

KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, April 12, 2017 @ 6:00 p.m.
Keizer Civic Center Council Chambers

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

## 2. VOLUNTEER APPRECIATION

## 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- March 15, 2017

4. APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS

This time is made available for those who wish to speak about an issue that is not on the agenda.
5. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING: Text Amendment: Section 2.110 Commercial Mixed Use
6. NEW-OLD BUSINESS/STAFF REPORT
7. COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT
8. COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE: Michael DeBlasi - April 17
9. ADJOURN

Next Meeting ~May 10, 2017
2016-7 Work Plan

1. Sections 2.102.02.C and 2.102.04.D (RS); 2.103.02.玉 and 2.103.04.D(RL); 2.104.02.E and 2.104.04.C (RM); and 2.105.02.C (RH) Child Gare Standards
2. Various Sections: Lot Line Adjustments and Pre-Application Conference
3. Section 2.311-Planned Unit Development Design Standards
4. Future Planning - Growth Management
a. Urban Transition (UT) Zone
b. Downtown Plan
f.-Section 2.102.06.J (RS)
d. Section 2.118 (UT)
e. Policy choices (UGB amendment)
5. Food Cart Allowance
6. Section 2.315 - Design Review
7. Clarification regarding corporations being represented by attorneys
8. Transportation Planning
9. Section 2.306 - Storm Drainage
10. Section 2.126 Resource Conservation Overlay Zone
11. Section 2.110.05.C Overlay Zone
12. Master Plan


## KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

# Wednesday, March 15, 2017 @ 6:00 pm Keizer Civic Center 

## CALL TO ORDER

Chair Hersch Sangster called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.
ROLL CALL:

## Present:

Hersch Sangster, Chair
Kyle Juran, Vice Chair Garry Whalen Josh Eggleston Michael DeBlasi Jim Jacks

Absent:<br>Jerry Crane<br>Council Liaison:<br>Marlene Parsons<br>Staff Present:<br>Nate Brown, Community Development Director Shane Witham, Associate Planner Shannon Johnson, City Attorney

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Commissioner Whalen moved for approval of the February 2017 Regular Session Minutes. Commissioner Eggleston seconded. Motion passed as follows: Sangster, Juran, Whalen and Eggleston in favor with Jacks and DeBlasi abstaining and Crane absent.

APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED CITIZENS: None

## PUBLIC HEARING: Section 2.110 - Commercial Mixed Use

Chair Sangster opened the Public Hearing.
Senior Planner Shane Witham explained that on February 6 Council had directed staff to initiate the process to amend the Commercial Mixed Use Zone specific to the Chemawa/River area. This area overlay zone prohibits gas/service stations. Safeway has asked the City to consider amending the Code to allow for a fueling station. He noted there are 4 options to consider:

1. No change to the Development Code (not recommended by staff)
2. Eliminate Chemewa/River restrictions completely (not recommended)
3. Approve the text amendment proposed by Safeway (Staff feels this is a good base point but is uncomfortable with it because it is a permitted use and specialized concerns could not be addressed).
4. Allow as a Conditional Use (Staff recommends this because it would require additional staff review and land use process and place conditions on the project to deal with traffic, design, aesthetics, etc.)

Mr. Witham also shared information regarding the traffic study and noted that mitigation measures represent a good compromise that will assure that city/neighborhood/transportation concerns can be addressed. He pointed out that the proposed structure could easily be viewed as an accessory use.
J eff Cowan, Keizer Fire Chief, voiced support for Option \#1 based on concerns about the proposed fueling station increasing traffic and ingress/egress issues. He cited traffic failings at the intersection and pedestrian dangers noting that a fueling station will exacerbate existing failings and affect the Fire District response times. He concluded that the Fire District responds to 15 calls a day and has to deal with high traffic already and a fueling station will make it worse.
Adam Wittenberg, Keizer, urged approval of the amendment noting that this would be a stimulus for future businesses and allow them to prosper.
Seth King, Land Use Attorney from Perkins Coie, LLP, Portland, representing Albertsons/Safeway, explained that a general need is being served by this amendment. Fuel stations in conjunction with grocery stores allow for efficient use of land and fill a public need to allow businesses to grow in existing locations. He noted that this would be strictly a fueling station, not a full service gas station, but added that he could not support the prohibition of sales of other merchandise at the fuel center. He noted the proposal is not for a full service convenience store but simply some ancillary sales that are expected by customers and that are necessary as part of the business model. He asked that, if the amendment is approved, the prohibition on sales of other merchandise be deleted or the hearing be continued for a month to allow for an alternate proposal.
Chris Miles, Project Manager for the fuel centers, explained that the primary reason for this request is in response to customer demand. Patrons of Safeway earn fuel points but cannot redeem them in Keizer, they must drive to Salem. It makes sense to locate the fuel center here because there is room and it meets customer needs. The proposed fuel center would be 6 islands with a total of 12 pumps because this moves traffic most efficiently.
Henry Basit, Construction Director for Albertsons/Safeway displayed photos showing the actual site with driveways, the existing site survey and the proposed area of the fuel center with a kiosk selling 'rapid consumables' or quick service items such as coffee and sodas. He showed drawings of options to address ingress and egress which included islands to avoid stacking at the entrances and additional pedestrian and handicap access.

Chris Bremmer, Kittelson \& Associates, noted that the site plans being displayed were not final. He explained that this development would be a chance to improve the current narrow driveways that have bumps and site restrictions and that the fuel station has been moved away from the Fire District to alleviate backup traffic. He noted that fire responses were recorded in the traffic study; they are in the appendices at the back. He indicated that cueing in front of the Fire Station needs to be addressed and that there are potential opportunities to control the signal near the station and a number of variations possible to address traffic concerns. He expressed a willingness to work with staff and the Fire District on this.

Pedro DeGuzman, Terraforma Design Group, Seattle, reviewed the site plan specifically related to traffic/access, site distance obstructions, and removal of stalls close to the entrance. He reiterated that having a fuel station at a grocery store reduces trips and increases overall safety in the area and indicated that he was in favor of reconfiguring the signal to work with the Fire District.
Pam Rushing, Caldwell Banker, Salem, voiced support for the amendment noting that it has been hard to attract tenants to the River Road area and this would help.
Peter Thom, Eugene, voiced support for changing the overlay zone noting that he represents a business looking at property in the overlay zone and is opposed to the restrictions.

Discussion then took place regarding Oregon State University Credit Union, the validity of the traffic study, inclusion of cycling facilities, the proposed layout of the parking lot and possible options, bringing traffic in behind the back of the store in the loading areas, re-orienting the parking arrangement, reconstruction of all four driveways, location of the post office drop box, Transit District input, and the importance of having rapid consumables available at the fueling station. Community Development Director Nate Brown pointed out that the drawings of ingress and egress presented were different than what was given to the City Engineer so he has not reviewed them. He noted that issues that still need to be addressed are:

- Traffic Engineer review of the new drawings
- More information and dialog with the Fire District
- Communication with the Transit District
- Provision of a map showing the exact location and boundaries of the overlay zone

Commission agreed by consensus to continue the Public Hearing to April 12, 2017.
NEWIOLD BUSINESSISTAFF REPORT: Mr. Brown explained that the grants are moving forward. There is a Transportation open house on April 25 for the revised Regional Transportation System Plan.

COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT: Councilor Parsons reported that Council approved the Boy Scout Camporee, passed the Planned Unit Development amendments, did long range planning and now has a Youth Councilor on Council and a Youth Liaison on the Parks Board. She added that the Parks survey ends tonight.

COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE: Commissioner Sangster will report to Council.
ADJOURN: The meeting adjourned at 8:19 pm.
Next Meeting: April 12, 2017
Minutes approved:

# TO: PLANNING COMMISSION <br> THRU: NATE BROWN, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR FROM: SHANE WITHAM, SENIOR PLANNER 

## DATE: $\quad$ April 4, 2017

## SUBJECT: Continuance of March 15, 2017 Hearing regarding proposed text amendment relating to the allowance of gasoline service stations within the Chemawa/River Road restriction area.

## ATTACHMENTS:

- Planning Commission Packet from March $15^{\text {th }}$ meeting.
- Map showing restriction area boundary


## DISCUSSION:

At the March 15, 2017 Planning Commission meeting, testimony was received regarding a proposed text amendment to Section 2.110 to allow a gasoline service station as a conditional use within the Chemawa/River Road restriction area, subject to specific requirements. At the request of the Safeway team, the hearing was continued to allow for additional testimony regarding their desire to allow a "convenience store" in conjunction with a gasoline service station. Their testimony at the March $15^{\text {th }}$ meeting indicated they agreed with the proposed text amendment with the exception of Section 2.110.04.C. 1 - which limits retail sales to only "fuel related products such as gasoline and oil" and prohibits "accessory sales of other merchandise."

Staff feels the provision to limit convenience retail is necessary to ensure the gasoline service station truly functions as another department of the grocery store, and is only accessory to the main use of the property as Safeway's initial letter (dated January 31, 2017) to Council asserted. Their letter made a compelling argument that an "accessory fuel station is treated like another department of the supermarket..." and that an accessory fuel station results in vehicle trip consolidation and combined shopping opportunities. The letter also pointed out that a proposed amendment would not be inconsistent with the original intent to prohibit gasoline service stations in the CM zone because, "Gasoline service stations typically offer an array of vehicle repair and maintenance services, plus the incidental sale of batteries, tires and other automobile accessories, all of which create a greater destination use and more potential for additional traffic and noise than a fuel station that only sells fuel related products such as gasoline and oil." Staff found Safeway's logic to be sound and therefore proposed the language found in Section 2.110.04.C. 1 which proposes limiting sales to "fuel related products such as gasoline and oil." This language was directly quoted from Safeway's initial request to Council and was intended to ensure that any proposed gasoline service station be limited to fueling and be developed accessory to a Food Store use in order to maximize opportunities for consolidating trips and to limit the greater destination use of a stand-alone gasoline service station. This limited aspect, coupled with mitigations as proposed are primarily why staff believes the proposed recommendation can be supported.

Staff is concerned that if allowances are made for a convenience store to be developed in conjunction with the gasoline service station, it would cease to be accessory to the main grocery store use. Items proposed to be sold in the convenience store would also be sold in the grocery
store, so while it would clearly be convenient for a customer who had come primarily to purchase gasoline to grab an impulse item or "rapid consumable", the existence of the convenience store would not benefit the customer who was consolidating shopping trips by purchasing fuel as an accessory function of a planned trip to the grocery store. The end result would be another gasoline service station developed similarly to the other stations in Keizer which all (but one) have convenience stores associated with them.

Safeway's original request stated the grocery industry has evolved and many grocery supermarkets are now developed with fuel stations. Staff has reviewed the other grocery/fuel store combinations in the Salem/Keizer area and has found that none of them have convenience stores associated with them. Costco has no outside sales, while Fred Meyer on Market Street and Safeway on S. Commercial both have small kiosks that are located under the existing canopy, and sell a very limited variety of merchandise. So to assert that a convenience store is necessary to be successful in the marketplace is not currently demonstrated here in our region.

Testimony was received from Chief Cowan of the Keizer Fire District who urged Planning Commission to take no action. He cited concerns regarding traffic safety impacts and specifically the impact to the Keizer Fire District. Staff had proposed language regarding traffic impacts with the intent to address any concerns, but based on Chief Cowan's testimony, Planning Commission may wish to modify or strengthen the existing proposed language addressing transportation concerns.

Testimony was received from Adam Wittenberg, Pam Rushing, and Peter Thomas who all voiced support for the proposal, and requested that Planning Commission lift the restrictions on drive thru windows associated with eating and drinking establishments as well. Their testimony generally cited economic development factors as a reason to eliminate or modify the restriction area altogether, and felt that lifting the restrictions would be good for business. While staff acknowledges the validity of their testimony (and agrees economic development goals should help shape policy discussions), it is premature to make a broad policy decision at this time, a mere few months before the commencement of a process to take a bigger look at the restriction area as a whole. This look at the bigger context is precisely what the City is undertaking with the TGM grant project, which will have a robust public involvement process to engage stakeholders.

## CONCLUSION:

Ultimately, staff felt that because of the limited "accessory" nature of this proposal, together with the other mitigating factors, the proposed text amendment could be warranted. If the gasoline service station use was to be allowed outright, or if additional modifications to the restriction area were to be proposed, at that point staff would feel it would be most appropriate to hold off on the proposal altogether. Staff is recommending that any proposal for a gasoline service station within the Chemawa/River Rd restriction area be subject to Conditional Use Permit approval, and be allowed only as an accessory use to a Food Store, with no convenience store allowance.

## RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission consider the proposal and forward a recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed text language.

### 2.110 COMMERCIAL MIXED USE (CM)

### 2.110.01 Purpose

The Commercial Mixed Use (CM) zone is the primary commercial zone within the City. The zone is specifically designed to promote development that combines commercial and residential uses. This zone will support transit use, provide new housing opportunities while allowing a full range of commercial retail, service and office uses. Development is intended to be pedestrian-oriented with buildings close to and oriented to the sidewalk. Parking may be shared between residential and commercial uses. Clusters of residential and commercial uses around landscaping features or parking areas can occur and are encouraged. The Commercial Mixed Use zone is suitable for the Commercial Plan designation. (5/98)

### 2.110.02 Permitted Uses

The following uses, when developed under the applicable development standards in the Zoning Ordinance, are permitted in the CM zone:
A. One or more buildings with one or more dwelling units or guest rooms, and/or, one or more other uses allowed in this section on a lot. (5/98)
B. Residential homes and facilities. (5/98)
C. Day care facility for 17 or more children consistent with state regulations, including Family day care provider for 16 or fewer children consistent with state regulations. (4/16)
D. Public parks, playgrounds, community clubs including swimming, tennis and similar recreational facilities, and other public and semi-public uses. (5/98)
E. Landscape counseling and planning (0781). (5/98)
F. Offices for any use listed in SIC Division C - Construction. (5/98)
G. Commercial printing (275). (5/98)
H. Transportation, Communication and Utilities. (5/98)

1. Public utility structures and buildings. (5/98)
2. Post office (43). (5/98)
3. Travel agency (4722). (5/98)
4. Communications (48). (5/98)
I. Retail Trade. (5/98)
5. Building materials, hardware, retail nurseries, and garden supply (52), BUT EXCLUDING mobile home dealers (527). (5/98)
6. General merchandise stores (53). (5/98)
7. Food stores (54). (5/98)
8. Automobile, recreational vehicle or trailer sales (55), BUT EXCLUDING gasoline service stations (554). (5/98)
9. Apparel and accessory stores (56). (5/98)
10. Furniture, home furnishings, and equipment stores (57). (5/98)
11. Eating and drinking places (58) except as provided in Section 2.110.05, below. (5/98)
12. Miscellaneous retail (59), BUT EXCLUDING fuel and ice dealers (598). (5/98)
13. Electrical and lighting shops and office machines and equipment stores. (5/98)
J. Business, Professional and Social Services. (5/98)
14. Finance, insurance and real estate (60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67). (5/98)
15. Hotels, motels and tourist courts (701). (5/98)
16. Organization hotels and lodging houses on membership basis (704). (5/98)
17. Personal services (72) BUT EXCLUDING industrial launderers (7218). (5/98)
18. Business services (73) BUT EXCLUDING disinfecting and exterminating services (7342). (5/98)
19. Parking lots (7523) except as provided in Section 2.110.05, below. (5/98)
20. Miscellaneous repair services (76). (5/98)
21. Motion pictures (78), BUT EXCLUDING drive-ins (7838). (5/98)
22. Amusement and recreation (79), BUT EXCLUDING golf courses (7992) and amusement parks (7996). (5/98)
23. Health services (80), BUT EXCLUDING hospitals (806). (5/98)
24. Legal services (81). (5/98)
25. Elementary and secondary schools (8211). (5/98)
26. Correspondence schools and vocational schools (824). (5/98)
27. Schools and educational services not elsewhere classified (829). (5/98)
28. Social services (83). (5/98)
29. Museums, art galleries, botanical and zoological gardens (84). (5/98)
30. Membership organizations (86). (5/98)
31. Miscellaneous services (89). (5/98)
32. Pet Grooming (6/01)
K. Public Administration (91-97). (5/98)
L. Child foster home for five or fewer children as a secondary use.(6/99)

### 2.110.03 Special Permitted Uses

The following uses, when developed under the applicable development standards in the Ordinance and special development requirements, are permitted in the CM zone:
A. Partitions, subject to the provisions in Section 2.310. (5/98)
B. Subdivision, subject to the provisions in Section 2.310. (5/98)
C. Planned unit development, subject to the provisions in Section 2.311. (5/98)
D. Accessory structures and uses prescribed in Section 2.203. (5/98)
E. Transit Facilities (Section 2.305). (05/09)

F The following special uses subject to the applicable standards in Section 2.4:

1. Shared housing facilities (Section 2.403). (5/98)
2. Zero side yard dwelling units (Section 2.404). (5/98)
3. Home occupations (Section 2.407). (5/98)
4. Bed and breakfast establishments (Section 2.408). (5/98)
5. Residential sales offices (Section 2.409). (5/98)
6. Public golf course (7992) or membership recreation club having golf course (7997) (Section 2.410). (5/98)
7. Boat and RV storage area (Section 2.411) except as provided in Section 2.110.05, below. (5/98)
8. House of Worship (Section 2.423). (5/98)
9. Recreational vehicle storage space (Section 2.413) except as provided in Section 2.110.05, below. (5/98)
10. Veterinary services (074) (Section 2.414). (5/98)
11. Funeral service and crematories (726) (Section 2.415). (5/98)
12. Used Merchandise Store (Section 2.417)
13. Adult entertainment business (Section 2.418). (5/98)
14. Service stations (554) (Section 2.419) except as provided in Section 2.110.05, below. (5/98)
15. Recreational vehicle parks (7033) (Section 2.412) except as provided in Section 2.110.05, below. (5/98)
16. Automobile services (75) (Section 2.420) except as provided in Section 2.110.05, below. (5/98)
17. Manufacturing and Assembly Facilities (Section 2.421). (5/98)
18. Wireless Telecommunications Facilities (Section 2.427). (5/98)
19. Medical Marijuana Facilities (Section 2.433) (10/14)
20. Marijuana Retailer (Section 2.433) (1/16)
21. Mobile Food Vendor (Section 2.434) (9/16)

### 2.110.04 Conditional Uses

The following uses may be permitted subject to obtaining a conditional use permit:
A. Craft Industries, subject to the provisions in Section 2.421. (5/98)
B. Transit Station (Section 2.429). (05/09)
C. Gasoline service stations (554) located in the Chemawa/River Rd restriction area described in Section 2.110.05.C. subject to the following requirements:

1. May only sell fuel related products such as gasoline and oil. No service, repair functions, or accessory sales of other merchandise is allowed.
2. Subject to the provisions in Section 2.419 .
3. Must be accessory to a Food store(54) use. The primary Food Store use must be a minimum of 15,000 square feet in area.
4. Must be setback more than 100 feet from adjacent public streets, and must provide pedestrian oriented amenities on the entire site.
5. Must provide screening and buffering to adjacent residential uses, and must mitigate the aesthetic impacts of on-site stacking and queuing visible from any public right of way or adjacent properties.
6. Employ access management and control standards as appropriate to eliminate and/or reduce conflicts.
7. Comply with all applicable requirements and standards, including, but not limited KDC 2.301.04 (Traffic Impact Analysis) and any all mitigations required by such section.

