Old Ranch Rd and Howells Rd

File Name : Old Ranch and Howells Sat Noon
Site Code : IPO 422
Start Date : 3/30/2019
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Automobiles

|  | Old Ranch Rd Eastbound |  |  |  | Old Ranch Rd Westbound |  |  |  | Howells Rd Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | U Turn | App. Total | Thru | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Left | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 12:00 PM | 5 | 33 | 0 | 38 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 72 |
| 12:15 PM | 3 | 29 | 0 | 32 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 77 |
| 12:30 PM | 5 | 19 | 0 | 24 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 72 |
| 12:45 PM | 4 | 28 | 0 | 32 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 65 |
| Total | 17 | 109 | 0 | 126 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 18 | 286 |


| 01:00 PM | 1 | 29 | 0 | 30 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 66 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:15 PM | 5 | 26 | 1 | 32 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 62 |
| 01:30 PM | 1 | 43 | 0 | 44 | 31 | 2 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 85 |
| 01:45 PM | 2 | 33 | 0 | 35 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 70 |
| Total | 9 | 131 | 1 | 141 | 118 | 2 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 22 | 283 |
| Grand Total | 26 | 240 | 1 | 267 | 260 | 2 | 0 | 262 | 1 | 39 | 0 | 40 | 569 |
| Apprch \% | 9.7 | 89.9 | 0.4 |  | 99.2 | 0.8 | 0 |  | 2.5 | 97.5 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 4.6 | 42.2 | 0.2 | 46.9 | 45.7 | 0.4 | 0 | 46 | 0.2 | 6.9 | 0 | 7 |  |

Ridgeview Data Collection

El Paso County, CO
The Shire at Old Ranch
Saturday Noon Peak
Old Ranch Rd and Howells Rd

File Name : Old Ranch and Howells Sat Noon
Site Code : IPO 422
Start Date : 3/30/2019
Page No : 2


Ridgeview Data
Collection

El Paso County, CO
The Shire at Old Ranch
Saturday Noon Peak
Old Ranch Rd and Howells Rd

File Name : Old Ranch and Howells Sat Noon
Site Code : IPO 422
Start Date : 3/30/2019
Page No : 3

|  | Old Ranch Rd Eastbound |  |  |  | Old Ranch Rd Westbound |  |  |  | Howells Rd Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | U Turn | App. Total | Thru | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Left | Right | U Turn | App. Total | Int. Total |

Peak Hour Analysis From 12:00 PM to 01:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 12:00 PM

| 12:00 PM | 5 | 33 | 0 | 38 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 72 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:15 PM | 3 | 29 | 0 | 32 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 77 |
| 12:30 PM | 5 | 19 | 0 | 24 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 72 |
| 12:45 PM | 4 | 28 | 0 | 32 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 65 |
| Total Volume | 17 | 109 | 0 | 126 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 18 | 286 |
| \% App. Total | 13.5 | 86.5 | 0 |  | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 5.6 | 94.4 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 850 | . 826 | . 000 | . 829 | . 866 | . 000 | . 000 | . 866 | . 250 | . 607 | . 000 | . 643 | . 929 |



The Shire at Old Ranch Project Traffic Projections

| Roadway | Source | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ <br> Volume | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ <br> Projection | Growth <br> Factor | Annual <br> Growth |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Burgess Rd E/O Milan Rd | El Paso County | 3,200 | 5,200 | 1.63 | $1.81 \%$ |
| Shoup Rd W/O Milan Rd | El Paso County | 4,200 | 10,800 | 2.57 | $3.56 \%$ |
| Black Forest Rd N/O Burgess Rd | El Paso County | 4,800 | 13,400 | 2.79 | $3.88 \%$ |
| Powers Blvd (SH-21) S/O Old Ranch Rd | CDOT(20yr) | - | - | 1.56 | $2.25 \%$ |
| Average |  |  |  |  | $2.87 \%$ |

## Kimley»)Horn

Project The Shire at Old Ranch
Subject Trip Generation for Nursery (Garden Center)

| Designed by | Curtis Rowe | Date | April 09, 2019 | Job No. Sheet No. | 96829000 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Checked by |  | Date |  |  | 1 | of | 1 |

## TRIP GENERATION MANUAL TECHNIQUES

ITE Trip Generation Manual 10th Edition, Average Rates
Land Use Code - Nursery (Garden Center) (817)
Independant Variable - Acres (X)
Acres $=20$
T = Average Vehicle Trip Ends
Weekday (800 Series Page 91)
Average Weekday Directional Distribution: 50\% ent. 50\% exit.
$\mathrm{T}=108.10$ (X)
$\mathrm{T}=108.10$ * (20.0)

T = $2162 \quad$ Average Vehicle Trip Ends
1081 entering 1081 exiting
$1081+1081=2162$

Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m. ( 800 Series Page 92)


Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m. ( 800 Series Page 93)
Directional Distribution: $50 \%$ ent. $50 \%$ exit.
$\mathrm{T}=8.06(\mathrm{X})$
$\mathrm{T}=8.06$ *
(20.0)
$\mathrm{T}=161 \quad$ Average Vehicle Trip Ends
81 entering 81 exiting
$81+80=161$

Saturday (800 Series Page 96)
Average Saturday Directional Distribution: 50\% ent. 50\% exit.
$\mathrm{T}=154.82$ (X)
$T=154.82$ *
T = $3098 \quad$ Average Vehicle Trip Ends
1549 entering 1549 exiting
$1549+1549=3098$