### 2.110.05 Use Restrictions

No permitted or special permitted use shall in any way involve any of the following:
A. Farm Use. (5/98)
B. The rendering, processing, or cleaning of animals, fish, seafoods, fowl, poultry, fruits, vegetables, or dairy products for wholesale use. (5/98)
C. The following uses are prohibited from any property fronting on River Road or Chemawa Road in the following area: the west side of River Road between 5119 River Road on the north and Janet Avenue extended on the south; the east side of River Road between Claggett Street on the north and James Avenue on the south; and either side of Chemawa Road between Elizabeth Street on the west and Bailey Road on the east; and (2) Any property contained within the Area B as described in the Keizer Station Plan. This prohibition does not apply to any business facility, legally established as
of the date of the adoption of this Ordinance, which as of that date has drivethrough window facilities. (12/03)

1. Gasoline service stations (554)-(5/98) except as provided in Section 2.110.04.C
2. Drive-Through windows or car service associated with eating and drinking places (58). (5/98)
3. Vehicle sales and secondary repair. (5/98)
4. Public utility structures and buildings. (5/98)
5. Recreational vehicle parks (7033). (5/98)
6. Automobile parking not associated with an allowed use (752). (5/98)
7. Automotive Dealers (55). (5/98)
8. Automotive rental and leasing, without drivers (751). (5/98)
9. Automotive repair shops (753). (5/98)
10. Automotive services, except repair (754). (5/98)
11. Utilities - secondary truck parking and material storage yard. (5/98)
D. A limitation of the total floor area of specified uses applies to all of Area B - Retail Service Center of the Keizer Station Plan. A maximum total floor area shall apply to the uses identified in Sections 2.110.02 (I) and 2.110.03 (E)(12) - (14). This maximum floor area is set forth in the Keizer Station Plan, however this maximum floor area may change as part of an approved master plan or amended master plan. (06/10)

### 2.110.06 Dimensional Standards

A. Minimum Lot Dimension and Height Requirements

| DIMENSION | Single Family | Duplex or <br> Multi-Family | Commercial | Mixed Use |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lot Size | 4,000 sq. ft. (1) | 6,000 sq. ft. (2) | None (3) | None (3) |
| Average Width | 40 feet | 50 feet | None | None |
| Average Depth | 70 feet | 80 feet | None | None |
| Maximum <br> Height | 35 feet | 50 feet | 50 feet | 50 feet |

(1) A single family dwelling attached on one side has a minimum lot area of 3500 square feet, and a single family dwelling attached on both sides has a minimum lot area of 3000 square feet. (5/98)
(2) Multi-family development must comply with the density standard in Section 2.110.07. (5/98)
(3) Parcel size shall be adequate to contain all structures within the required yard setbacks and, where applicable, comply with residential density standards in Section 2.110.07. (5/98)
B. Minimum Yard Setback Requirements

| SETBACKS | Single Family <br> or Duplex | Multi-Family | Commercial | Mixed Use |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Front | 10 feet | 10 feet | 10 feet | 10 feet |
| Side | 5 feet (1) | $(3)$ | $(3)$ | $(3)$ |
| Rear | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(3)$ | $(3)$ |
| Street-side (4) | 10 feet | 10 feet | 10 feet | 10 feet |
| Garage <br> entrance (5) | 20 feet (5) | 20 feet (5) | 20 feet (5) | 20 feet (5) |

(1) Zero side yard dwelling units are subject to the setback provisions in Section 2.404. (5/98)
(2) The rear yard setback shall be as follows: 14 feet for a 1-story home, 20 feet for a 2-story home. (5/98)
(3) The setback shall be no less than the minimum rear yard setback of the zone on the adjacent property. For the CM zone, the rear yard setback is 0 feet. (5/98)
(4) Setbacks are measured from property lines, not easement lines. However, no structure shall be placed any closer than five feet from
the edge of an access easement or 20 feet from the right-of-way of an arterial or collector street. (5/98)
(5) The garage entrance setback shall be measured from the property line or edge of private access easement to the entrance of the garage. The centerline of the driveway shall be measured if the driveway to the garage entrance is not perpendicular to the property line or private access easement. In no case shall a garage be set back less than the minimum front, side, and rear setbacks. (5/98)

### 2.110.07 Development Standards

All development in the CM Zone shall comply with the applicable provisions of this Ordinance. The following includes referenced items as well as additional development requirements. If a conflict exists with a specific standard found in this section and a standard found elsewhere in this Ordinance, the standard in this section shall govern. (5/98)
A. Off-street parking:

1. Parking shall be as specified in Section 2.303. In the event that onstreet parking is provided, on-street parking that abuts the property can be used to meet the standard. (5/98)
2. No off-street parking is required for uses above the ground floor. (5/98)
3. The off-street parking requirement for residential uses is one space per unit. (5/98)
4. If mixed uses on the ground floor exhibit peak parking demand at different times, the resulting parking requirement is limited to the number of spaces generated at the highest combined peak demand at any one particular time. (For example, if there is a movie theater exhibiting peak parking demand between 7:00 and 10:00 PM with a total requirement of 100 spaces, and a pet store exhibiting peak demand between 1:00 and 5:00 PM with a requirement of 50 spaces, the total requirement for the building would be 100 spaces.)
B. Subdivisions and Partitions. Land divisions shall be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of Section 2.310. (5/98)
C. Yards and Lots. Yards and lots shall conform to the standards of Section 2.312. (5/98)
D. Signs. Signs shall conform to the requirements of Section 2.308. (5/98)
E. Accessory Structures: Accessory structures shall conform to requirements in Section 2.313. (5/98)
F. Storage, Trash, and Service Functions: Storage areas, trash, recycling, utilities and other service functions shall be located within the main structure if possible. If any of the above functions are located outside the main structure, the area containing the function must be screened with a solid, durable structure that is architecturally related to the building. (5/98)
D. Landscaping-General: All required yards shall be landscaped. Landscaped areas shall be landscaped as provided in Section 2.309.
5. The minimum landscaped area requirements shall be as follows:

$$
\text { Commercial development: } 10 \%
$$

Mixed commercial and residential development: 15\%
Residential development: 20\%
2. Properties located within Area B as defined in the Keizer Station Plan shall have a 20 -foot landscape buffer along all property lines adjacent to any residential zone. Landscape and buffer requirements shall be met as defined in the Keizer Station Plan. (1203)
H. Landscaping-Parking Lots: One tree shall be provided for every eight parking spaces in parking lots. The trees shall be dispersed throughout the parking lot in minimum four by four foot planters located between parking spaces. (5/98)
I. Lot Coverage: The maximum coverage allowed for buildings, accessory structures and paved parking shall be as follows: (5/98)

|  | Max. | Min |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Commercial development: | $90 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Mixed commercial and residential development: | $85 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Residential development: | $80 \%$ | $50 \%$ |

J. Density: The maximum residential density shall be 24 units per acre and minimum residential density shall be 8 units per acre. Developments limited exclusively to residential uses and containing less than 8 dwelling units per acre are allowed if they comply with the following: (5/98)

1. No more than $50 \%$ of the property shall be occupied. The occupied area shall include all buildings, accessory structures, driveways, parking and required landscaping. (5/98)
2. The remaining undeveloped portion of the property shall be in one contiguous piece. Access to a public street, in conformance with Ordinance requirements, shall be available. The undeveloped portion shall have sufficient width and depth to be developed for additional residential, or commercial, uses. (5/98)

### 2.110.08 Design Standards

All development in the CM Zone shall comply with the applicable design standards described below:
A. Building Design Standards. Primary buildings shall comply with the following design standards: (5/98)

1. Design Standards - Unless specifically modified by provisions in this Section, buildings located within the CM zone shall comply with the following standards: (5/98)
a. Single family homes shall comply with the design standards in Section 2.314. (5/98)
b. Multi-family buildings and non-residential structures shall comply with the provisions in Section 2.315 - Development Standards. (4/12)
$\qquad$

| TO: | MAYOR CLARK AND COUNCIL MEMBERS |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | NATE BROWN, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR |
| THROUGH: | CHRISTOPHER C. EPPLEY, CITY MANAGER |
| SUBJECT: | INITIATION OF TEXT AMMENDMENT PROCESS TO |
|  | CONSIDER ALLOWING GASOLINE SERVICE STATIONS |
|  | IN THE CHEMAWA USE RESTRICTION AREA. |

## BACKGROUND:

Safeway has submitted a request (attachment A) to the City Council to initiate a Text Amendment process to allow "Gasoline Service Station" as an allowed use under certain circumstances in the use restrictions of the Commercial Mixed-use (CM) zone in the Keizer Development Code (KDC). The request suggests a specific avenue of how to accomplish this, namely, to add an allowance that gasoline could be established only as an accessory use to existing "grocery supermarkets". They have also provided a suggested development plan and a traffic analysis for Council's consideration.

The use restrictions in the KDC were specifically established even before their establishment in the KDC by ordinance (Ord\# 95-333). These restrictions have a very long history and importance in the City of Keizer. The originally stated purpose of these restrictions was "...to create a thriving economic center based on eliminating the negative design elements characteristic of strip commercial areas. The uniqueness of a shopping area based on attracting pedestrian traffic and not catering to automobile oriented uses is anticipated to encourage economic development." Further, the aesthetic improvements of eliminating the relative unsightly nature of service stations was also reportedly a consideration.

Rather than discuss specific site plan development and the most effective manner in which to change the specific language of the KDC, the basic policy question of the allowance of the use and the fundamental nature of the appropriateness of the use restrictions in today's economic environment should be addressed. The property owner maintains that the nature of the grocery business has changed, and has committed to city staff that the purpose and intent of the KDC can still be maintained through specific limitations and mitigations that they are willing to construct.

Staff feels that by initiating the Text Amendment process, the Council can have a full discussion about all of the issues surrounding the policy decision. The text amendment process would be the vehicle to examine the specific policy issues. By initiating the process, Council does not make any commitment or promise as to the outcome. The Council may choose to not adopt the amendment and that decision cannot be appealed.

If the Council chooses to initiate, staff would examine the specific proposal, make a recommendation on the merits of the proposal to the Planning Commission, which in turn would make a recommendation to the City Council. At that point, Council itself would evaluate the proposal and then make their policy decision.

The proponents are more than willing to appear before the Council to advocate their position. Staff, however, feels that to initiate the process, to ask does the Council even wish to discuss the matter-should be more appropriately based on the overall policy questions rather than the specifics of the Safeway plan. Consequently, staff requested that Safeway not appear at tonight's meeting.

## RECOMMENDATION.

Staff recommends the Keizer City Council adopt the attached Resolution initiating the Text Amendment Process to examine the merits and or restrictions of whether or not to allow Gasoline Service Stations under certain circumstances in the CM zone of the KDC.

1120 NW Couch Street<br>(1) +1.503 .727 .2000<br>10th Floor<br>© +1.503.727.2222<br>Portland, OR 97209-4128<br>PerkinsCoie.com

Mark D. Whitlow
January 31, 2017

| MWhitlow@perkinscoiecom |
| ---: |
| D. |
| (503) $727-2073$ |
| F. (503) $346-2073$ |

Keizer City Council
c/o Nate Brown, Planning Director
Community Development Department
City of Keizer
PO Box 21000
Keizer, OR 97307-1000

## Re: Petition for Initiation of Legislative Amendments to Development Code Amendment of Commercial Mixed Use (CM) Zone

Dear Nate:
This office represents Safeway Inc. ("Safeway"), the owner of the existing Safeway grocery supermarket (termed "Food Store" in the Keizer Development Code) at the intersection of Chemawa and River Road in Keizer, Oregon. The site is zoned Commercial Mixed Use (CM) in an area which prohibits gasoline service stations, but Safeway would like to investigate the potential to develop a fuel station in conjunction with the existing grocery supermarket. As discussed in more detail below, there is a market need for this type of one-stop shopping and a transportation need to combine and consolidate vehicle trips to buy groceries and fuel. There is also a public need to promote economic development and support local businesses seeking to grow and expand in line with the operational profile of other supermarkets in the industry. This petition represents an opportunity to meet these various needs for the benefit of the community.

## Request

Safeway hereby petitions the City Council pursuant to Keizer Development Code ("KDC") 3.111 to request the initiation of a text amendment to amend the CM zone standards to find a limited way to allow fuel stations in conjunction with grocery supermarkets as an exception to the prohibition against gasoline service stations in the zone. Safeway also proposes to work with staff to develop a desirable site plan for the fuel station's use and development to ensure that the size and scale of the fuel station complements the site and the adjacent areas. A proposed site plan is attached.

## Benefits

There are many benefits associated with this request. Initiation of the proposed legislative text amendments will allow the City's development code standards to better reflect the changing
conditions of the grocery industry and of customer shopping patterns. The grocery industry has evolved since the time that the KDC was adopted. Many grocery supermarkets are now developed with fuel stations that allow those supermarkets to sell gasoline to supermarket customers while they are on the supermarket site buying groceries. The accessory fuel station is treated like another department of the supermarket, except that it is outside the store, but still linked with the store's cash register for cross-over purchasing discounts. Safeway employees will operate the fuel station.

There is both a market need and a transportation need to allow the vehicle trip consolidation opportunity presented by major grocery supermarkets offering accessory fuel stations. The combination of trips to buy groceries and fuel captures customers on site for cross-shopping opportunities of the most frequently shopped for items. That maximizes the efficient utilization of land by getting more shopping needs satisfied in one trip at one location. The combined shopping opportunity does not significantly increase traffic, but, rather, gets more use out of existing traffic. A current traffic study is attached.

There is also a public need to support existing businesses and allow their expansion and growth without having to relocate to a new location. The support of local businesses is a central component of the economic development policies of Keizer's Comprehensive Plan. See Keizer Comprehensive Plan Section III.C.4. The proposed amendment would allow grocery supermarkets in the CM zone to also add fuel, in keeping with the operational profile of other grocery supermarkets in the industry. Further, the addition of fuel to the Safeway site would prompt the related upgrade of the site's access and internal circulation, as an additional benefit.

The proposed amendment is not inconsistent with the original intent to prohibit gasoline service stations in the CM zone. Gasoline service stations typically offer an array of vehicle repair and maintenance services, plus the incidental sale of batteries, tires and other automobile accessories, all of which create a greater destination use and more potential for additional traffic and noise than a fuel station that only sells fuel related products such as gasoline and oil.

In summary, the proposed legislative amendment allows economic growth, increased shopping opportunities in a single trip, and a more efficient utilization of land, without a significant increase in traffic.

## Legislative Process

Once staff, the Planning Commission or City Council initiates this legislative text amendment to the KDC, Safeway will prepare a narrative statement setting forth the specific language of the proposed text amendment and addressing the criteria for approval of a text amendment pursuant to KDC Section 3.111.04. In accordance with KDC Section 3.111.02, this proposed text amendment will be reviewed under Type IV procedures as specified in KDC Section 3.203,
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which include hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council. We understand there are several specific legislative issues that would need to be addressed and we are fully prepared to work with staff, the Planning Commission and the City Council to find the ideal solution.

## Post Amendment Design Review

Assuming that the City Council approves a legislative amendment to allow the addition of fuel stations to existing grocery supermarkets in the CM zone, Safeway or any other existing supermarket operator in the CM zone would then need to apply for and satisfy the site plan review criteria in order to develop a fuel station in the zone. The legislative text amendment will only remove the use prohibition in the zone, with any proposed fuel stations then needing to apply for site plan approval to develop.

Thank you for your consideration of this proposal. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or if you require additional information.

Very truly yours,

Mark D. Whitlow
MDW:sv
Enclosure
cc: Shannon Johnson
Chris Miles, Safeway Inc.


Kittelson \& Associates, inc.
TRANSPORTATIONENGINEERING/PLANNING 610 SW Alder Street, Suite 700, Portland, OR 97205 P 503.228.5230 F 503.273.8169

Diane Phillips
Safeway, Inc.
PO Box 523
Clackamas, OR 97015

## RE: \#1516 Keizer Fueling Station Preliminary Transportation Impact Assessment

Dear Diane,

This letter documents the initial findings and recommendations of a preliminary transportation impact assessment prepared for the proposed development of a fueling station located within the Safeway site at the River Road $N$ and Chemawa Road NE intersection in Keizer, Oregon. This study was prepared for Safeway's internal due-diligence assessment purposes. Additional study intersections and analysis may be required in conjunction with the site plan application process and the City of Keizer's development review process.

Based on our preliminary analysis, the primary findings and recommendations are as follows:

- The study intersections operate acceptably under 2013 weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions.
- The study intersections are forecast to continue to operate acceptably under 2015 future AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions.
- The proposed fueling facility is estimated to generate 340 daily trips, including 20 total $A M$ peak hour trips and 30 total PM peak hour trips.
- With the addition of peak hour site-generated traffic, the study intersections continue to operate acceptably.
- Queuing along Chemawa Road NE blocks the western right-in/right-out only site driveway and is expected to continue to do so in the future. The main site driveway in front of the store is not blocked by queues and is not expected to be.
- Queuing along River Road $N$ routinely blocks the northern left-in/right-in/right-out only site driveway and sporadically blocks the southern full movement driveway. The southern full movement driveway is expected to continue to accommodate left-turns in and out but will be blocked during portions of the peak 15 minutes of the weekday PM peak hour by $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues.
- Operations at the south driveway on River Road $N$ could be enhanced by reconstructing the driveway to improve the entry grade (the existing driveway has a relatively steep entry,
causing most drivers to slow entering and exiting and causing some vehicle undersides to contact and scrape the driveway pavement).

In addition to addressing the items above, this letter highlights some of the opportunities and constraints associated with two potential fuel pad locations on the Safeway site. Information is provided in the following order:

- Safeway Fuel Trip Generation Estimate
- Intersection Operations (existing, background without fuel, and total traffic with fuel)
- Queuing analysis
- Crash data review
- Fuel pad location opportunities and constraints


## SAFEWAY FUEL TRIP GENERATION

Trip generation estimates were developed based on trip rates found in the standard reference manual Trip Generation, Ninth Edition published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) (ITE, Reference 1). The internal and pass-by trip rates applied were determined based on information provided in ITE's Trip Generation Manual (ITE, Reference 2). Table 1 summarizes the daily, weekday AM, and weekday PM peak hour trips.

Table 1: Trip Generation Estimate

| Land Use | ITE Code | \# Fueling <br> Stations | Daily Trips | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Gasoline/Service Station w/Conv. Market | 945 | 8 | 1,300 | 80 | 40 | 40 | 110 | 55 | 55 |
| Internal Trips (36\%)* |  |  | (470) | (30) | (15) | (15) | (40) | (20) | (20) |
| Pass-By Trips (62\% a.m., 56\% p.m.) |  |  | (490) | (30) | (15) | (15) | (40) | (20) | (20) |
| Net New Trips |  |  | 340 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 15 | 15 |

*Reflects 36\% internal trip reduction measured at other Safeway fuel sites.

## INTERSECTION OPERATIONS

Operations of each of the five site driveways and the signalized River Road N/Chemawa Road NE intersection were reviewed as documented below.

## Analysis Methodology and Operating Standards

The level of service (LOS) and queuing analysis described in this report was performed in accordance with the procedures stated in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM, Reference 3). To ensure that the analyses were based on a reasonable worst-case scenario, the peak 15-minute flow rates were used in the LOS evaluation of the study intersection. Thus, the LOS analysis reflects conditions that are likely to occur for only 15 minutes out of each average peak hour. Traffic conditions during typical weekday hours are expected to operate under better conditions than those described in this report.

The City of Keizer's operational standards govern the intersection in this analysis. For signalized intersections and unsignalized intersections in the City of Keizer, LOS "D" and LOS "E" are considered to be the minimum acceptable levels, respectively (Keizer, Reference 4).

Figure 1 illustrates the existing lane configurations and traffic control devices. Figures 2, 3, 4, and 5 summarize existing traffic conditions, forecast year 2015 background, and 2015 total traffic conditions at the study intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

## Existing Conditions

Weekday AM and PM peak hour turn movement counts were conducted at the study intersections on February 20, 2013 between 7:00 and 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 and 6:00 p.m.

All intersections were found to operate acceptably as shown in Figure 2.

## Background Conditions

A preliminary 2015 future conditions assessment was prepared assuming two percent annual growth in the study area based on historical growth patterns. Note that the City may identify additional inprocess development in conjunction with the formal site plan application.

All of the study intersections were found to operate acceptably as shown in Figure 3.

## Total Traffic Conditions

Future conditions assuming development of the fuel pad site were prepared by assigning the anticipated site-generated traffic to the study intersections following existing turn movement patterns in the site vicinity. The year 2015 background traffic volumes for the weekday AM and PM peak hours were added to the site-generated traffic to arrive at the total traffic volumes.

All of the study intersections were found to operate acceptably as shown in Figures 4 and 5 .
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## QUEUING ANALYSIS

Existing and forecast future $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues were estimated along the site frontage to assess their potential impact on site driveway operations. Specifically, a Synchro analysis was conducted to identify projected queue lengths at the Chemawa Road NE and River Road N intersection, and the subsequent impact to site driveway access and operations.

Figure 6 illustrates the existing and 2015 estimated $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths, rounded to the nearest 25 feet, relative to the location of the site driveways. As shown, the estimated queues for both the existing and 2015 estimated conditions extend beyond the west driveway on Chemawa Road NE and the north driveway on River Road N during the AM peak, and beyond the south driveway on River Road N and west driveway on Chemawa Road NE during the PM peak. Note that the west driveway on Chemawa Road NE is currently signed to prohibit left-turns in or out of the driveway. Some vehicles were observed to make left-turns in and out despite the signing prohibiting the left-turn movement.

The queuing results indicate that the two site driveways on River Road N will be blocked intermittently during the PM peak hour. The condition is consistent with other driveways on the corridor. The City of Keizer may choose to implement raised median treatments at the west site driveway on Chemawa Road NE or the north site driveway on River Road $N$ to enforce the existing driveway turn movement restrictions. While feasible, raised median treatments could impact neighboring properties pending their location and design.
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## CRASH DATA REVIEW

The crash histories of the study intersection and site driveways were reviewed in an effort to identify potential intersection safety issues. Collision records were obtained from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) for the most recent five-year period from January 2007 through December 2011. A summary of the collision data is provided in Table 2.

Table 2: Intersection Collision Histories

| Intersection | Number of Crashes | Crash Type |  |  |  | Crash Severity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Rear-End | Turning | Angle | Other | PDO ${ }^{1}$ | Injury |
| River Road N/ Chemawa Road NE | 20 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 9 |
| River Road N/ S Driveway | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| River Road N/ N Driveway | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Chemawa Road NE/ W Driveway | 6 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Chemawa Road NE/ Main Driveway | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Chemawa Road NE/ E Driveway | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

${ }^{1}$ PDO: Property Damage Only

Based on the collision review, the collisions that occurred at the site driveways were generally a result of illegal turning movements or were attributed to reckless driving rather than site driveway design. Per the ODOT crash reports, the following documents the causes for the collisions reported in the fiveyear period:

- Two of the three reported collisions at the south driveway on River Road N occurred at the site driveway, and were caused by left-turning vehicles that did not yield right-of-way to northbound through vehicles.
- The two reported turning collisions at the north driveway on River Road N were attributed to illegal turn movements from the driveway, including left-turn and through movements.
- Three of the six collisions reported at the west driveway on Chemawa Road NE occurred at the site driveway. Two of these were collisions between a bicycle and a vehicle, and one of which the bicycle was traveling in the wrong direction. The other collision was due to an illegal left-turning movement from the site driveway.


## FUEL PAD LOCATION OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS

We understand that Safeway is considering two potential locations on-site for the fuel station; the existing vacant pad site in the south central portion of the site and within the parking field along the Chemawa Road NE frontage site. Attachment " $A$ " illustrates the multimodal access paths depending on the fueling station placement, and also shows the potential queuing patterns of vehicles waiting for fueling pumps. Table 3 below summarizes key opportunities and constraints associated with the two potential locations from a transportation perspective.

Table 3: Benefits and Considerations to Pad Site Location

| Consideration | Chemawa Road NE Frontage Site | Vacant Pad Site |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Impact to Safeway Store Parking | Relative to vacant pad site, this site would <br> displace the most existing Safeway customer <br> parking. Queus waiting to fuel would also <br> potentially block customer parking spaces. | Least impact to existing Safeway <br> customer parking - engages an area <br> currently being used for non-Safeway <br> truck parking. |
| Impact to Safeway Store Entry Operations | Location would add fuel related vehicular traffic <br> directly in front of Safeway store entry, <br> increasing interaction with Safeway customers <br> pushing shopping carts to and from the store. | Least impact for interactions store <br> shoppers/customer vehicles destined <br> to/from Safeway fuel. |
| Impact to Safeway Main Chemawa Road NE | Relative to the vacant pad site, this location <br> results in more vehicles and queuing at the <br> Chemawa Road NE site driveway. | This location results in less impact to the <br> Main Chemawa Road NE driveway <br> relative to the Chemawa Road NE <br> frontage site. |
| Fuel Delivery Truck Access Implications Operations | Allows for truck entry on Chemawa Road NE or <br> River Road N, requires exit to Chemawa Road NE <br> with left-turn internal to Safeway parking lot and <br> left-turn exit to Chemawa Road NE. Requires fuel <br> truck navigation through customer parking areas <br> and truck passing across main store front <br> through pedestrian area. | Allows for truck entry on Chemawa Road <br> NE, exit to River Road N with all right- <br> turns. Minimal navigation through <br> customer parking areas required. |
| Queue Storage for Vehicles Waiting to Fuel | Allows limited storage space for vehicle in queue <br> waiting to fuel. As a result, vehicles anticipated <br> to queue in the parking aisle may cause <br> additional friction and interaction between <br> vehicles in queue and other vehicles and <br> pedestrians. | Allows adequate queue storage for <br> vehicles waiting to fuel. In addition, the <br> vacant pad site is located away from the <br> Safeway main entrance, thus minimizing <br> possible interactions between Safeway- <br> only customers and fueling customers. |

## Site Access

Based on our review, the following potential improvements and recommendations to site access were identified:

- The City may require the west access be further modified to enforce existing turn movement restrictions through provision of a raised median treatment on Chemawa Road NE.
- The City will likely require Safeway to restrict existing movements at the north driveway on River Road N to right-in/right out (eliminate left-in). The existing queues from the intersection prohibit southbound left-in movements during the peak hours.
- The south driveway on River Road N has potential sight distance issues associated with onsite vegetation. In addition, the driveway grading results in entering and exiting vehicles slowing abnormally and turning wide. Exhibit 1 illustrates the potential sight distance and grading issues with the driveway. This condition could be improved by trimming and maintaining the existing vegetation to improve sight distance, and by reconstructing the driveway to minimize the grade differential between the roadway and the parking aisle.

Exhibit 1: Sight Distance and Grading Issues at South Driveway on River Road N


We trust this letter adequately assesses the preliminary transportation impacts associated with the proposed development of a fueling station at the Safeway site in Keizer, OR. Please contact us if you have any questions or comments regarding the contents of this letter or of the analysis completed.

Sincerely,
KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.

Chris Brehmer, P.E.
Principal Engineer

Anais Malinge
Transportation Analyst
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## ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Fueling Station Pad Site Circulation Analysis

## Attachment A Fueling Station Pad Site Circulation Analysis




Planning staff is delegated the authority to draft proposed text amendments for notice purposes.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that staff is directed to schedule the matter for public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council as provided in state and local law.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution shall take effect immediately upon the date of its passage.

PASSED this 6 th day of February , 2017. SIGNED this th day of February , 2017.


February 28, 2017
Project \#: 21098

Nate Brown
City of Keizer
Community Development
PO Box 21000
Keizer, OR 97307

## RE: Keizer Safeway Fuel Center Transportation Impact Assessment

Dear Nate,

This letter documents the findings and recommendations of a transportation impact assessment prepared for the proposed fueling station within the existing Safeway site southwest of the River Road N/ Chemawa Road NE intersection in Keizer.

Based on our analysis, the primary study findings are as follows:

- From a regulatory perspective, the River Road N/Chemawa Road intersection and the site driveways satisfy City operating standards under 2017 weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions.
- While operating standards are met, field observations found that:
- Traffic queuing along the site frontage (particularly northbound along River Road N) results in lengthy delays leaving the site during peak periods;
- On-site circulation at the main Chemawa Road site driveway could be improved for vehicles and pedestrians by reconstructing the driveway to provide a wider entry, reducing the vertical "bump" at the curb, and reconfiguring the first parking lot drive aisle and pedestrian crossing area within the site; and
- While the west driveway on Chemawa Road NE and the north driveway on River Road N are currently signed to prohibit left-turns entering or exiting the Safeway site, vehicles were observed to turn left at both locations. Measures to address these issues are recommended within this report.
- The member-based cost savings realized by customers at a Safeway Fuel station results in fewer site trips than a stand-alone fuel station.
- Based on studies of other Safeway sites, 36 percent of the peak hour trips to and from the fuel site will be made by customers already shopping at the Safeway store.
- In addition to these "internal" trips, roughly 50 percent of the 64 percent remaining vehicle trips will be made by drivers who visit the fuel site as part of their regular commute and simply "pass-by" to purchase fuel as a function of convenience.
- After accounting for pass-by and diverted trips, the proposed fuel facility is estimated to generate 626 net new daily trips, including 40 AM net new peak hour trips ( 20 vehicles entering and exiting the site) and 52 net new PM peak hour trips ( 26 vehicles entering and exiting the site).
- With the addition of peak hour site-generated traffic, the study intersections are forecast to continue to satisfy City operating standards under 2019 future weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions.
- The main site driveway in front of the store is not blocked by east-west queues along Chemawa Road NE today and is not expected to be in the future.
- Queuing along River Road N routinely blocks the northern right-in/right-out only site driveway and sporadically blocks the southern full movement driveway.
- The southern full movement driveway along River Road N is expected to continue to accommodate left-turns in and out but is expected to be blocked during portions of the peak 15 minutes of the weekday PM peak hour by $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues.

Our analysis led to the following recommendations:

- Widen and reconstruct the main site access to improve driveway operations and reduce the potential for westbound left-turns at the west (right-in/right-out) site driveway on Chemawa Road NE. These improvements would include:
- Regrading the driveway to reduce the vertical dip that results in a "bump" entering the driveway;
- Restrict turn movements to the existing on-site parking aisle closest to the site entry (improving operations at the main access);
- Add width to the inbound travel lane to improve the ingress movement;
- Add vehicle storage to the left- and right-turn lanes leaving the site;
- Reconstruct the pedestrian crossing and ramps; and
- Improve pedestrian circulation at both the driveway and in the paved area connecting the parking lot with the store entry.
- Reconstruct the north right-in/right-out driveway on River Road N to:
- Provide an improved raised median design and new signage to better restrict left turns into and out of the access;
- Improve the pedestrian crossing of the driveway; and
- Reduce the vertical dip that results in a "bump" entering the driveway.
- Reconstruct the southern site driveway on River Road N to:
- Improve the pedestrian crossing of the driveway; and
- Reduce the vertical dip that results in a "bump" entering the driveway.

To the extent practical, we recommend reconstruction of each driveway be completed in a manner that incorporates special pavement or ornamental treatments furthering site compliance with the aspirations of the Keizer River Road Renaissance Implementation Report.

- It is further recommended that above-ground utilities, monuments, fencing, and vegetation be appropriately located and maintained to preserve adequate intersection sight lines at the site driveways and at new internal site intersections.


## SCOPE OF THE REPORT

This analysis determines the transportation-related impacts associated with the proposed Safeway Fuel. The study intersections were determined based on a review of existing travel patterns, Keizer Development Code Section 2.301.04 and direction provided by City staff. As such, the report addresses the following transportation issues:

- Trip generation estimates for the proposed development;
- Intersection operations under existing conditions as well as under future year 2019 conditions without and with the proposed fuel center;
- Suggested driveway improvements;
- Study intersection crash history review;
- Intersection sight distance review; and,
- Conclusions and recommendations.


## Study Intersections

The signalized Chemawa Road NE/River Road $N$ and five existing site driveways illustrated in Figure 1 were studied.

## Analysis Periods

Weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions were modeled at the study intersections under existing and year 2019 conditions.
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## SAFEWAY FUEL TRIP GENERATION

Trip generation estimates for the proposed fueling facility were developed based on trip rates found in the standard reference manual Trip Generation, $9^{\text {th }}$ Edition published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE, Reference 1).

Safeway Club members (a no-cost membership opportunity offered to all Safeway customers) are able to receive cost savings on fuel purchases. As a result, many Safeway customers shop at the Safeway store and also purchase fuel while on-site. Based on studies of other Safeway sites ${ }^{1}, 36$ percent of the peak hour trips to and from the fuel site are made by customers already shopping at the Safeway store (these trips are referred to as internal trips). Consequently, fewer off-site trips are generated by a typical Safeway fuel compared to a stand-alone gas station.

In addition to the internal trips, roughly 50 percent of the remaining vehicle trips will be made by drivers who visit the fuel site as part of their regular commute and simply "pass-by" to purchase fuel as a function of convenience. Table 1 summarizes the daily, weekday AM, and weekday PM peak hour trips.

Table 1: Trip Generation Estimate

| Land Use | ITE Code | \# Fueling Stations | Daily Trips | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Gasoline/Service Station w/Conv. Market | 945 | 12 | 1,954 | 122 | 61 | 61 | 162 | 81 | 81 |
| Internal Trips (36\%)* |  |  | (702) | (44) | (22) | (22) | (58) | (29) | (29) |
| Pass-By Trips (50\%) |  |  | (626) | (38) | (19) | (19) | (52) | (26) | (26) |
| Net New Trips |  |  | 626 | 40 | 20 | 20 | 52 | 26 | 26 |

*Reflects $36 \%$ internal trip reduction measured at other Safeway fuel sites.

## INTERSECTION CAPACITY \& QUEUING ANALYSIS

Operations of each of the five site driveways and the signalized River Road N/Chemawa Road NE intersection were reviewed as documented below. Attachment A includes the analysis worksheets.

## Analysis Methodology and Operating Standards

The level of service (LOS) and queuing analysis described in this report was performed in accordance with the procedures stated in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM, Reference 2). To ensure that the analyses were based on a reasonable worst-case scenario, the peak 15-minute flow rates were

[^0]used in the LOS evaluation of the study intersection. Thus, the LOS analysis reflects conditions that are likely to occur for only 15 minutes out of each average peak hour. Traffic conditions during typical weekday hours are expected to operate under better conditions than those described in this report.