Saturday Peak Hour of Generator (800 Series Page 97)
Directional Distribution: 50\% ent. 50\% exit.
$\mathrm{T}=23.29(\mathrm{X})$
$\mathrm{T}=23.29$ *
T = $466 \quad$ Average Vehicle Trip Ends 233 entering 233 exiting $233+233=466$









| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | 1 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 7 | 1 | 27 | 8 | 0 | 22 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 7 | 1 | 27 | 8 | 0 | 22 |
| 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 | 58 | 25 | 61 | 50 | 92 | 71 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 12 | 4 | 44 | 16 | 0 | 31 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 0 | 26 | 3 | 0 | 25 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 0 | 26 | 3 | 0 | 25 |
| 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 | 33 | 92 | 58 | 75 | 92 | 65 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 12 | 0 | 45 | 4 | 0 | 38 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | r |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 83 | 5 | 23 | 85 | 4 | 18 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 83 | 5 | 23 | 85 | 4 | 18 |
| 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 | 70 | 50 | 61 | 70 | 92 | 71 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 119 | 10 | 38 | 121 | 4 | 25 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 132 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 99 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 33 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 862 | 957 | - | - | 1420 | - |
| Stage 1 | 925 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 989 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 859 | 957 | - | - | 1420 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 859 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 922 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 989 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.9 |  | 0 |  | 1.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 866 | 1420 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - |  | 0.148 | 0.003 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.9 | 7.5 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - |  | 0.5 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{r}$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 225 | 12 | 14 | 224 | 12 | 13 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 225 | 12 | 14 | 224 | 12 | 13 |
| 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 | 70 | 92 | 58 | 75 | 92 | 65 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 321 | 13 | 24 | 299 | 13 | 20 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 220 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 323 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 174 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 46 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 768 | 869 | - | - | 1237 | - |
| Stage 1 | 856 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 976 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 760 | 869 | - | - | 1237 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 760 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 847 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 976 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 13.3 |  | 0 |  | 3.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 764 | 1237 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.438 | 0.011 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 13.3 | 7.9 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 2.2 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 7 | 1 | 41 | 8 | 0 | 32 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 7 | 1 | 41 | 8 | 0 | 32 |
| 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 | 58 | 25 | 61 | 50 | 92 | 71 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 12 | 4 | 67 | 16 | 0 | 45 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 120 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 75 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 45 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 876 | 986 | - | - | 1514 | - |
| Stage 1 | 948 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 977 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 876 | 986 | - | - | 1514 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 876 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 948 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 977 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 901 | 1514 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - |  | 0.018 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.1 | 0 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |





| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 133 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 82 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 51 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 861 | 978 | - | - | 1505 | - |
| Stage 1 | 941 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 971 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 861 | 978 | - | - | 1505 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 861 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 941 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 971 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 887 | 1505 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - |  | 0.018 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.1 | 0 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |





| Major/Minor $\quad$ N | Minor1 | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 181 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | 128 |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 53 |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - |  | 4.12 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 808 | 922 | - |  | 1386 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 898 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 970 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 806 | 922 | - | - | 1386 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 806 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 895 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 970 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.3 |  | 0 |  | 0.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBR1 | BLn1 | SBL | SBT |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  |  | - | 814 | 1386 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.158 | 0.003 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 10.3 | 7.6 | - |  |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.6 | 0 | - |  |



| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 258 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 344 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 195 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 63 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 731 | 846 | - | - | 1215 | - |
| Stage 1 | 838 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 960 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 723 | 846 | - | - | 1215 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 723 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 829 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 960 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 13.6 |  | 0 |  | 2.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 727 | 1215 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.431 | 0.011 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 13.6 | 8 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 2.2 | 0 | - |



| Major/Minor $\quad$ N | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 220 | 0 | - | 0 | 681 | 216 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 216 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 465 |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - |  | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - |  | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - |  | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1349 | - | - | - | 416 | 824 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 820 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 632 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1349 |  | - | - | 402 | 824 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 402 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 793 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 632 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.8 |  | 0 |  | 10.1 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT WBT WBR SBLn1 |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1349 | - | - | - | 746 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.033 | - | - | - | 0.054 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.8 | - | - | - | 10.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.1 | - | - | - | 0.2 |



| Major/Minor $\quad$ N | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 163 | 0 | - | 0 | 334 | 163 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 163 | - |
| Stage 2 | - |  | - | - | 171 |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - |  | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - |  | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1416 |  | - |  | 661 | 882 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 866 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 859 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1416 | - | - | - | 652 | 882 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 652 | - |
| Stage 1 | - |  |  |  | 854 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 859 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 1 |  | 0 |  | 9.4 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | A |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1416 | - | - | - | 845 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.014 | - | - | - | 0.038 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.6 | - | - | - | 9.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | - | - | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | - | - | - | 0.1 |



| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 227 | 0 | - | 0 | 701 | 223 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 223 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 478 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1341 | - | - | - | 405 | 817 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 814 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 624 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1341 | - | - | - | 391 | 817 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 391 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 786 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 624 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.8 |  | 0 |  | 10.2 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT WBR SBLn1 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1341 | - | - | - | 740 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.034 | - | - | - | 0.056 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.8 | - | - | - | 10.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.1 | - | - | - | 0.2 |





| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 293 | 0 | - | 0 | 893 | 289 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 289 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 604 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1269 | - | - | - | 312 | 750 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 760 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 546 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1269 | - | - | - | 290 | 750 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 290 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 707 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 546 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 1.4 |  | 0 |  | 10.8 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT WBR SBLn1 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1269 | - | - | - | 687 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.07 | - | - | - | 0.101 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 8.1 | - | - | - | 10.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.2 | - | - | - | 0.3 |


|  | Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 4 | F゙ | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 111 | 217 | 286 | 0 | 1 | 76 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 111 | 217 | 286 | 0 | 1 | 76 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None |  | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 100 | - | - | 50 | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 85 | 83 | 87 | 92 | 25 | 70 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 131 | 261 | 329 | 0 | 4 | 109 |










| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 303 | 0 | - | 0 | 624 | 303 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 303 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 321 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1258 | - | - | - | 449 | 737 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 749 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 735 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1258 | - | - | - | 436 | 737 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 436 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 727 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 735 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 1.1 |  | 0 |  | 10.9 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT WBR SBLn1 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1258 | - | - | - | 675 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.03 | - | - | - | 0.09 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 8 | - | - | - | 10.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.1 | - | - |  | 0.3 |



| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 472 | 0 | - | 0 | 1423 | 468 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 468 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 955 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - |  | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - |  | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1090 | - | - | - | 150 | 595 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 630 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 374 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1090 | - | - | - | 135 | 595 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 135 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 568 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 374 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 1.1 |  | 0 |  | 13.4 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT |  | WBR S | SBLn1 |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1090 | - | - | - | 515 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.099 | - | - | - | 0.17 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 8.7 | - | - | - | 13.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.3 | - | - | - | 0.6 |



| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 464 | 0 | - | 0 | 1129 | 464 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 464 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 665 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - |  | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - |  | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - |  | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1097 | - | - | - | 226 | 598 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 633 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 511 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1097 |  | - |  | 196 | 598 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - |  | - |  | 196 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 548 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 511 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 2.5 |  | 0 |  | 13.1 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1097 | - | - | - | 559 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.134 | - | - | - | 0.208 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 8.8 | - | - | - | 13.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.5 | - | - | - | 0.8 |



| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 423 | 0 | - | 0 | 1412 | 403 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 403 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 1009 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - |  | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1136 | - | - | - | 152 | 647 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 675 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 352 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1136 | - | - | - | 131 | 647 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 131 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 583 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 352 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 1.6 |  | 0 |  | 18.1 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | BT | WBR | BLn1 |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1136 | - | - | - | 437 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.135 | - | - | - | 0.375 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 8.7 | - |  | - | 18.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | - | - | C |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.5 | - | - | - | 1.7 |






| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{Y}$ |  | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ |  | $\mathbf{-}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 58 | 12 | 18 | 93 | 12 | 19 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 58 | 12 | 18 | 93 | 12 | 19 |
| 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 | - | - | 100 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 63 | 13 | 20 | 101 | 13 | 21 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 67 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 20 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 47 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 938 | 1058 | - | - | 1467 | - |
| Stage 1 | 1003 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 975 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 930 | 1058 | - | - | 1467 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 930 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 994 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 975 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.1 |  | 0 |  | 2.9 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 950 | 1467 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.08 | 0.009 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.1 | 7.5 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.3 | 0 | - |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{Y}$ |  | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ |  | $\mathbf{-}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 58 | 12 | 32 | 93 | 12 | 33 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 58 | 12 | 32 | 93 | 12 | 33 |
| 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 | - | - | 100 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 63 | 13 | 35 | 101 | 13 | 36 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 97 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 35 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 62 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 902 | 1038 | - | - | 1448 | - |
| Stage 1 | 987 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 961 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 894 | 1038 | - | - | 1448 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 894 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 978 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 961 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.3 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 916 | 1448 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.083 | 0.009 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.3 | 7.5 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.3 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | F | 个 |  |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 36 | 370 | 164 | 8 | 8 | 48 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 36 | 370 | 164 | 8 | 8 | 48 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 100 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 39 | 402 | 178 | 9 | 9 | 52 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | T | A | F |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 105 | 113 | 146 | 23 | 23 | 140 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 105 | 113 | 146 | 23 | 23 | 140 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 100 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 114 | 123 | 159 | 25 | 25 | 152 |


| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 184 | 0 | - | 0 | 523 | 172 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 172 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 351 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1391 | - | - | - | 514 | 872 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 858 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 713 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1391 | - | - | - | 472 | 872 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 472 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 788 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 713 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 3.8 |  | 0 |  | 11 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT WBR SBLn1 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1391 | - | - | - | 779 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.082 | - | - | - | 0.227 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.8 | - | - | - | 11 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.3 | - | - | - | 0.9 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | F | 个 | F |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 36 | 668 | 296 | 8 | 8 | 48 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 36 | 668 | 296 | 8 | 8 | 48 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 100 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 39 | 726 | 322 | 9 | 9 | 52 |








| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 | Minor1 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 256 | 0 | 7 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - |





| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 | Minor1 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 256 | 0 | 7 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 2-3. Roadway Design Criteria Continued

| Criteria | Concern | Guideline |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimize <br> Space <br> Devoted to <br> Road Use | It is desirable to minimize local road <br> mileage, thereby reducing construction <br> and maintenance costs, as well as <br> permitting the most efficient use of land. <br> Roads should also have an appearance <br> commensurate with their function. | Roads should be designed to complement <br> local character. |
| Relate Road <br> to <br> Topography | Local roads are more attractive and <br> economical if constructed to closely <br> adhere to topography (minimize cut and <br> fill). | The important role that roads play in the <br> overall storm drainage system can be <br> enhanced by closely following existing <br> topography. |
| Layout Road <br> to Achieve <br> Optimum <br> Subdivision <br> of Land | The arrangement of roads should allow <br> for economical and practical patterns, <br> shapes, and sizes of adjacent lots. Roads <br> as a function of land use must not unduly <br> hinder the development of land. | Distances between roads, number of roads, <br> and related elements all have a bearing on <br> efficient subdivision of an area. Access to <br> adjoining properties should also be <br> encouraged. |

### 2.3.2 Design Standards by Functional Classification

Section 2.2.4 of these standards identifies the Roadway Functional Classifications recognized and used by the County. Table 2-4 through Table 2-7 summarize many of the minimum roadway design standards by category and functional classification. Detailed road Standard Drawings are provided in Appendix F.
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Table 2-4. Roadway Design Standards for Rural Expressways and Arterials

|  | Expr | sways |  | Arterials |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Criteria | 6 Lane | 4 Lane | 6 Lane Principal | 4 Lane Principal | Minor |
| Design Speed / Posted Speed (MPH) | 70 / 65 | $70 / 65$ | 70 / 65 | 70 / 65 | 60 / 55 |
| Clear Zone | 34' | $34^{\prime}$ | 34' | $34^{\prime}$ | 30' |
| Minimum Centerline Curve Radius | 2,510, ${ }^{1}$ | 2,510, ${ }^{1}$ | 2,510, ${ }^{1}$ | 2,510, ${ }^{1}$ | 1,505 ${ }^{1}$ |
| Number of Through Lanes | 6 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| Lane Width | 12' | 12' | 12' | 12' | 12' |
| Right-of-Way | 210' | 180' | 210' | 180' | 100' |
| Paved Width | $56{ }^{2}$ | $38^{\prime 2}$ | 56 , ${ }^{2}$ | $38^{\prime 2}$ | 40' |
| Median Width | $24^{\prime}$ | $24^{\prime}$ | $24^{\prime}$ | $24^{\prime}$ | n/a |
| Outside Shoulder Width (paved/gravel) | 12'(10'/2') | 12'(10'/2') | 12'(10'/2') | 12'(10'/2') | 10'(8'/2') |
| Inside Shoulder Width (paved/gravel) | 12'(10'/2') | 6'(4'/2') | 12'(10'/2') | $6^{\prime}\left(4^{\prime} / 2\right.$ ') | n/a |
| Design ADT |  | 48,000 |  | 40,000 | 10,000 |
| Design Vehicle | WB-67 | WB-67 | WB-67 | WB-67 | WB-67 |
| Access Permitted | No | No | No | No | No |
| Access Spacing | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Intersection Spacing | 1 mile | 1 mile | $1 / 2$ mile | $1 / 2$ mile | $1 / 4$ mile |
| Parking Permitted | No | No | No | No | No |
| Minimum Flowline Grade | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Centerline Grade (Min.-Max.) | 1-5\% | 1-5\% | 1-5\% | 1-5\% | 1-6\% |
| Intersection Grades (Min.-Max.) | 1-2\% | 1-2\% | 1-3\% | 1-3\% | 1-4\% |
| Assumes 4\% superelevation, 6\% for 70 MPH design speeds <br> ${ }^{2}$ Pavement width in each direction for divided roadways |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2-5. Roadway Design Standards for Rural Collectors and Locals

| Criteria | Collectors |  | Local |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Major | Minor | Local | Gravel |
| Design Speed / Posted Speed (MPH) | $50 / 45$ | 40 / 35 | $30 / 30$ | 50/45 |
| Clear Zone | $20^{\prime}$ | $14^{\prime}$ | 7 | 12' |
| Minimum Centerline Curve Radius | 930, ${ }^{2}$ | 565' | 300' | As Approved |
| Number of Through Lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Lane Width | 12 | 12 | $12^{\prime}$ | 12' |
| Right of Way | $90^{\prime}$ | 80' | $70^{3}$ | $70^{13}$ |
| Paved Width | 32' | $32^{\prime}$ | $28^{\prime}$ | n/a |
| Median Width | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Outside Shoulder Width (paved/gravel) | $8^{\prime}\left(4^{\prime} / 4^{\prime}\right)$ | $6^{\prime}\left(4^{\prime} / 2^{\prime}\right)$ | $4^{\prime}\left(2^{\prime} / 2^{\prime}\right)$ | 5'(0'/5') |
| Inside Shoulder Width (paved/gravel) | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Design ADT | 3,000 | 1,500 | 750 | 200 |
| Design Vehicle | WB-67 | WB-67 | WB-50 | WB-50 |
| Access Permitted | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Access Spacing | n/a | Frontage | Frontage | Frontage |
| Intersection Spacing | $1 / 4$ mile | 660' | 330' | 330' |
| Parking Permitted | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Minimum Flowline Grade | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | n/a |
| Centerline Grade (Min.-Max.) | $1-8 \%{ }^{1}$ | 1-8\% ${ }^{1}$ | 1-8\% ${ }^{1}$ | 1-6\% |
| Intersection Grades (Min.-Max.) | 1-4\% | 1-4\% | 1-4\% | 1-4\% |
| $10 \%$ maximum grade permitted at the discretion of the ECM Administrator <br> ${ }^{2}$ Assumes $4 \%$ superelevation, $6 \%$ for 70 MPH design speeds <br> ${ }^{3}$ 60-foot right-of-way plus two 5 -foot Public Improvements Easements granted to EI Paso County |  |  |  |  |
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Table 2-6. Roadway Design Standards for Urban Expressways and Arterials