The City of Keizer's operational standards govern the intersections in this analysis. For signalized intersections and unsignalized intersections in the City of Keizer, LOS " $D$ " and LOS " $E$ " are considered to be the minimum acceptable levels, respectively (Reference 3).

Figure 1 illustrates the existing lane configurations and traffic control devices at the study intersections. Note that the west driveway on Chemawa Road NE and the north driveway on River Road N are currently signed to prohibit left-turns into or out of the driveway. Some vehicles were observed to make left-turns in and out of these two driveways despite the signing prohibiting the left-turn movements.

## Existing Conditions

Weekday AM and PM peak hour turn movement counts were conducted at the study intersections on Wednesday, February 15, 2017 between 7:00 and 9:00 AM and 4:00 and 6:00 PM while school was insession. Attachment B includes the traffic counts. All intersections were found to operate acceptably during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, as shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3, respectively.

## Background Conditions

A 2019 future conditions assessment was prepared assuming two percent annual growth in the study area based on historical growth patterns, as well as in-process traffic from the proposed Herber Family Apartments located on the west side of Verda Lane between Chemawa Road NE and Dearborn Avenue.

All of the study intersections are projected to continue operating acceptably during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, as shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5, respectively. Note that the existing left-turn movements recorded at the two right-in/right-out only site driveways were assumed to re-route to the next closest site driveway allowing left-turns.

## Total Traffic Conditions

Future conditions, assuming development of the Safeway fuel site, were prepared by assigning the anticipated site-generated traffic to the study intersections following existing turn movement patterns in the site vicinity. The assignment of site-generated and pass-by trips during the weekday AM and PM peak hours is shown in Figure 6 and Figure 7, respectively.

The year 2019 background traffic volumes for the weekday AM and PM peak hours were added to the site-generated traffic to arrive at the year 2019 total traffic volumes. These total traffic volumes also reflect the assumed re-routing of illegal left-turn movements from the two right-in/right-out driveways to the nearest full-access driveways on Chemawa Road NE and River Road N.
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All of the study intersections are projected to continue operating acceptably during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, as shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9, respectively.

## Queuing Analysis

Projected queue lengths were reviewed at the signalized Chemawa Road $\mathrm{NE} /$ River Road N intersection and their impact to site driveway access and operations was considered. Figure 10 illustrates the existing $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue lengths, and Figure 11 illustrates the estimated $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths under 2019 total traffic conditions, rounded to the nearest 25 feet, relative to the location of the site driveways. The figures show the left-turn and through-movement queues on the northbound and westbound approaches of the Chemawa Road NE/River Road N intersection.

As shown, the existing and projected westbound queues for the 2019 total traffic conditions extend beyond the west driveway on Chemawa Road NE during the weekday AM peak hour, and the northbound queues extend beyond the both driveways on River Road N and west driveway on Chemawa Road NE during the weekday PM peak hour.

Field observations confirmed that the River Road N driveways are routinely blocked by northbound queues under existing peak hour conditions. Drivers exiting the site to turn left onto River Road N were observed to routinely wait for northbound queues on River Road N to clear and many drivers were observed to use the center left-turn lane on River Road $N$ to complete their turns. The proposed fuel center will result in additional vehicles entering and leaving the site, resulting in an incremental increase in delay and on-site queuing. We also reviewed projected future on-site $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues at each of the site driveways, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Year 2019 Site Driveway Projected 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queues

| ID | Intersection | Movement | $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queue (feet) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | Available Storage |
| 2 | Chemawa Road NE West Site Access | Northbound right | 25 | 25 | $25^{1}$ |
| 3 | Chemawa Road NE Center Access | Northbound left | 25 | 75 | $25^{1}$ |
|  |  | Northbound right | 25 | 25 | $25^{1}$ |
| 4 | Chemawa Road NE East (Loading) Access | Northbound left/right | 25 | 25 | 50 |
| 5 | River Road N North Access | Westbound right | 25 | 25 | $50^{2}$ |
| 6 | River Road N South Access | Westbound left/right | 25 | 25 | $15^{2}$ |
|  | own to first internal drive aisle, additional | age available on-site rage available on-site |  |  |  |

As shown in Table 2, queues departing the main (center) site driveway on Chemawa Drive NE are expected to continue to back past the first internal parking lot drive aisle, especially during the


Existing Traffic 95th-percentile Queues
Weekday AM and PM Peak Hours Keizer, Oregon


Year 2019 Total Traffic 95th-percentile Queues
Weekday AM and PM Peak Hours Keizer, Oregon
weekday PM peak hour. The queuing results in congestion at the site driveway that can delay inbound vehicle turns and complicate on-site circulation. As a result, changes are recommended at the driveway to address queuing and other operational considerations described later in this report.

## CRASH DATA REVIEW

The crash history of the signalized Chemawa Road NE/River Road $N$ intersection and the site driveways was reviewed in an effort to identify potential intersection safety issues. Collision records were obtained from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) for the most recent five-year period from January 2010 through December 2014. A summary of the collision data is provided in Table 3.

Table 3: Crash Data Summary, January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2014

| Intersection | Crash Severity |  | Crash Type |  |  |  |  | Total Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Injury | PDO* | Rear End | Turning | Angle | Sideswipe | Pedestrian |  |
| Chemawa Road NE/River Road N | 13 | 11 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 24 |
| Chemawa Road NE/West Safeway Driveway | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Chemawa Road NE/Center Safeway Driveway | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Chemawa Road NE/East Safeway Driveway | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| River Road N/North Safeway Driveway | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| River Road N/South Safeway Driveway | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

*Property Damage Only
Crash Rate expressed per million entering vehicles
Per the ODOT crash reports, none of the reported driveway collisions appeared to be related to illegal left turns into or out of the site driveways with restricted turn movements. Four of the six crashes that occurred at the central (full access) driveway on Chemawa Road NE occurred when a car pulled out of the driveway in front of a car going eastbound or westbound on Chemawa Road NE.

## Critical Crash Rate

Critical crash rates were calculated for each of the study intersections following the analysis methodology presented in ODOT's SPR 667 Assessment of Statewide Intersection Safety Performance (Reference 4). SPR 667 provided average crash rates at a variety of intersection configurations in Oregon based on the number of approaches and traffic control types. The average crash rate represents the approximate number of crashes that are "expected" at a study intersection. This average crash rate is used to calculate the critical crash rate for each study intersection, based on the Highway Safety Manual methodology (Reference 5). The critical crash rate serves as a threshold for further analysis.

Table 4 summarizes the critical crash rate for each intersection and compares those values to the observed crash rate.

Table 4: Intersection Crash Rate Assessment

| Location | Total <br> Crashes | Critical Crash <br> Rate by <br> Intersection | Critical Crash <br> Rate by <br> Volume | Observed <br> Crash Rate at <br> Intersection | Observed Crash <br> Rate>Critical Crash <br> Rate $?$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chemawa Road NE/River Road N | 24 | 0.49 | 0.41 | 0.41 | No |
| Chemawa Road NE/West Safeway Driveway | 2 | 0.16 | 0.23 | 0.12 | No |
| Chemawa Road NE/Center Safeway Driveway | 6 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.31 | Yes |
| Chemawa Road NE/East Safeway Driveway | 0 | 0.16 | 0.24 | 0.00 | No |
| River Road N/North Safeway Driveway | 2 | 0.14 | 0.41 | 0.02 | No |
| River Road N/South Safeway Driveway | 1 | 0.21 | 0.41 | 0.02 | No |

${ }^{1}$ Critical crash rate by intersection type or volume
Crash Rates expressed per million entering vehicles
As shown in Table 4, the observed crash rate at the center Safeway driveway on Chemawa Road NE exceeds the critical crash rate and suggests that additional review is appropriate. Potential improvements at the Safeway driveway identified through this subsequent review are discussed in the next section. Attachment C includes the crash data from ODOT.

## SITE DRIVEWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Several potential driveway modifications have been identified based on the driveway capacity and queuing analysis described above and field observations made in February 2017. Based on our review, we recommend the improvements described below be made at the existing site driveways in conjunction with the proposed fuel station development. Reconstruction of the driveways should be completed in a manner that incorporates special pavement or ornamental treatments furthering site compliance with the aspirations of the Keizer River Road Renaissance Implementation Report. Current pedestrian accessibility standards should also be met with the reconstructed driveways.

## Chemawa Road NE Main Site Access

The existing main site driveway on Chemawa Road NE offers a relatively short queuing distance on-site before reaching the first internal parking drive aisle. As a result, two vehicles queued leaving the site can routinely block the drive aisle. This is shown in Photo 1 . Further, the main store entry door is located relatively close to Chemawa Road NE and results in pedestrians crossing the main drive aisle relatively close to Chemawa Road NE. There is also a vertical drop at the driveway entry that causes a bump that drivers slow for when entering. With the "bump" and a narrow inbound travel lane, drivers routinely make slow turning maneuvers to and from the entry.

Photo 1. Chemawa Road NE Main Drive Aisle Facing into Safeway Site


Given the above considerations, we recommend widening and reconstructing the main site access on Chemawa Road NE to:

- Regrade the driveway to reduce the "bump" entering the driveway;
- Restrict turn movements to the existing on-site northern-most east-west parking aisle closest to the site entry (improving operations at the main access);
- Add width to the inbound travel lane to improve the ingress movement;
- Add vehicle storage to the left- and right-turn lanes leaving the site;
- Reconstruct the pedestrian crossing and ramps; and
- Improve pedestrian circulation at both the driveway and in the paved area connecting the parking lot with the store entry.

Improving the main site access is expected to result in improved driveway operations and may result in fewer westbound left-turns at the right-in/right-out site driveway on Chemawa Road NE.

Exhibit 1 illustrates the driveway widening and reconstruction concept.

Exhibit 1. Chemawa Road Widening and Reconfiguration Concept


## River Road N North Site Access

As previously described, some drivers were observed to complete southbound left-turns into the River Road N north site access. This access driveway is shared with other tenants on the site and the southbound left-turn drivers were not necessarily traveling to Safeway. Given the anticipated increase in site trip generation, we recommend reconstructing and resigning the driveway to better communicate to drivers that left-turns are not allowed. A new raised island could be provided at the intersection along with new no left-turn/right-turn only signage. The reconstructed driveway should provide appropriate pedestrian accessibility.

## River Road N South Site Access

The existing southern site driveway is shared also with other tenants on the site and currently has a vertical drop at the driveway entry (some vehicles scrape the pavement) as shown in Photo 2 . The vertical dip causes both entering and exiting drivers to slow and the driveway design is not desirable for pedestrian crossing/accessibility. We recommend the driveway approach be reconstructed to reduce the vertical dip and to provide appropriate pedestrian accessibility.

Photo 2. Vehicle Departing Southern Site Access (facing north along River Road N)


## INTERSECTION SIGHT DISTANCE

It is recommended that above-ground utilities, monuments, fencing, and vegetation be appropriately located and maintained to preserve adequate intersection sight lines at the site driveways and at new internal site intersections.

## SUMMARY

Based on our analysis, the Chemawa Road $N E /$ River Road $N$ intersection and the site driveways are expected to continue to satisfy City of Keizer intersection operating standards after construction of the proposed Safety Fuel Center.

Based on the analysis and findings presented in this report, we recommend the following improvements be provided in conjunction with development of the proposed Safeway Fuel Center.

- Widen and reconstruct the main site access to improve driveway operations and reduce the potential for westbound left-turns at the west (right-in/right-out) site driveway on Chemawa Road NE. These improvements would include:
- Regrading the driveway to reduce the vertical dip that results in a "bump" entering the driveway;
- Restrict turn movements to the existing on-site parking aisle closest to the site entry (improving operations at the main access);
- Add width to the inbound travel lane to improve the ingress movement;
- Add vehicle storage to the left- and right-turn lanes leaving the site;
- Reconstruct the pedestrian crossing and ramps; and
- Improve pedestrian circulation at both the driveway and in the paved area connecting the parking lot with the store entry.
- Reconstruct the north right-in/right-out driveway on River Road N to:
- Provide an improved raised median design and new signage to better restrict left turns into and out of the access;
- Improve the pedestrian crossing of the driveway; and
- Reduce the vertical dip that results in a "bump" entering the driveway.
- Reconstruct the southern site driveway on River Road N to:
- Improve the pedestrian crossing of the driveway; and
- Reduce the vertical dip that results in a "bump" entering the driveway.

To the extent practical, we recommend reconstruction of each driveway be completed in a manner that incorporates special pavement or ornamental treatments furthering site compliance with the aspirations of the Keizer River Road Renaissance Implementation Report.

- It is further recommended that above-ground utilities, monuments, fencing, and vegetation be appropriately located and maintained to preserve adequate intersection sight lines at the site driveways and at new internal site intersections.

We trust this letter adequately assesses the transportation impacts associated with the proposed Keizer Safeway Fuel Center. Please contact us if you have any questions or comments regarding the contents of this letter or of the analysis completed.

Sincerely,
KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.

## Chis Buhner

Chris Brehmer, P.E.
Principal Engineer



Expires: $12-31-2017$
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## ATTACHMENTS
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Attachment B: Turning Movement Counts
Attachment C: Crash Data

## Attachment A Traffic Analysis Worksheets

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | 7 | $\uparrow$ | F | 7 | 个t |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 86 | 245 | 271 | 118 | 117 | 50 | 126 | 421 | 74 | 63 | 999 | 39 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 86 | 245 | 271 | 118 | 117 | 50 | 126 | 421 | 74 | 63 | 999 | 39 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 |  | 4.0 | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1719 | 1845 | 1537 | 1752 | 1845 | 1508 | 1736 | 3271 |  | 1752 | 3482 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1719 | 1845 | 1537 | 1752 | 1845 | 1508 | 1736 | 3271 |  | 1752 | 3482 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 96 | 272 | 301 | 131 | 130 | 56 | 140 | 468 | 82 | 70 | 1110 | 43 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 243 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 96 | 272 | 58 | 131 | 130 | 11 | 140 | 541 | 0 | 70 | 1151 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 8 |  | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 2 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 3\% | 1\% | 3\% | 3\% | 4\% | 4\% | 8\% | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 10.2 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 12.7 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 13.4 | 71.9 |  | 6.9 | 65.4 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 10.2 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 12.7 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 13.4 | 71.9 |  | 6.9 | 65.4 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.08 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.10 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.10 | 0.55 |  | 0.05 | 0.50 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 |  | 4.0 | 4.5 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |  | 0.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 134 | 312 | 260 | 171 | 347 | 284 | 178 | 1809 |  | 92 | 1751 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.06 | c0.15 |  | c0.07 | 0.07 |  | c0.08 | 0.17 |  | 0.04 | c0.33 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.04 |  |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.72 | 0.87 | 0.22 | 0.77 | 0.37 | 0.04 | 0.79 | 0.30 |  | 0.76 | 0.66 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 58.5 | 52.6 | 46.6 | 57.2 | 46.1 | 43.1 | 56.9 | 15.6 |  | 60.7 | 24.0 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 14.1 | 21.8 | 0.2 | 16.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 18.7 | 0.4 |  | 27.7 | 1.9 |  |
| Delay (s) | 72.5 | 74.4 | 46.8 | 73.9 | 46.3 | 43.1 | 75.6 | 16.0 |  | 88.5 | 25.9 |  |
| Level of Service | E | E | D | E | D | D | E | B |  | F | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 61.7 |  |  | 57.1 |  |  | 28.1 |  |  | 29.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 39.6 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | D |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.72 | Sum of lost time (s) | 16.5 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 130.0 | C |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $70.4 \%$ | ICU Level of Service | C |

Analysis Period (min)
C Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $t$ | $\longleftarrow$ | 4 | $p$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 352 | 30 | 0 | 285 | 0 | 5 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 352 | 30 | 0 | 285 | 0 | 5 |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 391 | 33 | 0 | 317 | 0 | 6 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  | TWLTL |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) | 216 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  | 0.86 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |
| vC , conflicting volume |  |  | 433 |  | 734 | 416 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 416 |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 317 |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol |  |  | 254 |  | 605 | 235 |  |
| tC , single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  | 5.4 |  |  |
| tF (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% |  |  | 100 |  | 100 | 99 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 1124 |  | 592 | 688 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 424 | 317 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 33 | 0 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 688 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.25 | 0.19 | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 30.4\% |  |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  | \% | F |  |  | ${ }^{4}$ | 7 |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 334 | 29 | 22 | 257 | 1 | 42 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 334 | 29 | 22 | 257 | 1 | 42 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 380 | 33 | 25 | 292 | 1 | 48 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 7 |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 16.0 |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Median type |  | TWLTL |  | TWLTL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median storage veh) |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  | 603 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  | 0.86 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 300 |  | 419 |  | 748 | 752 | 402 | 768 | 768 | 300 |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 402 | 402 |  | 350 | 350 |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 345 | 350 |  | 418 | 419 |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 300 |  | 250 |  | 630 | 635 | 231 | 653 | 654 | 300 |
| tC , single (s) | 4.1 |  | 4.1 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 7.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.2 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  | 98 |  | 91 | 100 | 95 | 100 | 100 | 99 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1263 |  | 1142 |  | 539 | 510 | 700 | 503 | 494 | 554 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Volume Total | 0 | 413 | 25 | 293 | 48 | 38 | 3 |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 3 |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1142 | 1700 | 539 | 700 | 554 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.02 | 0.17 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.01 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 12.3 | 10.4 | 11.5 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | A |  | B | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.6 |  | 11.5 |  | 11.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | B | B |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  | 1.5 |  |  |  | A |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  | $36.1 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
4: E. Driveway/7th St NE \& Chemawa Rd NE