| Criteria | Expressways |  | Arterials |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6 Lane | 4 Lane | 6 Lane Principal | 4 Lane Principal | Minor |
| Design Speed / Posted Speed (MPH) | 60 / 55 | 60 / 55 | $50 / 45$ | $50 / 45$ | 40 / 35 |
| Clear Zone | 30' | $30^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | $14{ }^{\prime}$ |
| Minimum Centerline Curve Radius | 1,505,1 | 1,505 ${ }^{1}$ | $930{ }^{11}$ | $930^{11}$ | 565 ' |
| Number of Through Lanes | 6 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| Lane Width | $12^{\prime}$ | $12^{\prime}$ | $12^{\prime}$ | $12^{\prime}$ | $12^{\prime}$ |
| Right-of-Way | $16{ }^{\prime}$ | $140^{\prime}$ | 160 | 130' | 100' |
| Paved Width (Excluding Gutter Pan) | $48^{\prime 2}$ | $36^{\text {, }}$ | $48^{\prime 2}$ | 36, | 62 ' |
| Median Width (Including Curb \& Gutter) | 31 | 23 ' | 31 | 19' | $14^{\prime}$ |
| Shoulder Width (Ext., Excluding Gutter) | 8 ' | 8 ' | 8 ' | 8 ' | n/a |
| Shoulder Width (Int., Excluding Gutter) | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | n/a |
| Required Curb/ Gutter Type (Vertical) | $6 "$ | $6 "$ | $6 "$ | $6 "$ | $6 "$ |
| Sidewalk Width (@ FL) | $\begin{gathered} 6^{\prime} \\ \text { detached } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6^{\prime} \\ \text { detached } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6^{\prime} \\ \text { detached } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6^{\prime} \\ \text { detached } \end{gathered}$ | $6^{\prime}$ <br> detached |
| Design ADT |  | 48,000 |  | 40,000 | 20,000 |
| Design Vehicle | WB-67 | WB-67 | WB-67 | WB-67 | WB-67 |
| Bike Lanes Permitted | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Access Permitted | No | No | No | No | $\mathrm{No}^{3}$ |
| Access Spacing | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { See Table } \\ 2-36 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Intersection Spacing | 1 mile | 1 mile | 1/2 mile | 1/2 mile | $1 / 4$ mile |
| Parking | No | No | No | No | No |
| Minimum Flowline Grade of Curb | . $50 \%$ | . $50 \%$ | .50\% | .50\% | .50\% |
| Centerline Grade (Min.-Max.) | 0.5-5\% | 0.5-5\% | 0.5-6\% | 0.5-6\% | 0.5-6\% |
| Intersection Grades (Min.-Max.) | 0.5-2\% | 0.5-2\% | 0.5-3\% | 0.5-3\% | 0.5-4\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Assumes $4 \%$ superelevation, $6 \%$ for 70 MPH design speeds <br> ${ }^{2}$ Pavement width in each direction for divided roadways <br> ${ }^{3}$ Where no local public or private roadway can provide access, temporary or partial turn movement parcel access may be permitted |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2-7. Roadway Design Standards for Urban Collectors and Locals

| Criteria | Collectors |  | Local |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NonResidential | Residential | Local | Local ${ }^{4}$ (Iow volume) |
| Design Speed / Posted Speed (MPH) | 40 / 35 | 40 / 35 | $25 / 25$ | $20 / 20$ |
| Clear Zone | $14^{\prime}$ | $14^{\prime}$ | 12' | 7 |
| Minimum Centerline Curve Radius | 565' | 565' | 200' | 100 |
| Number of Through Lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Lane Width | 12 ' | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Right-of-Way | $80^{\prime}$ | $60^{\prime}$ | $60^{\prime 3}$ | $60^{\prime 3}$ |
| Paved Width (Excluding Gutter Pan) | 48' | 36' | $30^{\prime}$ | $24^{\prime}$ |
| Median Width (Including Curb \& Gutter) | $12^{\prime}$ | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Shoulder Width (Ext., Excluding Gutter) | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Shoulder Width (Int., Excluding Gutter) | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Required Curb/ Gutter Type (Vertical) | 6 " | 6 " | 6" (or ramp) | 6" (or ramp) |
| Sidewalk Width (@ FL) | 5' detached | 5' detached | 5' attached | 5' attached |
| Design ADT | 20,000 | 10,000 | 3,000 | 300 |
| Design Vehicle | WB-50 | WB-50 | WB-50 | SU-30 |
| Bike Lanes Permitted | No | Yes | No | No |
| Access Permitted | No ${ }^{5}$ | No ${ }^{5}$ | Yes | Yes |
| Access Spacing | $\begin{gathered} \text { See Table } \\ 2-36 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { See Table } \\ 2-36 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Frontage | Frontage |
| Intersection Spacing | 660, ${ }^{2}$ | 660 , | 175' | 150' |
| Parking Permitted | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Minimum Flowline Grade of Curb | . $50 \%$ | . $50 \%$ | . $50 \%$ | . $50 \%$ |
| Centerline Grade (Min.-Max,) | $0.5-6 \%{ }^{1}$ | 0.5-8\% ${ }^{1}$ | $0.5-8 \%{ }^{1}$ | $0.5-8 \%{ }^{1}$ |
| Intersection Grades (Min.-Max.) | 0.5-4\% | 0.5-4\% | 0.5-4\% | 0.5-4\% |
| $10 \%$ maximum grade permitted at the discretion of the ECM Administrator <br> ${ }^{2} 330$ feet when intersecting local roadways <br> ${ }^{3} 50$-foot right-of-way plus two 5 -foot Public Improvements Easements granted to El Paso County <br> ${ }^{4}$ Section can be used for cul-de-sacs, or roads with two ways out having a maximum of 300 ADT and a maximum length of 1,200 feet <br> ${ }^{5}$ Where no local public or private roadway can provide access, temporary or partial turn movement parcel access may be permitted |  |  |  |  |

### 2.3.3 Horizontal Alignment

## A. General Criteria

Proper roadway alignment provides for safe and continuous operation at a uniform design speed. Proposed road layouts shall have a logical relationship to existing or platted roads and fit within the overall transportation plan.

Figure 2-17. Typical Urban Local (low volume) Cross Section


### 2.2.5 Roadway Access Criteria

All new or modified accesses to the County roadways shall meet the requirements of the ECM. Standards and technical criteria not specifically addressed in the ECM shall follow the provisions of the AASHTO, A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Roadways ("Green Book") and the Colorado State Highway Access Code. In addition, should any access request fall within the preview of the Major Thoroughfare Task Force (MTTF), per their adopted bylaws, then the request shall be brought before the MTTF for a recommendation.

## A. Rural and Urban Expressway Access Criteria

## 1. Intersection Spacing and General Access Standards

Full movement intersections and major access spacing shall meet the requirements of this section. Right-in/right-out and three quarter movement accesses may be permitted as a deviation only if they meet the criteria presented in this section for sight distances, turn lane requirements, grades and do not negatively impact traffic operations or safety.
2. No Alternative Access to Road System

Where reasonable access can be obtained from the local roadway system, a temporary direct lot or partial turn movement access may be permitted provided the access meets these Standards or as otherwise required by the ECM Administrator.

## 3. Access and Lot Division

No additional access right shall accrue and no additional access shall be provided when splitting or dividing of existing lots of land. When an alternative is reasonably available in the opinion of the ECM Administrator, all access to the newly created properties shall be

[^0]provided internally from the existing access or new access to a roadway of lower functional classification.

## 4. Relocation of Access when Alternative is Available

All access to an expressway not meeting the minimum one-mile spacing requirement shall be closed in favor of an alternative access when an alternative is reasonably available in the opinion of the ECM Administrator.

## B. Rural and Urban Principal Arterial and Rural Minor Arterial Access Criteria

## 1. Spacing

Spacing of roads accessing a principal arterial or rural minor arterial that will result in a full movement intersection shall be planned at one-half mile (one-quarter mile for rural minor arterials). Should the one-half mile spacing not be "viable or practical" for providing access to the adjacent land, a deviation may be considered and approved by the ECM Administrator. If a deviation is granted, only one additional full movement intersection will be permitted by the ECM Administrator. The Applicant shall have the burden of proof that no other "viable or practical" access is available. A deviation request should be supported by a traffic study or memorandum that provides information to assist the ECM Administrator in determining the proposed deviation minimizes negative safety and other operational impacts. If the development is at the intersection of two major corridors, the full movement access should be located on the lower functional classification roadway. The intersection shall only be approved if the intersection and roadway are shown to operate safely and efficiently with buildout design hour/peak hour projected traffic volumes. The intersection must also show a public benefit. An arterial progression through bandwidth percentage of 35 percent or greater must be achieved or the inclusion of a signal at the access must not degrade the existing signal progression. The intersection must not create any queuing or blocking of lane entries or access points. The intersection must be in a location such that any necessary turn, acceleration and deceleration lanes can be accommodated to maintain safe operations and capacity. The analysis should consider all potential future additional requirements for left turn or other exclusive phasing at a signal for which the need is created by traffic generated by land uses on both sides of the roadway.

## 2. Topographic and Other Limitations

Where topography or other existing conditions make the required spacing inappropriate or unfeasible, location of the access shall be determined with consideration given to topography, established property ownerships, unique physical limitations, pre-existing historical land use patterns, and physical design constraints, with every attempt to achieve an access spacing of one-half mile. The final location shall serve as

[^1]many properties as possible to reduce the need for additional direct access to the principal arterial or rural minor arterial. In selecting locations for full movement intersections, preference shall be given to roads that meet, or may be reasonably expected to meet, signal warrants in the future.

## 3. Access and Lot Division

No additional access right shall accrue and no additional access shall be provided when splitting or dividing existing lots of land. When an alternative is reasonably available in the opinion of the ECM Administrator, all access to the newly created properties shall be provided internally from the existing access or new access to a roadway of lower functional classification.

## C. Urban Minor Arterial Access Criteria

Spacing of roads accessing an urban minor arterial that will result in a full movement intersection shall be planned at one-quarter mile. However, one parcel access shall be granted to each existing lot, if it does not create safety or operational problems. The parcel access will provide for right turns only. The access may allow for left turns in (three-quarters movement) if the addition of left turns will improve the operation at an adjacent full movement intersection and meet appropriate design standards.

## D. Collector Access Standards

Collector roadways shall intersect another roadway (centerline to centerline) in accordance with the standards in Section 2.3.7. On minor collector roadways, the closest local roadway intersection to an arterial roadway shall be 330 feet (right-of-way line of arterial to centerline of local roadway). On major collector roadways, the closest local roadway intersection to an arterial roadway shall be 660 feet (right-of-way line of arterial to centerline of local roadway). Single-family residence access to major collector roadways is not permitted (even though existing conditions show otherwise).

## E. Rural and Urban Local Roadways

Roads shall not intersect urban local roadways closer than 200 feet from each other (centerline to centerline) and shall not intersect a rural local roadway closer than 330 feet from each other. On an urban local roadway, the closest intersection to a collector roadway shall be at least 200 feet (centerline to centerline). To an arterial roadway, the closest intersection shall be 330 feet (arterial right-of-way line to local roadway centerline).

[^2]
## 1. Sight Distance Triangles within Easements

There shall be an unobstructed sight distance along both approaches and both sides at an intersection (within the right-of-way) for distances sufficient to allow the operators of vehicles, approaching simultaneously, to see each other in time to prevent collisions at the intersection.

All sight distance triangles must be within the public right-of-way or a sight distance easement (See Figure 2-24). If the line of sight crosses onto private property, a "Sight Distance Easement" shall be dedicated to provide the required sight distance. The easement or right-of-way shall be dedicated to the County. Maintenance of a sight distance easement shall be the responsibility of the property owner or the homeowners' association unless otherwise approved by the County.

## 2. Encroachment into Sight distance Triangles or Easements

Any object within the sight distance triangle or easement more than 30 inches above the flowline elevation of the adjacent roadway shall constitute a sight obstruction, and shall be removed or lowered. The objects may include but are not limited to berms, buildings, parked vehicles on private property, cut slopes, hedges, trees, bushes, utility cabinets or tall crops. Trees may be permitted at the discretion of the ECM Administrator if pruned to at least 8 feet above the flowline elevation of the adjacent roadway.

## 3. On-Roadway Parking within Sight Distance Triangles <br> The ECM Administrator may limit on-street parking to protect visibility and enhance roadway capacity.