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ | \% | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ | $\downarrow$ | $\frac{1}{7}$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | f |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 个 |  |  | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 365 | 2 | 3 | 279 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 365 | 2 | 3 | 279 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 415 | 2 | 3 | 317 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | TWLTL |  |  | TWLTL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  | 915 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  | 0.88 |  |  | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 317 |  |  | 423 |  |  | 746 | 745 | 428 | 747 | 746 | 317 |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 422 | 422 |  | 323 | 323 |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 324 | 323 |  | 424 | 423 |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 317 |  |  | 280 |  |  | 646 | 645 | 286 | 647 | 646 | 317 |
| tC , single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1255 |  |  | 1137 |  |  | 542 | 518 | 662 | 539 | 516 | 728 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 0 | 417 | 3 | 317 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1137 | 1700 | 628 | 516 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.01 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | A |  | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.1 |  | 10.8 | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 31.1\% |  | CU Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 96 | 272 | 301 | 131 | 130 | 56 | 140 | 550 | 70 | 1153 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.72 | 0.87 | 0.60 | 0.77 | 0.37 | 0.15 | 0.78 | 0.30 | 0.68 | 0.66 |
| Control Delay | 85.2 | 79.0 | 11.1 | 84.1 | 48.6 | 0.8 | 84.1 | 17.0 | 90.3 | 28.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 85.2 | 79.0 | 11.1 | 84.1 | 48.6 | 0.8 | 84.1 | 17.0 | 90.3 | 28.5 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 80 | 222 | 6 | 109 | 95 | 0 | 117 | 127 | 59 | 380 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 136 | \#367 | 91 | 172 | 158 | 0 | 181 | 187 | 109 | 541 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 397 |  |  | 136 |  |  | 122 |  | 318 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 300 |  |  | 200 |  |  | 100 |  | 180 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 257 | 333 | 517 | 262 | 359 | 384 | 267 | 1839 | 134 | 1751 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.37 | 0.82 | 0.58 | 0.50 | 0.36 | 0.15 | 0.52 | 0.30 | 0.52 | 0.66 |

## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 9 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | 个t |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 95 | 166 | 165 | 158 | 223 | 87 | 182 | 1110 | 139 | 117 | 707 | 71 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 95 | 166 | 165 | 158 | 223 | 87 | 182 | 1110 | 139 | 117 | 707 | 71 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 |  | 4.0 | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1787 | 1863 | 1528 | 1805 | 1900 | 1572 | 1770 | 3500 |  | 1805 | 3475 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1787 | 1863 | 1528 | 1805 | 1900 | 1572 | 1770 | 3500 |  | 1805 | 3475 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 98 | 171 | 170 | 163 | 230 | 90 | 188 | 1144 | 143 | 121 | 729 | 73 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 98 | 171 | 19 | 163 | 230 | 13 | 188 | 1281 | 0 | 121 | 798 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/rr) | 8 |  | 17 | 17 |  | 8 | 6 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 6 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 2\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 2\% | 3\% |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | , |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 10.1 | 14.7 | 14.7 | 14.2 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 16.9 | 73.3 |  | 11.3 | 67.7 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 10.1 | 14.7 | 14.7 | 14.2 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 16.9 | 73.3 |  | 11.3 | 67.7 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.56 |  | 0.09 | 0.52 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 |  | 4.0 | 4.5 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |  | 0.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 138 | 210 | 172 | 197 | 274 | 227 | 230 | 1973 |  | 156 | 1809 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.05 | 0.09 |  | c0.09 | c0.12 |  | c0.11 | c0.37 |  | 0.07 | 0.23 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.01 |  |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.71 | 0.81 | 0.11 | 0.83 | 0.84 | 0.06 | 0.82 | 0.65 |  | 0.78 | 0.44 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 58.5 | 56.3 | 51.8 | 56.7 | 54.1 | 48.0 | 55.0 | 19.5 |  | 58.1 | 19.4 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 13.3 | 20.0 | 0.1 | 22.9 | 18.9 | 0.0 | 18.8 | 1.7 |  | 19.4 | 0.8 |  |
| Delay (s) | 71.9 | 76.3 | 51.9 | 79.6 | 73.0 | 48.0 | 73.8 | 21.2 |  | 77.5 | 20.2 |  |
| Level of Service | E | E | D | E | E | D | E | C |  | E | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 65.8 |  |  | 70.6 |  |  | 27.9 |  |  | 27.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 39.1 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | D |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.75 | Sum of lost time (s) | 16.5 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 130.0 | ICU Level of Service | D |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $76.3 \%$ |  |  |

Analysis Period (min)
C Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | 7 | 4 | 4 | 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 345 | 77 | 4 | 465 | 3 | 54 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 345 | 77 | 4 | 465 | 3 | 54 |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 356 | 79 | 4 | 479 | 3 | 56 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | TWLTL |  |  | TWLTL |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) | 216 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  | 0.91 |  | 0.91 | 0.91 |  |
| vC, conflicting volume |  |  | 443 |  | 890 | 404 |  |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 404 |  |  |
| $v C 2$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 487 |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol |  |  | 340 |  | 831 | 297 |  |
| tC, single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  | 5.4 |  |  |
| tF (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% |  |  | 100 |  | 99 | 92 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 1114 |  | 523 | 677 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 435 | 483 | 59 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 4 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 79 | 0 | 56 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1114 | 667 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.09 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 10.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  | A | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 10.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | Err\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | H |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  | 7 | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 383 | 46 | 95 | 337 | 2 | 138 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 383 | 46 | 95 | 337 | 2 | 138 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 403 | 48 | 100 | 355 | 2 | 145 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 16.0 |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Percent Blockage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Median type | TWLTL | TWLTL |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Median storage veh) | 2 | 2 |
| Upstream signal (ft) | 603 |  |


| pX, platoon unblocked |  | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vC , conflicting volume | 360 | 453 | 987 | 989 | 432 | 1016 | 1012 | 362 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  | 429 | 429 |  | 559 | 559 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  | 558 | 560 |  | 457 | 453 |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 360 | 378 | 950 | 952 | 355 | 981 | 977 | 362 |
| tC , single (s) | 4.1 | 4.1 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 | 91 | 65 | 100 | 92 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1206 | 1110 | 409 | 405 | 644 | 359 | 376 | 683 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Volume Total | 0 | 451 | 100 | 357 | 145 | 51 | 0 |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 145 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 48 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 51 | 0 |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1110 | 1700 | 409 | 644 | 1700 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.09 | 0.21 | 0.35 | 0.08 | 0.00 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 39 | 6 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 18.6 | 11.1 | 0.0 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | A |  | C | B | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 1.9 |  | 16.6 |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | C | A |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  | 3.7 |  |  | A |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{F}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |  | * |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 430 | 1 | 4 | 425 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 430 | 1 | 4 | 425 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 453 | 1 | 4 | 447 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | VLTL |  |  | WLTL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  | 915 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  | 0.97 |  |  | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 447 |  |  | 463 |  |  | 918 | 918 | 472 | 932 | 918 | 447 |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 462 | 462 |  | 455 | 455 |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 455 | 455 |  | 476 | 463 |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 447 |  |  | 429 |  |  | 899 | 899 | 438 | 913 | 899 | 447 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 98 | 100 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1124 |  |  | 1097 |  |  | 462 | 457 | 594 | 449 | 455 | 616 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume Total | 0 | 454 | 4 | 447 | 24 | 0 |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1097 | 1700 | 531 | 1700 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.05 | 0.00 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 12.1 | 0.0 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | A |  | B | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.1 |  | 12.1 | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | B | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 35.3\% |  | CU Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |



HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
6: River Road N \& S Driveway

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 6 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 3 | 0 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 1411 | 97 | 6 | 1040 | 14 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 3 | 0 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 1411 | 97 | 6 | 1040 | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 3 | 0 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 1455 | 100 | 6 | 1072 | 14 |
| Pedestrians |  | 7 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | WLTL |  |  | TWLTL |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 315 |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  | 0.86 |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 1864 | 2685 | 552 | 2100 | 2642 | 786 | 1093 |  |  | 1563 |  |  |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol | 1098 | 1098 |  | 1537 | 1537 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol | 766 | 1587 |  | 563 | 1105 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 1682 | 2635 | 160 | 1956 | 2585 | 786 | 788 |  |  | 1563 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 7.0 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.4 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | 6.5 | 5.5 |  | 6.5 | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.4 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 99 | 100 | 98 | 90 | 100 | 96 | 98 |  |  | 98 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 221 | 140 | 738 | 116 | 149 | 323 | 720 |  |  | 351 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | NB 3 | SB 1 | SB 2 | SB 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 16 | 26 | 12 | 970 | 585 | 6 | 715 | 371 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 3 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 13 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 514 | 177 | 720 | 1700 | 1700 | 351 | 1700 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.03 | 0.15 | 0.02 | 0.57 | 0.34 | 0.02 | 0.42 | 0.22 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 2 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 12.2 | 28.7 | 10.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | D | B |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 12.2 | 28.7 | 0.1 |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 52.8\% |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 98 | 171 | 170 | 163 | 230 | 90 | 188 | 1287 | 121 | 802 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.71 | 0.81 | 0.53 | 0.83 | 0.84 | 0.28 | 0.82 | 0.65 | 0.78 | 0.44 |
| Control Delay | 84.6 | 83.9 | 13.3 | 87.4 | 78.5 | 6.5 | 81.0 | 23.3 | 88.4 | 22.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 84.6 | 83.9 | 13.3 | 87.4 | 78.5 | 6.5 | 81.0 | 23.3 | 88.4 | 22.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 82 | 143 | 0 | 136 | 190 | 0 | 156 | 381 | 101 | 214 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 139 | 215 | 65 | 210 | 273 | 30 | 228 | 565 | 165 | 340 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 397 |  |  | 136 |  |  | 122 |  | 318 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 300 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 50 |  | 180 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 213 | 286 | 378 | 256 | 338 | 372 | 408 | 1980 | 208 | 1813 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.46 | 0.60 | 0.45 | 0.64 | 0.68 | 0.24 | 0.46 | 0.65 | 0.58 | 0.44 |

Intersection Summary


|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $t$ | $\longleftarrow$ | 4 | $p$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 370 | 30 | 0 | 307 | 0 | 5 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 370 | 30 | 0 | 307 | 0 | 5 |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 411 | 33 | 0 | 341 | 0 | 6 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  | TWLTL |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) | 216 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  | 0.85 |  | 0.85 | 0.85 |  |
| vC , conflicting volume |  |  | 453 |  | 778 | 436 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 436 |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 341 |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol |  |  | 267 |  | 649 | 247 |  |
| tC , single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  | 5.4 |  |  |
| tF (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% |  |  | 100 |  | 100 | 99 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 1103 |  | 573 | 671 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 444 | 341 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 33 | 0 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 671 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.26 | 0.20 | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 31.4\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  | 7 | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 349 | 29 | 22 | 277 | 1 | 42 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 349 | 29 | 22 | 277 | 1 | 42 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 397 | 33 | 25 | 315 | 1 | 48 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 7 |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 16.0 |  |
| Walking Speed (tt/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Median type |  | TWLTL | TWLTL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median storage veh) |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  | 603 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 323 |  | 436 | 788 | 792 | 420 | 808 | 808 | 322 |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  | 420 | 420 |  | 372 | 372 |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  | 368 | 373 |  | 435 | 436 |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 323 |  | 258 | 668 | 674 | 238 | 691 | 693 | 322 |
| tC , single (s) | 4.1 |  | 4.1 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 7.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  | 2.2 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.2 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  | 98 | 91 | 100 | 94 | 100 | 100 | 99 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 12 |  | 1124 | 521 | 496 | 86 | 6 | 80 | 535 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Volume Total | 0 | 430 | 25 | 316 | 48 | 38 | 3 |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 3 |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1124 | 1700 | 521 | 686 | 535 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.02 | 0.19 | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.01 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 12.6 | 10.6 | 11.8 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | A |  | B | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.6 |  | 11.7 |  | 11.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | B | B |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1.5 |  |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  | $36.8 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
4: E. Driveway/7th St NE \& Chemawa Rd NE

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\dagger$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | ( | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | f |  | ${ }^{7}$ | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 380 | 2 | 3 | 299 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 380 | 2 | 3 | 299 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 432 | 2 | 3 | 340 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | TWLTL |  |  | TWLTL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  | 915 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  | 0.87 |  |  | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |  |
| vC, conflicting volume | 340 |  |  | 440 |  |  | 786 | 785 | 445 | 787 | 786 | 340 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 439 | 439 |  | 346 | 346 |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 346 | 346 |  | 441 | 440 |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 340 |  |  | 287 |  |  | 683 | 682 | 293 | 684 | 683 | 340 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1230 |  |  | 1119 |  |  | 525 | 504 | 650 | 522 | 502 | 707 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume Total | 0 | 434 | 3 | 340 | 4 | 1 |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1119 | 1700 | 614 | 502 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.01 | 0.00 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 10.9 | 12.2 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | A |  | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.1 |  | 10.9 | 12.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | B | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 31.9\% |  | CU Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |



HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
6: River Road N \& S. Driveway

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | 7 | $\longleftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 性 |  | \% | 虾 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 16 | 1 | 47 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 632 | 22 | 2 | 1368 | 62 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 16 | 1 | 47 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 632 | 22 | 2 | 1368 | 62 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 19 | 1 | 56 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 752 | 26 | 2 | 1629 | 74 |
| Pedestrians |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Percent Blockage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | WLTL |  |  | TWLTL |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 315 |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 |  | 0.73 |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 2095 | 2497 | 852 | 1688 | 2521 | 392 | 1704 |  |  | 780 |  |  |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol | 1671 | 1671 |  | 813 | 813 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol | 424 | 826 |  | 875 | 1708 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 1763 | 2313 | 65 | 1207 | 2345 | 392 | 1229 |  |  | 780 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | 6.5 | 5.5 |  | 6.5 | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 87 | 99 | 92 | 96 | 100 | 100 | 95 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 141 | 166 | 725 | 286 | 143 | 611 | 420 |  |  | 845 |  |  |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | NB 3 | SB 1 | SB 2 | SB 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume Total | 76 | 12 | 23 | 501 | 277 | 2 | 1086 | 617 |  |
| Volume Left | 19 | 11 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 56 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 74 |  |
| cSH | 349 | 299 | 420 | 1700 | 1700 | 845 | 1700 | 1700 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.22 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.29 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.64 | 0.36 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 20 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 18.2 | 17.5 | 14.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Lane LOS | C | C | B |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 18.2 | 17.5 | 0.4 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 50.1\% |  | CU Level | Service |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 9 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 99 | 176 | 172 | 166 | 234 | 90 | 189 | 1154 | 148 | 124 | 735 | 74 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 99 | 176 | 172 | 166 | 234 | 90 | 189 | 1154 | 148 | 124 | 735 | 74 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 |  | 4.0 | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1787 | 1863 | 1528 | 1805 | 1900 | 1572 | 1770 | 3499 |  | 1805 | 3475 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1787 | 1863 | 1528 | 1805 | 1900 | 1572 | 1770 | 3499 |  | 1805 | 3475 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 102 | 181 | 177 | 171 | 241 | 93 | 195 | 1190 | 153 | 128 | 758 | 76 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 102 | 181 | 21 | 171 | 241 | 14 | 195 | 1337 | 0 | 128 | 830 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/rr) | 8 |  | 17 | 17 |  | 8 | 6 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 6 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 2\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 2\% | 3\% |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | , |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 10.4 | 15.2 | 15.2 | 14.7 | 19.5 | 19.5 | 17.4 | 72.0 |  | 11.6 | 66.2 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 10.4 | 15.2 | 15.2 | 14.7 | 19.5 | 19.5 | 17.4 | 72.0 |  | 11.6 | 66.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.55 |  | 0.09 | 0.51 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 |  | 4.0 | 4.5 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |  | 0.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 142 | 217 | 178 | 204 | 285 | 235 | 236 | 1937 |  | 161 | 1769 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.06 | 0.10 |  | c0.09 | c0.13 |  | c0.11 | c0.38 |  | 0.07 | 0.24 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.01 |  |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.72 | 0.83 | 0.12 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.06 | 0.83 | 0.69 |  | 0.80 | 0.47 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 58.4 | 56.2 | 51.4 | 56.5 | 53.8 | 47.4 | 54.8 | 20.9 |  | 58.0 | 20.6 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 13.4 | 22.3 | 0.1 | 23.9 | 19.3 | 0.0 | 19.6 | 2.0 |  | 21.8 | 0.9 |  |
| Delay (s) | 71.8 | 78.5 | 51.5 | 80.4 | 73.1 | 47.4 | 74.4 | 23.0 |  | 79.8 | 21.5 |  |
| Level of Service | E | E | D | F | E | D | E | C |  | E | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 66.6 |  |  | 70.8 |  |  | 29.5 |  |  | 29.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 40.4 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | D |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.78 | Sum of lost time (s) | 16.5 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 130.0 | ICU Level of Service | D |

Analysis Period (min)
C Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | 7 | 4 | 4 | 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 371 | 77 | 4 | 487 | 3 | 54 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 371 | 77 | 4 | 487 | 3 | 54 |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 382 | 79 | 4 | 502 | 3 | 56 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | TWLTL |  |  | TWLTL |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) | 216 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  | 0.91 |  | 0.91 | 0.91 |  |
| vC, conflicting volume |  |  | 469 |  | 940 | 430 |  |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 430 |  |  |
| $v C 2$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 510 |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol |  |  | 362 |  | 881 | 318 |  |
| tC, single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  | 5.4 |  |  |
| tF (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% |  |  | 100 |  | 99 | 91 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 1087 |  | 505 | 654 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 461 | 506 | 59 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 4 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 79 | 0 | 56 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1087 | 645 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.09 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 11.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  | A | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 11.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | Err\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | H |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | f |  | 7 | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | * |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 406 | 46 | 95 | 354 | 2 | 138 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 406 | 46 | 95 | 354 | 2 | 138 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 427 | 48 | 100 | 373 | 2 | 145 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 16.0 |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Percent Blockage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | TWLTL |  |  | TWLTL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  | 603 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  | 0.93 |  |  | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 378 |  |  | 477 |  |  | 1029 | 1031 | 456 | 1058 | 1054 | 380 |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 453 | 453 |  | 577 | 577 |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 576 | 578 |  | 481 | 477 |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 378 |  |  | 395 |  |  | 991 | 994 | 373 | 1023 | 1018 | 380 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 91 |  |  | 63 | 100 | 92 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1188 |  |  | 1086 |  |  | 396 | 394 | 625 | 345 | 364 | 668 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume Total | 0 | 475 | 100 | 375 | 145 | 51 | 0 |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 145 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 48 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 51 | 0 |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1086 | 1700 | 396 | 625 | 1700 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.09 | 0.22 | 0.37 | 0.08 | 0.00 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 41 | 7 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 19.3 | 11.3 | 0.0 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | A |  | C | B | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 1.8 |  | 17.2 |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | C |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 52.9\% |  | CU Level | Service |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  | \% | $\hat{1}$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 453 | 1 | 4 | 442 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 453 | 1 | 4 | 442 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 477 | 1 | 4 | 465 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | VLTL |  |  | WLTL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  | 915 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  | 0.96 |  |  | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 465 |  |  | 487 |  |  | 960 | 960 | 496 | 974 | 960 | 465 |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 486 | 486 |  | 473 | 473 |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 473 | 473 |  | 500 | 487 |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 465 |  |  | 444 |  |  | 936 | 936 | 452 | 951 | 937 | 465 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 98 | 100 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1107 |  |  | 1073 |  |  | 448 | 444 | 578 | 434 | 442 | 602 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume Total | 0 | 478 | 4 | 465 | 24 | 0 |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1073 | 1700 | 515 | 1700 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.05 | 0.00 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 12.3 | 0.0 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | A |  | B | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.1 |  | 12.3 | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | B | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 36.5\% |  | CU Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |



HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
6: River Road N \& S Driveway

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | * | 7 | $\longleftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | * |  | \% | 蚛 |  | * | 个 ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 3 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 1470 | 97 | 6 | 1084 | 15 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 3 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 1470 | 97 | 6 | 1084 | 15 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 3 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 1515 | 100 | 6 | 1118 | 15 |
| Pedestrians |  | 7 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TWLTL |  |  | TWLTL |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 315 |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  | 0.85 |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 1940 | 2792 | 576 | 2184 | 2749 | 816 | 1140 |  |  | 1623 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol | 1144 | 1144 |  | 1597 | 1597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol | 796 | 1647 |  | 587 | 1152 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 1754 | 2755 | 150 | 2041 | 2705 | 816 | 813 |  |  | 1623 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 7.0 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.4 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | 6.5 | 5.5 |  | 6.5 | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.4 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 99 | 100 | 98 | 89 | 100 | 95 | 98 |  |  | 98 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 210 | 130 | 740 | 107 | 139 | 308 | 695 |  |  | 332 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | NB 3 | SB 1 | SB 2 | SB 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 17 | 26 | 12 | 1010 | 605 | 6 | 745 | 388 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 3 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 14 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 512 | 165 | 695 | 1700 | 1700 | 332 | 1700 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.02 | 0.59 | 0.36 | 0.02 | 0.44 | 0.23 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 3 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 12.3 | 30.9 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | D | B |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 12.3 | 30.9 | 0.1 |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 54.4\% |  | CU Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | 个t |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 89 | 265 | 282 | 127 | 131 | 57 | 131 | 438 | 77 | 68 | 1040 | 41 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 89 | 265 | 282 | 127 | 131 | 57 | 131 | 438 | 77 | 68 | 1040 | 41 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1719 | 1845 | 1537 | 1752 | 1845 | 1508 | 1736 | 3271 |  | 1752 | 3481 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1719 | 1845 | 1537 | 1752 | 1845 | 1508 | 1736 | 3271 |  | 1752 | 3481 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 99 | 294 | 313 | 141 | 146 | 63 | 146 | 487 | 86 | 76 | 1156 | 46 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 99 | 294 | 80 | 141 | 146 | 13 | 146 | 563 | 0 | 76 | 1200 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/rr) | 8 |  | 14 | 14 |  | 8 | 2 |  | , | , |  | 2 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | , |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 3\% | 1\% | 3\% | 3\% | 4\% | 4\% | 8\% | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | , |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 10.4 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 13.4 | 26.5 | 26.5 | 13.9 | 69.5 |  | 7.1 | 62.7 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 10.4 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 13.4 | 26.5 | 26.5 | 13.9 | 70.0 |  | 7.1 | 63.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.08 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.10 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.11 | 0.54 |  | 0.05 | 0.49 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 |  | 4.0 | 4.5 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |  | 0.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 137 | 333 | 277 | 180 | 376 | 307 | 185 | 1761 |  | 95 | 1692 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.06 | c0.16 |  | c0.08 | c0.08 |  | c0.08 | 0.17 |  | 0.04 | c0.34 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.05 |  |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.72 | 0.88 | 0.29 | 0.78 | 0.39 | 0.04 | 0.79 | 0.32 |  | 0.80 | 0.71 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 58.4 | 51.9 | 46.0 | 56.9 | 44.7 | 41.6 | 56.6 | 16.7 |  | 60.7 | 26.2 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 14.7 | 22.4 | 0.2 | 18.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 0.5 |  | 34.9 | 2.5 |  |
| Delay (s) | 73.1 | 74.3 | 46.2 | 75.2 | 45.0 | 41.6 | 74.9 | 17.2 |  | 95.7 | 28.7 |  |
| Level of Service | E | E | D | E | D | D | E | B |  | F | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 61.7 |  |  | 56.5 |  |  | 28.9 |  |  | 32.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 41.3 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | D |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.75 | Sum of lost time (s) | 16.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 130.0 | C |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $72.6 \%$ | ICU Level of Service | C |

Analysis Period (min) 15
c Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $p$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | f |  |  | 4 |  | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 370 | 40 | 0 | 315 | 0 | 11 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 370 | 40 | 0 | 315 | 0 | 11 |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 411 | 44 | 0 | 350 | 0 | 12 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  | TWLTL |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) | 216 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  | 0.84 |  | 0.84 | 0.84 |  |
| vC , conflicting volume |  |  | 464 |  | 792 | 442 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 442 |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 350 |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol |  |  | 274 |  | 662 | 247 |  |
| tC, single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  | 5.4 |  |  |
| tF (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% |  |  | 100 |  | 100 | 98 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 1091 |  | 567 | 667 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 455 | 350 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 44 | 0 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 667 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.27 | 0.21 | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 32.0\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  | 7 | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 353 | 31 | 28 | 275 | 1 | 52 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 353 | 31 | 28 | 275 | 1 | 52 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 401 | 35 | 32 | 313 | 1 | 59 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 7 |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 16.0 |  |
| Walking Speed (tt/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Median type | TWLTL | TWLTL |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Median storage veh) | 2 | 2 |
| Upstream signal (ft) | 603 |  |


| pX, platoon unblocked |  | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| vC, conflicting volume | 321 | 442 | 804 | 810 | 424 | 828 | 826 | 320 |
| vC1, stige 1 conf vol |  |  | 424 | 424 |  | 384 | 384 |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  | 321 | 380 | 385 |  | 443 | 442 |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 4.1 | 4.1 | 686 | 692 | 241 | 713 | 712 | 320 |
| tC, single (s) |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 7.2 |  |
| tC, 2 stage $(s)$ | 2.2 | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.2 |  |
| p0 queue free $\%$ | 100 | 87 | 100 | 94 | 100 | 100 | 99 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1241 | 1117 | 512 | 488 | 682 | 472 | 470 | 537 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume Total | 0 | 436 | 32 | 314 | 59 | 42 | 3 |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 35 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 42 | 3 |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1117 | 1700 | 512 | 682 | 537 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.12 | 0.06 | 0.01 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 12.9 | 10.6 | 11.7 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | A |  | B | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.8 |  | 12.0 |  | 11.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 39.5\% |  |  |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
4: E. Driveway/7th St NE \& Chemawa Rd NE



| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume Total | 0 | 443 | 5 | 344 | 6 | 1 |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1109 | 1700 | 617 | 494 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.01 | 0.00 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 10.9 | 12.3 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | A |  | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.1 |  | 10.9 | 12.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | B | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 32.4\% |  | CU Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |



HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
6: River Road N \& S. Driveway

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | 7 | $\longleftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 性 |  | \% | 虾 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 16 | 1 | 47 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 627 | 31 | 12 | 1360 | 62 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 16 | 1 | 47 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 627 | 31 | 12 | 1360 | 62 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 19 | 1 | 56 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 746 | 37 | 14 | 1619 | 74 |
| Pedestrians |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Percent Blockage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | WLTL |  |  | TWLTL |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 315 |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 |  | 0.73 |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 2106 | 2516 | 848 | 1706 | 2534 | 394 | 1694 |  |  | 785 |  |  |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol | 1685 | 1685 |  | 812 | 812 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol | 421 | 831 |  | 894 | 1722 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 1773 | 2336 | 46 | 1225 | 2361 | 394 | 1208 |  |  | 785 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | 6.5 | 5.5 |  | 6.5 | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 86 | 99 | 92 | 92 | 100 | 100 | 95 |  |  | 98 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 137 | 161 | 743 | 283 | 139 | 609 | 426 |  |  | 841 |  |  |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | NB 3 | SB 1 | SB 2 | SB 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume Total | 76 | 24 | 23 | 497 | 286 | 14 | 1079 | 614 |  |
| Volume Left | 19 | 23 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 56 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 74 |  |
| cSH | 344 | 290 | 426 | 1700 | 1700 | 841 | 1700 | 1700 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.22 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.29 | 0.17 | 0.02 | 0.63 | 0.36 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 21 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 18.4 | 18.5 | 13.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Lane LOS | C | C | B |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 18.4 | 18.5 | 0.4 |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 49.9\% |  | Leve | Service |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 99 | 294 | 313 | 141 | 146 | 63 | 146 | 573 | 76 | 1202 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.72 | 0.88 | 0.61 | 0.78 | 0.39 | 0.16 | 0.79 | 0.32 | 0.72 | 0.71 |
| Control Delay | 85.1 | 78.6 | 13.2 | 83.8 | 47.8 | 1.4 | 83.9 | 17.9 | 93.5 | 31.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 85.1 | 78.6 | 13.2 | 83.8 | 47.8 | 1.4 | 83.9 | 17.9 | 93.5 | 31.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 83 | 237 | 20 | 118 | 104 | 0 | 122 | 142 | 64 | 426 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 139 | \#421 | 115 | 183 | 175 | 4 | 188 | 194 | \#118 | 576 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 397 |  |  | 136 |  |  | 122 |  | 318 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 300 |  |  | 200 |  |  | 100 |  | 180 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 257 | 341 | 515 | 262 | 377 | 398 | 267 | 1789 | 134 | 1693 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.39 | 0.86 | 0.61 | 0.54 | 0.39 | 0.16 | 0.55 | 0.32 | 0.57 | 0.71 |

## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 9 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 99 | 182 | 172 | 166 | 242 | 94 | 190 | 1157 | 148 | 128 | 735 | 74 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 99 | 182 | 172 | 166 | 242 | 94 | 190 | 1157 | 148 | 128 | 735 | 74 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 |  | 4.0 | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1787 | 1863 | 1528 | 1805 | 1900 | 1572 | 1770 | 3499 |  | 1805 | 3475 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1787 | 1863 | 1528 | 1805 | 1900 | 1572 | 1770 | 3499 |  | 1805 | 3475 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 102 | 188 | 177 | 171 | 249 | 97 | 196 | 1193 | 153 | 132 | 758 | 76 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 102 | 188 | 21 | 171 | 249 | 15 | 196 | 1340 | 0 | 132 | 830 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 8 |  | 17 | 17 |  | 8 | 6 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 6 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 2\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 2\% | 3\% |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | , |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 10.4 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 14.7 | 19.9 | 19.9 | 17.5 | 71.3 |  | 11.9 | 65.7 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 10.4 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 14.7 | 19.9 | 19.9 | 17.5 | 71.3 |  | 11.9 | 65.7 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.55 |  | 0.09 | 0.51 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 |  | 4.0 | 4.5 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |  | 0.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 142 | 223 | 183 | 204 | 290 | 240 | 238 | 1919 |  | 165 | 1756 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.06 | 0.10 |  | c0.09 | c0.13 |  | c0.11 | c0.38 |  | 0.07 | 0.24 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.01 |  |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.72 | 0.84 | 0.12 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.06 | 0.82 | 0.70 |  | 0.80 | 0.47 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 58.4 | 56.0 | 51.0 | 56.5 | 53.7 | 47.1 | 54.7 | 21.5 |  | 57.9 | 20.9 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 13.4 | 23.2 | 0.1 | 23.9 | 20.8 | 0.0 | 19.2 | 2.1 |  | 22.4 | 0.9 |  |
| Delay (s) | 71.8 | 79.2 | 51.2 | 80.4 | 74.4 | 47.1 | 74.0 | 23.6 |  | 80.3 | 21.8 |  |
| Level of Service | E | E | D | F | E | D | E | C |  | F | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 67.0 |  |  | 71.3 |  |  | 30.0 |  |  | 29.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 41.0 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | D |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.79 | Sum of lost time (s) | 16.5 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 130.0 | ICU Level of Service | D |

Analysis Period (min)
c Critical Lane Group

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | f |  |  | 4 |  | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 369 | 89 | 0 | 502 | 0 | 62 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 369 | 89 | 0 | 502 | 0 | 62 |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 380 | 92 | 0 | 518 | 0 | 64 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | TVLTL |  |  | TWLTL |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) | 216 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  | 0.90 |  | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| vC , conflicting volume |  |  | 472 |  | 944 | 426 |  |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 426 |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 518 |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol |  |  | 360 |  | 884 | 309 |  |
| tC, single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  | 5.4 |  |  |
| tF (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% |  |  | 100 |  | 100 | 90 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 1091 |  | 506 | 663 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 472 | 518 | 64 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 92 | 0 | 64 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 663 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.28 | 0.30 | 0.10 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 35.3\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  | \% | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | * |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 410 | 48 | 108 | 348 | 2 | 155 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 410 | 48 | 108 | 348 | 2 | 155 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 432 | 51 | 114 | 366 | 2 | 163 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 16.0 |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Percent Blockage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | TWLTL |  |  | TWLTL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  | 603 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  | 0.93 |  |  | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |  |
| vC, conflicting volume | 371 |  |  | 485 |  |  | 1056 | 1058 | 462 | 1088 | 1083 | 373 |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 460 | 460 |  | 598 | 598 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 597 | 599 |  | 490 | 485 |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 371 |  |  | 403 |  |  | 1021 | 1023 | 378 | 1055 | 1049 | 373 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 89 |  |  | 57 | 100 | 91 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1195 |  |  | 1078 |  |  | 382 | 381 | 620 | 327 | 349 | 674 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume Total | 0 | 483 | 114 | 368 | 163 | 55 | 0 |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 163 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 51 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 55 | 0 |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1078 | 1700 | 382 | 620 | 1700 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.11 | 0.22 | 0.43 | 0.09 | 0.00 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 52 | 7 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 21.3 | 11.4 | 0.0 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | A |  | C | B | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 2.1 |  | 18.8 |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | C |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 55.7\% |  | CU Level | Service |  | B |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\stackrel{1}{ }$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 461 | 1 | 4 | 449 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 461 | 1 | 4 | 449 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 485 | 1 | 4 | 473 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | NLTL |  |  | WLTL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  | 915 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  | 0.96 |  |  | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |  |
| vC, conflicting volume | 473 |  |  | 495 |  |  | 976 | 976 | 504 | 990 | 976 | 473 |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 494 | 494 |  | 481 | 481 |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 481 | 481 |  | 510 | 495 |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 473 |  |  | 455 |  |  | 954 | 954 | 463 | 970 | 955 | 473 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 98 | 100 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1099 |  |  | 1066 |  |  | 442 | 439 | 571 | 427 | 437 | 595 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume Total | 0 | 486 | 4 | 473 | 25 | 0 |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1066 | 1700 | 511 | 1700 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.05 | 0.00 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 12.4 | 0.0 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | A |  | B | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.1 |  | 12.4 | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | B | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 36.9\% |  | CU Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |




|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 102 | 188 | 177 | 171 | 249 | 97 | 196 | 1346 | 132 | 834 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.72 | 0.85 | 0.52 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.29 | 0.83 | 0.70 | 0.80 | 0.47 |
| Control Delay | 84.3 | 86.2 | 12.8 | 88.4 | 79.8 | 7.8 | 80.7 | 25.7 | 90.1 | 24.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 84.3 | 86.2 | 12.8 | 88.4 | 79.8 | 7.8 | 80.7 | 25.7 | 90.1 | 24.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 85 | 157 | 0 | 143 | 205 | 0 | 163 | 430 | 110 | 235 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 142 | 234 | 66 | 219 | \#311 | 37 | 235 | 606 | 178 | 360 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 397 |  |  | 136 |  |  | 122 |  | 318 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 300 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 50 |  | 180 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 213 | 286 | 384 | 256 | 340 | 374 | 408 | 1927 | 208 | 1761 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.48 | 0.66 | 0.46 | 0.67 | 0.73 | 0.26 | 0.48 | 0.70 | 0.63 | 0.47 |

Intersection Summary
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
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| LOCATION: Safeway West Dwy -- Chemawa Rd CITY/STATE: Keizer, OR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | QC JOB \#: 14224706 <br> DATE: Wed, Feb 152017 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{P G} \end{array}$ | Peak-H <br> eak 15 | ur | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \mid \\ & : 15 \end{aligned}$ | M -- 5 M -- | 40 PM :30 P <br> oun <br> on <br> SERV |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5-Min Count <br> Period Beginning At | Left | afeway <br> (North <br> Thru | West D hbound) Right | U | Left | feway (Sout Thru | West D bound) Right | U | Left | Chem (East <br> Thru | wa Rd ound) Right | U | Left | Chem <br> Thru | wa Rd ound) <br> Right | Total | Hourly |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |  |
| 4:05 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  |
| 4:10 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 |  |
| 4:20 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 |  |
| 4:25 PM | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |  |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |  |
| 4:35 PM | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |  |
| 4:40 PM | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |  |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  |
| 4:50 PM | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |  |
| 4:55 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 105 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 99 |
| $5: 05 \mathrm{PM}$ 5.10 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 106 |
| 5:10 PM | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 112 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 119 |
| 5:20 PM | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 125 |
| 5:25 PM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 130 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 135 |
| 5:35 PM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 138 |
| 5:40 PM | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 135 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 142 |
| 5:50 PM | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 153 |
| 5:55 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 154 |
| Peak 15-Min | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Total |  |
| Flowrates | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 4 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 180 |  |
| Heavy Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Pedestrians Bicycles Railroad Stopped Buses | 0 | 0 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Comments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