### 2.3.7 Intersections

## A. Intersection Design Guidelines

Intersections shall be designed to provide safe movement for all those using roadways within the County (motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists). By their nature, intersections are conflict locations. Vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles all cross paths. Each crossing is a conflict point. The basic design of intersections includes the following objectives:

- Minimize points of conflict
- Simplify areas of conflict
- Limit conflict frequency
- Limit conflict severity


## B. Intersection Spacing and General Access Standards

Full movement intersections and major accesses spacing shall meet the requirements in Section 2.2.5. While access to a major roadway should be avoided, right-in/right-out and three quarter movement accesses may be permitted as a deviation if they meet the criteria for sight distances, turn lane

[^3]requirements, grades and do not negatively impact traffic operations or safety. The applicant shall have the burden of proof that no other "viable or practical" property access is available. A deviation request should be supported by a traffic study or memorandum that provides information to assist the ECM Administrator in determining the proposed deviation minimizes negative safety and other operational impacts along upstream and downstream roadway segments. The addition of such an access shall minimize impacts to queuing or blocking of lane entries or access points and minimize impacts to progression. The access must be in a location such that any necessary turn lanes and acceleration/deceleration lanes can be accommodated to maintain safe operations and capacity. The analysis should consider all potential future additional requirements for to accommodate traffic generated by adjacent land uses. Buildout design hour/peak hour projected traffic volumes should be used.

## C. Intersection Alignment

## 1. Offset

All lanes traversing an intersection shall be in alignment. A maximum 2foot lane offset may be approved by the ECM Administrator if no other alternative exists.

## 2. Angle

Crossing roadways shall intersect at 90 degrees whenever possible. In no case shall roadways be permitted to intersect at less than 80 degrees or more than 100 degrees.

## 3. Horizontal Alignment

The horizontal alignment of roadways through an intersection shall be designed in conformance with this chapter depending on the classification of the roadways intersecting. Intersections may be placed on horizontal curves, provided the minimum tangent lengths shown in Table 2-11 are provided on the lower functional classification roadway and the required sight distance is met.

## 4. Vertical Alignment

The roadway profile grade shall not exceed the value presented in Table 2-23 on the approach to the intersection, as measured along the centerline of the roadway for a minimum distance equal to the grade lengths presented in Table 2-24 for each of the roadway functional classifications.

The grade of the roadway with the higher functional classification shall prevail at intersections. Grading of lower functional classifications, adjacent property, private access shall adapt to the higher functional classification roadway grade.
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In cases where the natural grade for which a roadway is to be constructed is steeper than 4 percent (hillside areas). A deviation from the presented standards may be requested for to accommodate these conditions up to a maximum of 8 percent.

Table 2-23. Intersection Grades by Roadway Functional Classification

| Functional <br> Classification | Maximum Intersection Grade <br> (\%) | Minimum Intersection <br> Grade (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Expressway (Urban/Rural) | $2 / 2$ | $0.5 / 1$ |
| Arterial (Urban/Rural) | $3 / 3$ <br> $(4$ for minor) | $0.5 / 1$ |
| Collector (Urban/Rural) | $4 / 4$ | $0.5 / 1$ |
| Local (Urban/Rural) | $4 / 4$ | $0.5 / 1$ |

Table 2-24. Intersection Profile Grade Lengths ${ }^{1}$

| Higher Classification Roadway (below) | Lower Classification Roadway |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Local | Collector | Arterial | Expressway |
| Expressway | n/a | n/a | 200 | $250{ }^{1}$ |
| Arterial | n/a | 120 | $200{ }^{1}$ | n/a |
| Collector | 100 | $120{ }^{1}$ | n/a | n/a |
| Local | $100{ }^{1}$ | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| ${ }^{1}$ In the case of where each intersecting roadway is of the same classification, the ECM Administrator will designate which roadway takes precedence and the distance required. |  |  |  |  |

## D. Turn Lanes Required

## 1. Exclusive Left Turn Lane Required

Exclusive left turn lanes shall be provided wherever left turn lanes are specified as being needed by an approved TIS, identified in the MTCP, required by the ECM, or determined to be warranted by the ECM Administrator. Information in the TIS shall be used to determine whether an exclusive left turn lane is warranted. Warrant determinations shall also be based on this chapter, which include:

- Expressways Left Turn Lane (State Highway Access Code Designation - EX): A left turn lane is required for any access that allows left turn ingress movement, except for field approaches. A left turn acceleration lane may be required if the design would be a benefit to safety and operation of the roadway.
- Principal Arterials Left Turn Lane (State Highway Access Code Designation - RA for Rural and NR-A for Urban): A left turn lane is required for an access with a projected peak hour left ingress turning volume of 10 VPH or greater. A left turn acceleration lane

[^4]may be required if it would be a benefit to the safety and operation of the roadway.

- Minor Arterials (State Highway Access Code Designation - RB for Rural and NR-B for Urban) and Lower Classifications Left Turn Lane: A left turn lane is required for any access with a projected peak hour ingress turning volume of 25 VPH or greater.


## 2. Exclusive Right Turn Lanes Required

Exclusive right turn lanes shall be provided wherever right turn lanes are specified as being needed by an approved TIS, identified in the MTCP, required by the ECM or determined to be warranted by the ECM Administrator. Information in the TIS shall be used to determine whether an exclusive right turn lane is warranted. Warrant determinations shall also be based on this chapter, which include:

- Expressway Right Turn Lane (State Highway Access Code Designation - EX): A right turn lane is required for any access with a projected peak hour right turn ingress turning volume of 10 VPH or greater. A right turn acceleration lane is required for any access with a projected peak hour right turn egress turning volume of 10 VPH or greater.
- Principal Arterials Right Turn Lane (State Highway Access Code Designation - RA for Rural and NR-A for Urban): A right turn lane is required for any access with a projected peak hour right ingress turning volume of 25 VPH or greater. A right turn acceleration lane is required for any access with a projected peak hour right turning volume of 50 VPH or greater when the posted speed on the roadway is greater than 40 MPH. A right turn acceleration lane may also be required at a signalized intersection if a free right-turn is needed to maintain an appropriate level of service in the intersection.
- Minor Arterials (State Highway Access Code Designation - RB for Rural and NR-B for Urban) and Lower Classifications Right Turn Lane: A right turn lane is required for any access with a projected peak hour right turning volume of 50 VPH or greater. An acceleration lane is generally not required.