## Attachment C Crash Data

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

CRASH SUMMARIES BY YEAR BY COLLISION TYPE
N Chemawa Rd \& N River Rd
January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014

| COLLISION TYPE | FATAL CRASHES | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NON- } \\ \text { FATAL } \\ \text { CRASHES } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY | TOTAL CRASHES | PEOPLE <br> KILLED | PEOPLE INJURED | TRUCKS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DRY } \\ \text { SURF } \end{gathered}$ | WET SURF | DAY | DARK | INTERSECTION | INTERSECTION RELATED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF- } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR: 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAR-END | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| TURNING MOVEMENTS | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2014 TOTAL | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAR-END | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAR-END | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| TURNING MOVEMENTS | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 2012 TOTAL | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAR-END | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| TURNING MOVEMENTS | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 TOTAL | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PEDESTRIAN | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| REAR-END | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| SIDESWIPE - OVERTAKING | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2010 TOTAL | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| FINAL TOTAL | 0 | 13 | 11 | 24 | 0 | 22 | 1 | 20 | 4 | 22 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 0 |

Disclaimer: A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file. Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics. transportation data section - CRASH analysis and reporting unit
IRBAN NON-SYSTEM CRASH LISTIN

N Chemawa Rd \& N River Rd
January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014

## CITY OF KEIZER, MARION COUNTY




| 03227 | N N N |  |  | 09/25 |  | 14 |  | HEMAWA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CITY |  |  |  | Tue | 1P | 0 |  | IVER RD $N$ |
| No |  | 59 | 48.89 | -123 | 13 |  |  | 1 |

## CITY OF Keizer, marion county


IRBAN NON-SYSTEM CRASH LISTIN

N Chemawa Rd \& N River Rd

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF tRANSPORTATION - TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT DIVISION transportation data section - CRASH analysis and reporting unit
er 31, 2014
 $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { No } & 44 & 59 & 48.89 & \text { Mon } & \text { 5P } & 0 & 0 & \text { RIVER RD N }\end{array}$

| Sta |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TRLR QTY OWNER | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MOVE } \\ & \text { FROM } \end{aligned}$ |
| V\# | VEH TYPE | то |
| 01 | none | Strght |
|  | PRVTE | , |
|  | PSNGR CAR |  |
|  | none | STO |
|  | PRVTE | N |
|  | PSNGR CAR |  |


| 01 | NONE | STRGH |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PRVTE | STRG |  |
| PSNGR CAR |  | S |

01 DRVR NONE 71 F OR-Y
OR- 25
 PRVTE
PSNGR CAR

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | PRTC | InJ | A |


 PSNGR CAR ${ }^{\text {N }}$

01 DRVR INJC 72 F OR-Y OR<25
$03 \begin{array}{lll}\text { NONE } & 0 & \text { TURN-L } \\ \text { PRVTE } & \text { E } & \text { S }\end{array}$
PSNGR CAR transportation data section - crash analysis and reporting unit

$$
\mathrm{N} \text { Chemawa } \operatorname{Rd} \& \mathrm{~N} \text { River R }
$$

January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014


CITY OF KEIZER, MARION COUNTY


| 02863 | N N N N N | $08 / 26 / 2012$ | 14 | CHEMAWA RD N |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CITY |  |  | Sun | 7 P | 0 | RIVER RD N |
| No | 44 | 59 | 48.89 | -123 | 1 | 35.92 |


| 02386 | N N N | 07/18/2014 | 14 | CHEMAWA RD N |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NONE |  |  | Fri | 1P | 0 | RIVER RD N |
| No | 44 | 59 | 48.89 | -123 | 1 | 35.92 |


| 04101 | N N N | 12/02/2011 | 16 | CHEMAWA RD N |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| NONE |  |  | Fri | 3P | 0 | RIVER RD N |
| No | 44 | 59 | 48.91 | -123 | 1 | 35.92 |



No $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} & 44 & 59 & 48.89 & \text { Tue } & \text { 2P } & & & & \text { RIVER RD N }\end{array}$ (

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF tRANSPORTATION - TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT DIVISION transportation data section - CRASH analysis and reporting unit

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { TEM CRASH LISTI } \\
& \text { Rd \& N River Rd }
\end{aligned}
$$

RBAN NON-SYSTEM CRASH LISTIN

N Chemawa Rd \& N River Rd
January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014

CITY OF KEIZER, MARION COUNTY


| 01324 | N N N N N | $04 / 25 / 2011$ | 14 | CHEMAWA RD N |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CITY |  |  | Mon | 7 AA | 0 | RIVER RD N |  |
| No | 44 | 59 | 48.91 | -123 | 1 | 35.92 | 1 |


| 02807 | N N N | 08/1 | /2014 |  | 4 |  | CHEMAWA RD N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NONE |  | Tue | 5P |  | 0 |  | RIVER RD N |
| No | 4459 | -12 |  |  |  |  | 1 |


| 03012 | N N N N N | 09/11/2011 | 14 | CHEMAWA RD N |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CITY |  |  | Sun | 9 A | 0 | RIVER RD N |
| No | 44 | 59 | 48.91 | -123 | 1 | 35.92 |


| INTER | CROSS | N | N | CLR | S-1STOP |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| W |  | TRF SIGNAL | N | DRY | REAR |
| 06 | 0 |  | N | DLIT | INJ |

$\begin{array}{llll}01 & \text { NONE } & 0 & \text { STRGHT } \\ \text { PRVTE } & \text { W } & \text { E } \\ \text { PSNGR CAR } & & \end{array}$
02 PSNG NO<5 02 M
03 PSNG INJC 16 F

01 DRVR NONE 00 M UNK
OR<25
026
000


01 DRVR INJC 44 F OR-Y
$000 \quad$
02 PSNG INJC $06 \mathrm{M}^{\text {OR<2 }}$
$\begin{array}{lcllllllll}\text { INTER } & \text { CROSS } & \text { N } & \text { N } & \text { CLD } & \text { O-1 } & \text { L-TURN } & 01 & \text { NONE } & 0 \\ \text { STRGHT } \\ \text { CN } & & \text { TRF SIGNAL } & \text { N } & \text { WET } & \text { TURN } & \text { PRVTE } & \text { S } & \text { N } \\ 02 & 0 & & & \text { N } & \text { DAY } & \text { INJ } & \text { PSNGR CAR } & & \end{array}$
01 DRVR INJB 78 M OR-Y
OR-Y
R $<25$
020
0
000
000
000
013 PSNGR CAR
$02 \begin{array}{lll}02 & \text { NONE } & 0 \\ \text { PRVTE } & \text { TURN-L } \\ & & \text { N }\end{array}$ PSNGR CAR ${ }^{\text {N }}$

01 DRVR INJC 40 F OR-Y
000
00001
000
00
 $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { PSNGR CAR } 01 & \text { DRVR INJC } & 32 & \mathrm{M} \text { OR-Y } & 000 & 000\end{array}$

000

|  | NONE | 0 | TURN-R |  | 02 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PRVTE |  | w S | 000 | 00 |

PRVTE
PSNGR CAR
01 DRVR NONE 28 F OR-Y
028
000
000

02 | 02 | NONE | 0 | STRGHT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PRVTE |  | N | S | PSNGR CAR

$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Inter } & \text { CROSS } & \text { N } & \text { N } & \text { CLR } & \text { S-1turn } \\ \text { CN } & & \text { TRF SIGNAL } & \text { N } & \text { DRY } & \text { TURN }\end{array}$
$01 \begin{array}{lll}01 & \text { NONE } & 0 \\ \text { PRVTE } & \text { STRGHT } \\ \text { PSNGR } & \text { SAR } & \end{array}$
01 DRVR NONE 48 M OR-Y 00000
00
OR<25
000
00 PSNGR CAR

01 DRVR NONE 28 M OR-Y
031,034,044 03
\(02 \underset{\substack{NONE <br>

PRVTE}}{ } 0\)| TURN-R |
| :---: |
|  | $\stackrel{\text { PRVTE }}{\text { PSNGR CAR }}$

01 DRVR NONE 60 M OR-Y
000
000


## CITY OF KEIZER, MARION COUNTY



CRASH SUMMARIES BY YEAR BY COLLISION TYPE
N Chemawa Rd from N River Rd to 7th Ave
January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014

| COLLISION TYPE | FATAL CRASHES | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NON- } \\ \text { FATAL } \\ \text { CRASHES } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY | TOTAL CRASHES | PEOPLE <br> KILLED | PEOPLE <br> INJURED | TRUCKS | DRY SURF | WET SURF | DAY | DARK | INTERSECTION | INTERSECTION RELATED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF- } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR: 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TURNING MOVEMENTS | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2014 TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAR-END | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| TURNING MOVEMENTS | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 2013 TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| YEAR: 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAR-END | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TURNING MOVEMENTS | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2012 TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAR-END | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAR-END | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| SIDESWIPE - OVERTAKING | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TURNING MOVEMENTS | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 2010 TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| FINAL TOTAL | 0 | 5 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |

Disclaimer: A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file.
Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics.

CITY Of Keizer, marion county

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | P |  | R | S W |  |  | CIty street |
| SER\# | E | A | U | C 0 | DATE |  | FIRST STREET |
| Invest | E | L | G | H R | DAY/TIME | FC | SECOND STREET |
| UNLOC? | D | C | S | L K | LAT/LONG | DISTNC | INTERSECTION |
| 00355 | N N N |  |  |  | 02/05/2013 16 |  | CHEMAWA RD ${ }^{\text {N }}$RIVER RD |
| none |  |  |  |  | Tue 3P | P 20 |  |
| No | 44 | 5948.88 |  |  | -123 135.00 |  | 1 |
| 01969 | N N N |  |  |  | 06/20/2011 | 16 | CHEMAWA RD N |
| NONE |  |  |  |  | Mon 1P | 60 | RIVER RD N |
| No | 44 | 59 | 9 | 48.88 | -123 135.08 |  | 1 |
| 02948 | N N N |  |  |  | 09/05/2010 | 16 | CHEMAWA RD N |
| NO RPT |  |  |  |  | Sun 4P | 150 | RIVER RD N |
| No | 44 | 59 | 9 | 48.84 | $\begin{array}{lll}-123 & 1 & 28.67\end{array}$ |  | 1 |
| 00561 | N N N |  |  |  | 02/18/2014 | 416 | CHEMAWA RD N |
| NONE |  |  |  |  | Tue 7A | 158 | RIVER RD N |
| No | 44 | 59 | 9 | 48.87 | $\begin{array}{llll}-123 & 1 & 33.29\end{array}$ |  | 1 |
| 02386 | N | N |  |  | 07/22/2010 | 16 | Chemawa RD N |
| NONE |  |  |  |  | Thu 1P | 100 | RIVER RD N |
| No | 44 | 59 | 9 | 48.88 | -123 13 | 34.50 | 1 |
| 04620 | N | N | N | N N | 12/23/2013 | 316 | Chemawa Rd n |
| CITY |  |  |  |  | Mon 1P | 530 | RIVER RD N |



CITY OF KEIZER, MARION COUNTY


| 03736 | N N N |  | $11 / 05 / 2012$ | 16 | CHEMAWA RD N |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CITY |  |  | Mon | 12 P | 114 | WITTENBURG LN |
| No | 44 | 59 | 48.84 | -123 | 1 | 29.03 |



| 03609 | N N N N N | $10 / 22 / 2012$ | 16 | CHEMAWA RD N |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CITY |  |  |  | Mon | 3P | 128 | WITTENBURG LN |
| No | 44 | 59 | 48.84 | -123 | 1 | 128.83 | 1 |


| 01520 | N N N N N | $05 / 03 / 2014$ | 16 | CHEMAWA RD N |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CITY |  |  |  | Sat | 9P | 140 | WITTENBURG LN |
| No | 44 | 59 | 48.84 | -123 | 1 | 28.70 | 1 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { N Chemawa Rd from N River Rd to 7th Ave } \\
& \text { Tanuary 1, } 2010 \text { through December 31, } 2014
\end{aligned}
$$

CITY OF Keizer, marion county

| S D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | P |  | R | S W |  |  |  | City street |
| SER\# | E | A | U | C 0 | DATE |  |  | FIRST STREET SECOND STREET |
| INVEST | E | L | G | H R | DAY/TI |  | FC |  |
| UNLOC? | D | C | S | L K | LAT/LONG DISTNC |  |  | INTERSECTION |
| 01853 | N N N |  |  |  | 06/07/2013 |  | 16 | CHEMAWA RD N WITTENBURG LN 1 |
| none |  |  |  |  | Fri | 4 P | 148 |  |
| No | 44 | 59 | 59 | 48.84 | -123 128.54 |  |  |  |
| 00313 | N | N |  |  | 01/28/ | 2013 | 16 | CHEMAWA RD N |
| NONE |  |  |  |  | Mon | 4 P | 106 | WIttenburg ln |
| No | 44 | 59 | 59 | 48.87 | -123 | 132 | 32.57 | 1 |
| 01551 | N | N |  |  | 05/19/ | 2010 | 16 | CHEMAWA RD N |
| none |  |  |  |  | Wed | 3 P | 0 | WIttenburg ln | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { No } & 44 & 59 & 48.85 & -123 & 1 & 30.77 & 1\end{array}$ TRANSPORTATION DATA SECTION - CRASH ANALYSIS AND REPORTING UNIT

January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014

$$
\text { January 1, } 2010 \text { through December 31, } 2014
$$

INT-T
(MEDI
IEGS

 $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { P\# TYPE } & \text { SVRTY } & \text { E } & \text { X } & \text { LICNS } & \text { PED } \\ \text { LOC }\end{array}$ ${ }^{02}$

01 DRVR NONE 00 M OR-Y OR-Y

028
28
018
000 $\begin{array}{lll} \\ \text { PRVTE } & 0 & \text { TURN- } \\ \text { MTRCYCIE } & \text { S } & \end{array}$
$02 \begin{array}{lll}\text { NONE } \\ \text { PRVTE } \\ \text { PSNGR } & 0 & \text { TURN-L } \\ \text { E } & & \text { S }\end{array}$
PSNGR CAR 01 DRVR NONE 39 F OR-Y
000
019
000
00
01 DRVR NONE 39 F OR-Y $000 \quad 000$
018
02
01 NONE 0 TURN-L PSNGR CAR

01 DRVR NONE 42 F OR-Y
028
018
000
02

CN $\quad$-LEG $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { STOP SIGN }\end{aligned}$
STOP SIGN

02 NONE 0 STRGHT
PRVTE W E PSNGR CAR

01 DRVR NONE 37 F OR-Y
000
000

00 OR<25 | NONE | 0 | StRGHT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PRVTE | E | W | PSNGR CAR

2 NONE 0 TURN-I PSNGR CAR

N River Rd from N Chemawa Rd to N Churchdale Ave / NE James St
January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014

| COLLISION TYPE | FATAL CRASHES | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NON- } \\ \text { FATAL } \\ \text { CRASHES } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY | TOTAL CRASHES | PEOPLE KILLED | PEOPLE INJURED | TRUCKS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DRY } \\ \text { SURF } \end{gathered}$ | WET <br> SURF | DAY | DARK | INTERSECTION | INTERSECTION RELATED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF- } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR: 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAR-END | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| SIDESWIPE - OVERTAKING | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TURNING MOVEMENTS | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2014 TOTAL | 0 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ANGLE | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| REAR-END | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 2013 TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAR-END | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| TURNING MOVEMENTS | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2012 TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAR-END | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 2011 TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| YEAR: 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ANGLE | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| REAR-END | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 2010 TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| FINAL TOTAL | 0 | 8 | 16 | 24 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 13 | 10 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 |

Disclaimer: A higher number of crashes may be reported as of 2011 compared to prior years. This does not reflect an increase in annual crashes. The higher numbers result from a change to an internal departmental process that allows the Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit to add previously unavailable, non-fatal crash reports to the annual data file. Please be aware of this change when comparing pre-2011 crash statistics.