## 3. Acceleration Lanes Required

Acceleration lanes shall be provided wherever acceleration lanes are specified as being needed by an approved TIS, identified in the MTCP, required by the ECM or determined to be warranted by the ECM Administrator. Information in the TIS shall be used to determine whether an acceleration lane is warranted. Warrant determinations shall be based on this chapter.
26. The specific designs for these lanes shall be in accordance with this chapter. For each high volume access and major intersection, both acceleration and deceleration lanes shall be considered in designing an exclusive left turn lane.

Figure 2-26. Design Elements for Left Turn Lanes


- Right Turn Lane. The design elements for a right turn and deceleration lanes are the approach taper, lane length, storage length, which in combination makes up the right turn lane. The elements are as shown in Figure 2-27. For each high volume access and major intersection, both acceleration and deceleration lanes shall be considered in designing an exclusive right turn lane. The specific designs for these lanes shall be in accordance with this chapter. Specific lane shift and lane drop design criteria can be found in Section 2.3.8J.3.
- Acceleration Lane. The design elements for an acceleration lane are the transition taper and acceleration length. For each high volume access and major intersection, both acceleration and deceleration lanes shall be considered in designing an exclusive right or left turn lane. The specific designs for these lanes shall be in accordance with this chapter.
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- Shift or Drop Lane. The design elements for a transition or drop land are the redirect taper, full width auxiliary lane, and storage length. The use and design of these elements varies based on the roadway classification and site-specific conditions.

Figure 2-27. Design Elements for Right Turn Lanes

2. Tapers

- Approach Tapers. The basis for designing a deceleration lane and taper is to provide sufficient length for a vehicle to decelerate and brake primarily outside the through traffic lanes. Table 2-25 provides the required deceleration lane and taper design lengths by design speed. Deceleration lane lengths shall be adjusted for a grade of $3 \%$ or more using the factors in Table $2-26$. The required length allows a motorist to decelerate in gear for at least 3 seconds followed by safe braking to a complete stop.

Table 2-25. Required Deceleration Lane and Taper Lengths

| Design Speed (MPH) | Lane Length (feet) | Approach Taper <br> (feet) | Total Length (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | 115 | 120 | 235 |
| 30 | 115 | 120 | 235 |
| 40 | 155 | 160 | 315 |
| 50 | 235 | 200 | 435 |
| 60 | 290 | 240 | 530 |
| 70 | Special Design | Special Design | Special Design |

Table 2-26. Deceleration Lane Grade Adjustment Factors

| Roadway Grade | Factors |
| :---: | :---: |
| Upgrade | 0.90 |
| $3 \%$ to $4.9 \%$ | 0.80 |
| $5 \%$ to $7.5 \%$ |  |
| Downgrade | 1.20 |
| $3 \%$ to $4.9 \%$ | 1.35 |
| $5 \%$ to $7.5 \%$ |  |

- Bay Tapers. Table 2-27 provides the required bay taper length by lane width. A bay taper is designed to direct left-turning vehicles into the turn lane. A minimum taper ratio of $8: 1$ may be used for tangent bay tapers in constrained locations. Bay tapers should be used (asymmetrical reverse curves) for deceleration transition tapers. Straight transition tapers should be avoided at design speeds above 40, and where a vertical crest or horizontal curve is present. Under these conditions, an immediate bay taper and lane striping should be substituted for a straight transition taper to reduce drifting of the through vehicles into the deceleration lane. Where horizontal or crest vertical curves exist, the ECM Administrator may require the deceleration transition taper to begin with an immediate asymmetrical reverse curve bay taper of $1 / 3 \mathrm{~L}$ then $2 / 3 \mathrm{~L}$ with the remaining required transition taper length at full lane width. Partial tangent transition tapers, symmetrical reverse curve tapers or asymmetrical reverse curve tapers may be used for transition taper design provided a radius of at least 150 feet is used in curve calculations.
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Table 2-27. Required Bay Taper Lengths

| Design Speed (MPH) | Lane Length (feet) | Bay Taper (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | 115 | 80 |
| Total Length (feet) |  |  |
| 30 | 115 | 120 |
| 195 |  |  |
| 40 | 155 | 160 |
| 50 | 235 | 200 |
| 60 | 290 | Special Design |

- Transition Tapers. The basis for designing an acceleration lane and transition taper is to provide sufficient length for a vehicle to accelerate to the appropriate speed and merge into the through traffic lanes without disrupting traffic flow. Table 2-28 provides the required acceleration lane and transition taper design lengths by design speed. Acceleration lane lengths in Table 2-28 shall be adjusted for a grade of $3 \%$ or more using the factors in Table $2-29$. The total length of the acceleration lane includes the values of both the lane and transition taper. The length of a transition taper is calculated by multiplying the width of the lane by a standard ratio. The beginning and ending point of all tapers shall be rounded.

Table 2-28. Design Criteria for Acceleration Lanes

| Design Speed (MPH) | Lane Length (feet) | Transition Taper (feet) | Total Length (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40 | 270 | 120 | 390 |
| 50 | 550 | 162 | 712 |
| 60 | 960 | 222 | 1182 |
| 70 | 1380 | 300 | 1680 |

Table 2-29. Grade Adjustment Factors for Acceleration Lanes

|  | Design Speed (MPH) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Upgrade | $\mathbf{4 0}$ to $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |  |
| 3 to $4.9 \%$ | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 |
| 5 to $7.5 \%$ | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 |
| Downgrade |  |  |  |
| 3 to $4.9 \%$ | 0.7 | 0.65 | 0.6 |
| 5 to $7.5 \%$ | 0.6 | 0.55 | 0.5 |

- Redirect Tapers. Redirect tapers shall be used where an exclusive turn lane, median or other redirection of vehicles is necessary and where redirection of the flow of traffic is necessary to accommodate the exclusive turn lane or median due to constraints. Redirect tapers required for redirecting
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