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT DIVISION TRANSPORTATION DATA SECTION - CRASH ANALYSIS AND REPORTING UNIT

N River Rd from N Chemawa Rd to N Churchdale Ave / NE James St January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014


CITY Of Keizer, marion county


| 04428 | N N N N N | 12/11/2014 | 14 | RIVER RD N |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CITY |  |  |  | Thu | 10A | 163 | CHEMAWA RD N |
| No | 44 | 59 | 47.01 | -123 | 1 | 35.92 | 1 |


| 01841 | N N N N N | $06 / 14 / 2010$ | 14 | RIVER RD N |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CITY |  |  |  | Mon | 12 P | 200 | CHEMAWA RD N |
| No | 44 | 59 | 46.90 | -123 | 1 | 35.90 | 1 |


| 01882 | N N N N N | $06 / 08 / 2014$ | 14 | RIVER RD N |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CITY |  |  | Sun | 1 P | 200 | CHEMAWA RD N |  |
| No | 44 | 59 | 46.55 | -123 | 1 | 35.92 | 1 |

STRGHT
S
SRG
S
07

| ALLEY |  | N | N | CLD | ANGL-OTH |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S | (NONE) | UNKNOWN | N | WET | TURN |
| 07 | (04) |  | N | DAY | INJ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

N CLR S-1stop
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { N } & \text { DRY } & \text { REA } \\ \text { N } & \text { DAY } & \text { PDO }\end{array}$
(04)
$\begin{array}{llll}01 & \text { NONE } & 0 & \text { STRGHT } \\ \text { PRVTE } & \text { N } & \text { S } \\ \text { PSNGR CAR } & & \end{array}$ PSNGR CAR

| 02 | NONE | 0 | STOP |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PRVTE | N | S |  |
| PSNGR CAR |  |  |  |

01 DRVR NONE 35 F UNK
026
000
000

01 DRVR NONE 00 F
00
0
000

01 NONE 0 TURN-L


018
000
PSNGR CAR

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| NONE | 0 | STRGHI |  |
| PRVTE | N | S |  | PSNGR CAR 01 DRVR NONE 76 F OR-Y $000 \quad 000$

01 NONE 0 STRGHT OR<25
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { PRVTE } & \text { E } \\ \text { PSNGR CAR } \\ \text { P }\end{array}$
01 DRVR NONE 43 M OR-Y
028
018
000

02 | NONE | 0 | STRGHT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | PRVTE |  | S |
|  | PR |  |  | PRVTE

PSNGR CAR

| 01 | NONE | 0 | STRGHT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PRVTE | N | S |  |
| PSNGR CAR |  |  |  |


$\begin{array}{lll}\text { PRVTE } & \text { n } & \text { s }\end{array}$

01 NONE 0 STRGHT PRVTE $N$ S PSNGR CAR 01 DRVR NONE 77 M OR-Y

01 DRVR NONE 77 | M | $\begin{array}{l}\text { OR-Y } \\ \text { OR<25 }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |

000
$+\quad 000$

01 DRVR INJC 33 M OR-Y
02 PSNG INJC 32 F
03 PSNG INJC 08 M
04 PSNG INJC 06 F
05 PSNG INJC 13 F

045
01 DRVR NONE 33 F OR-Y 000 000

000
000

0
000
000
000
000
000

00

00

07
07
00
00
07

00
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| 04412 | N N N | $12 / 15 / 2010$ | 14 | RIVER RD N |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NONE |  | Wed | 6 P | 100 | CHEMAWA RD N |
| No | 44 | 59 | 47.90 | -123 | 1 |
|  |  | 35.91 | 1 |  |  |

$\left.\begin{array}{lllllll}01494 & \text { N N N } & & 05 / 06 / 2014 & 14 & \text { RIVER RD N } \\ \text { NO RPT } & & & \text { Tue } & \text { 3P } & 100 & \text { CHEMAWA RD N } \\ \text { No } & 44 & 59 & 47.58 & -123 & 1 & 35.92\end{array}\right]$

No $\quad \begin{array}{lllllll}44 & 59 & 47.58 & -123 & 1 & 35.92\end{array}$

TRANSPORTATION DATA SECTION - CRASH ANALYSIS AND REPORTING UNI
URBAN NON-SYSTEM CRASH LISTING
N River Rd from N Chemawa Rd to N Churchdale Ave / NE James St
January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014

River Rd from Nom NoN-SYS on Churchdale Ave/ NE James St
January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014

| SER\# INVEST UNLOC? |  | $\begin{array}{rr}  & D \\ & \text { D } \\ \text { A } & U \\ \text { L } & G \\ C & S \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} R & S & W \\ U & C & O \\ G & H & R \\ S & L & K \\ \hline \end{array}$ | DATE <br> DAY/TI <br> LAT/LO |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FC } \\ & \text { DISTNC } \end{aligned}$ | City street <br> FIRST STREET SECOND STREET INTERSECTION SEQ |  | RD CHAR DIRECT LOCTN | $\begin{gathered} \text { INT-TYP } \\ \text { (MEDIAN) } \\ \text { LEGS } \\ \text { (\#LANES) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { INT-REL } & \\ \text { TRAF- } & \text { R } \\ \text { CONTL } & \text { } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF-RD } \mathrm{RD} \\ & \text { RNDBGT } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WTHR } \\ & \text { SURE } \\ & \text { LIGHT } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | CRASH TYP <br> COLL TYP <br> SVRTY | v\# | SPCL USE TRLR QTY OWNER VEH TYPE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MOVE } \\ & \text { FROM } \\ & \text { TO } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | P\# | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PRTC } \\ & \text { TYPE } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INJ } \\ & \text { SVRTY } \end{aligned}$ | A <br>  <br>  <br> E | S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LICNS } \\ & \text { RES } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | PED <br> LOC | ERROR | ACTN | EvENT | CAUSE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NONE 0 } \\ & \text { PRVTE } \\ & \text { PSNGR CAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STOP } \\ & \text { S } \end{aligned}$ | 01 | DRVR | INJA | 17 | F | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OR-Y } \\ & \text { OR<25 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 000 | $\begin{aligned} & 011 \\ & 000 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & 00 \end{aligned}$ |
| $00690$ <br> NONE | N | N N |  | $\begin{aligned} & 03 / 06 / \\ & \text { Wed } \end{aligned}$ | 2013 | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 152 \end{aligned}$ | RIVER RD N CHEMAWA RD N |  | STRGHT | (NONE) | Y UNKNown | N N | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CLD } \\ & \text { WET } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { S-1STOP } \\ & \text { REAR } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{ll} \begin{array}{l} \text { NONE } \\ \text { PRVTE } \end{array} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STRGHT } \\ & \text { S N } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 000 | 013 |  |
| No | 44 | 59 | 47.06 | -123 | 135 |  | 1 |  | 08 | (04) |  | N | DAY | inu |  | pSNGR CAR |  | 01 | DRVR | none | 16 | M | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OR-Y } \\ & \text { OR<25 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 016,026 | 000 |  | 27,07 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NONE 0 } \\ & \text { PRVTE } \\ & \text { PSNGR CAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STOP } \\ & \text { S } \quad \begin{array}{l} \text { N } \end{array} \text { STO } \end{aligned}$ | 01 | DRVR | NONE | 56 | M | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OR-Y } \\ & \text { OR<25 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 000 | $\begin{aligned} & 011 \\ & 000 \end{aligned}$ | 013 | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & 00 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NONE 0 } \\ & \text { PRVTE } \\ & \text { PSNGR CAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STOP } \\ & \text { S } \quad \begin{array}{l} \text { N } \end{array} \text { STO } \end{aligned}$ | 01 | DRVR | INJC | 34 | F | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OR-Y } \\ & \text { OR<25 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 000 | $\begin{aligned} & 011 \\ & 000 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & 00 \end{aligned}$ |
| 02470 | N | N N |  | 07/26/2 | 2012 | 16 | RIVER RD n |  | Alley |  | N | N | CLR | Angl-oth | 01 | none 0 | TURN-R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 02 |
| none |  |  |  | Thu | 5P | 180 | Chemawa rd n |  | s | (NONE) | Stop Sign | N N | DRY | tURN |  | PRVTE | E N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 018 |  | 00 |
| No | 44 | 59 | 46.62 | -123 | 135 |  | 1 |  | 08 | (04) |  | N | DAY | PDO |  | PSNGR CAR |  | 01 | DRVR | none | 72 | F | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OR-Y } \\ & \text { OR<25 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 028 | 000 |  | 02 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NONE } \quad 0 \\ & \text { PRVTE } \\ & \text { PSNGR CAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STRGHT } \\ & \text { S N } \end{aligned}$ | 01 | DRVR | NONE | 00 | M | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UNK } \\ & \text { OR<25 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 000 | $\begin{aligned} & 000 \\ & 000 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & 00 \end{aligned}$ |
| 00937 | N | N N |  | 03/29/2 | 2010 | 14 | RIVER RD N |  | StRGht |  | Y | N | RAIN | S-1stop | 01 | NONE 0 | Strght |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 07 |
| NONE |  |  |  | Mon | 5 P | 200 | Chemaw rd n |  | s | (NONE) | unknown | N | WET | Rear |  | PRVTE | S N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 000 |  | 00 |
| No | 44 | 59 | 46.89 | -123 | 135 |  | 1 |  | 08 | (04) |  | N | DAY | PDO |  | PSNGR CAR |  | 01 | DRVR | none | 00 | M | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OR-Y } \\ & \text { OR }<25 \end{aligned}$ |  | 026 | 000 |  | 07 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NONE 0 } \\ & \text { PRVTE } \\ & \text { PSNGR CAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STOP } \\ & \text { S } \quad \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | 01 | DRVR | NONE | 37 | F | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OR-Y } \\ & \text { OR }<25 \end{aligned}$ |  | 000 | $\begin{aligned} & 011 \\ & 000 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & 00 \end{aligned}$ |
| ${ }_{\text {CITY }}^{00029}$ | Y | N N | N N | 01/03/2 Tue | ${ }_{4 \mathrm{P}}^{2012}$ | 14 200 | RIVER RD N CHEMAWA RD N |  |  | (NONE) | Y UNKNown | N N | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CLD } \\ & \text { DRY } \end{aligned}$ | S-OTHER <br> REAR | 01 | $\text { NONE } \quad 0$ PRVTE | StRGHT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 000 |  | 32,01 00 |
| No | 44 | 59 | 46.93 | -123 |  |  | Chemama ro |  | 08 | (04) |  | $N$ | DAY | INJ |  | PSNGR CAR |  | 01 | DRVR | NONE | 16 | M | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OR-Y } \\ & \text { OR<25 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 052,042 | 000 |  | 32,01 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NONE } \quad 0 \\ & \text { PRVTE } \\ & \text { PSNGR CAR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STRGHT } \\ & \text { S } \end{aligned}$ | 01 | DRVR | INJC | 47 | F | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{OR}-\mathrm{Y} \\ & \mathrm{OR}<25 \end{aligned}$ |  | 000 | $\begin{aligned} & 006 \\ & 000 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & 00 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 00565 \\ & \text { CITY } \end{aligned}$ | N | N N | N N | $02 / 22 /$ | 118 | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 346 \end{aligned}$ | RIVER RD N CHEMAWA RD N |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ALLEY } \\ & \mathrm{S} \end{aligned}$ | (NONE) | N <br> NONE | N | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RAIN } \\ & \text { WETT } \end{aligned}$ | ANGL-OTH <br> ANGL | 01 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NONE } \\ & \text { PRVTE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STRGHT } \\ & \text { E W } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 018 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 02 \\ & 00 \end{aligned}$ |
| No | 44 | 59 | 44.98 | -123 | 135 | . 89 | 1 |  | 08 | (04) |  | N | DAY | PDO |  | PSNGR CAR |  | 01 | DRVR | none | 17 | F | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OR-Y } \\ & \text { OR }<25 \end{aligned}$ |  | 028 | 000 |  | 02 |




CITY OF KEIZER, MARION COUNTY
January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014

TRANSPORTATION DATA SECTION - CRASH ANALYSIS AND REPORTING UNIT
URBAN NON-SYSTEM CRASH LISTING

ACTION CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| ACTION CODE | SHORT <br> DESCRIPTION | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 000 | NONE | NO ACTION OR NON-WARRANTED |
| 001 | SKIDDED | SKIDDED |
| 002 | ON/OFF V | getting on or off stopped or parked vehicle |
| 003 | LOAD OVR | OVERHANGING LOAD STRUCK ANOTHER VEHICLE, ETC. |
| 006 | SLOW DN | SLOWED DOWN |
| 007 | AVoiding | AVOIDING MANEUVER |
| 008 | PAR PARK | PARALLEL PARKING |
| 009 | ANG PARK | ANGLE PARKING |
| 010 | Interfere | PASSENGER Interfering with driver |
| 011 | Stopped | Stopped in traffic not waiting to make a left turn |
| 012 | STP/L TRN | Stopped because of left turn signal or waiting, etc. |
| 013 | STP TURN | Stopped while executing a turn |
| 015 | GO A/Stop | PROCEED AFTER STOPPING FOR A STOP SIGN/FLASHING RED. |
| 016 | TRN A/RED | turned on red after stopping |
| 017 | LOSTCTRL | LOST CONTROL OF VEHICLE |
| 018 | Exit DWY | Entering Street or highway from alley or driveway |
| 019 | Entr DWY | Entering Alley or driveway from street or highway |
| 020 | STR Entr | BEFORE ENTERING ROADWAY, STRUCK PEDESTRIAN, ETC. ON SIDEWALK OR SHOULDER |
| 021 | NO DRVR | CAR RAN AWAY - No driver |
| 022 | PREV COL | Struck, OR WAS Struck by, vehicle or pedestrian in prior collision before acc. Stabilized |
| 023 | StALLED | VEHICLE STALLED OR DISABLED |
| 024 | DRVR DEAD | dead by unassociated cause |
| 025 | FAtigue | fatigued, Sleepy, ASleep |
| 026 | SUN | DRIVER BLINDED BY SUN |
| 027 | HDLGHTS | DRIVER BLINDED BY HeAdlights |
| 028 | illness | Physically ILl |
| 029 | THRU MED | VEHICLE CROSSED, PLunged over, OR through median barrier |
| 030 | PURSUIT | PURSUING OR Attempting to stop a vehicle |
| 031 | PASSING | PASSING SITUATION |
| 032 | PRKOFFRD | VEHICLE PARKED BEYOND CURB OR SHOULDER |
| 033 | CROS MED | VEHICLE CROSSEd EARTH OR GRASS MEdIAN |
| 034 | $\mathrm{X} \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{SGNL}$ | Crossing at intersection - no traffic signal present |
| 035 | X W/ SGNL | Crossing at intersection - traffic signal present |
| 036 | DIAGONAL | CROSSING AT INTERSECTION - diagonally |
| 037 | BTWN InT | CROSSING BETWEEN INTERSECTIONS |
| 038 | DISTRACT | DRIVER'S ATTENTION DISTRACTED |
| 039 | W/TRAF-S | WALKIng, RUNNING, RIDING, EtC., ON Shoulder with traffic |
| 040 | A/TRAF-S | WALKIng, RUNNING, RIDING, EtC., ON SHOULDER FACING TRAFFIC |
| 041 | W/TRAF-P | WALKIng, RUNNING, RIding, Etc., ON PAVEMENT WITH TRAFFIC |
| 042 | A/traf-P | WALKIng, RUNNING, RIDING, EtC., ON PAVEMENT FACING TRAFFIC |
| 043 | PLAYINRD | Playing in street or road |
| 044 | puSh mv | PUSHING OR WORKING ON VEHICLE IN ROAD OR ON SHOULDER |
| 045 | WORK ON | WORKING IN ROADWAY OR ALONG SHOULDER |
| 046 | W/ TRAFIC | NON-MOTORIST WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC. WITH TRAFFIC |
| 047 | A/ TRAFIC | NON-MOTORIST WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, EtC. FACING TRAFFIC |
| 050 | LAY ON RD | Standing or lying in roadway |
| 051 | ENT Offrd | Entering / Starting in traffic lane from off road |
| 052 | MERGING | MERGING |
| 055 | SPRAY | blinded by water spray |
| 088 | OTHER | OTHER ACTION |

ACTION CODE TRANSLATION LIST

## CODE DESCRIPTION LONG DESCRIPTION <br> 099 UNK UNKNOWN ACTION

## CAUSE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

CAUSE SHORT
CODE DESCRIPTION LONG DESCRIPTION

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

COLLISION TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST
CODE DESCRIPTION LONG DESCRIPTION

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

## CRASH TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

CRASH SHORT
TYPE DESCRIPTION LONG DESCRIPTION

| $\&$ | OVERTURN | OVERTURNED |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | NON-COLL | OTHER NON-COLLISION |
| 1 | OTH RDWY | MOTOR VEHICLE ON OTHER ROADWAY |
| 2 | PRKD MV | PARKED MOTOR VEHICLE |
| 3 | PED | PEDESTRIAN |
| 4 | TRAIN | RAILWAY TRAIN |
| 6 | BIKE | PEDALCYCLIST |
| 7 | ANIMAL | ANIMAL |
| 8 | FIX OBJ | FIXED OBJECT |
| 9 | OTH OBJ | OTHER OBJECT |
| A | ANGL-STP | ENTERING AT ANGLE - ONE VEHICLE STOPPED |
| B | ANGL-OTH | ENTERING AT ANGLE - ALL OTHERS |
| C | S-STRGHT | FROM SAME DIRECTION - BOTH GOING STRAIGHT |
| D | S-1TURN | FROM SAME DIRECTION - ONE TURN, ONE STRAIGHT |
| E | S-1STOP | FROM SAME DIRECTION - ONE STOPPED |
| F | S-OTHER | FROM SAME DIRECTION-ALL OTHERS, INCLUDING PARKING |
| G | O-STRGHT | FROM OPPOSITE DIRECTION - BOTH GOING STRAIGHT |
| H | O-1 L-TURN | FROM OPPOSITE DIRECTION-ONE LEFT TURN,ONE STRAIGHT |
| I | O-1STOP | FROM OPPOSITE DIRECTION - ONE STOPPED |
| J | O-OTHER | FROM OPPOSITE DIRECTION-ALL OTHERS INCL. PARKING |

## DRIVER LICENSE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

DRIVER RESIDENCE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| LIC <br> CODE | SHORT <br> DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | NONE | NOT LICENSED (HAD NEVER BEEN LICENSED) |
| 1 | OR-Y | VALID OREGON LICENSE |
| 2 | OTH-Y | VALID LICENSE, OTHER STATE OR COUNTRY |
| 3 | SUSP | SUSPENDED/REVOKED |

## ERROR CODE TRANSLATION LIS

| ERROR CODE | SHORT <br> DESCRIPTION | FULL DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 000 | NONE | NO ERROR |
| 001 | WIDE TRN | WIDE TURN |
| 002 | CUT CORN | CUT CORNER ON TURN |
| 003 | FAIL TRN | FAILED TO OBEY MANDATORY TRAFFIC TURN SIGNAL, SIGN OR LANE MARKINGS |
| 004 | L IN TRF | LEFT TURN IN FRONT OF ONCOMING TRAFFIC |
| 005 | L PROHIB | LEFT TURN WHERE PROHIBITED |
| 006 | FRM WRNG | TURNED FROM WRONG LANE |
| 007 | TO WRONG | turned into wrong lane |
| 008 | Illeg U | U-TURNED ILLEGALLY |
| 009 | IMP STOP | IMPROPERLY STOPPED IN TRAFFIC LANE |
| 010 | IMP SIG | IMPROPER SIGNAL OR FAILURE TO SIGNAL |
| 011 | IMP BACK | BACKING IMPROPERLY (NOT PARKING) |
| 012 | IMP PARK | IMPROPERLY PARKED |
| 013 | UNPARK | Improper Start leaving Parked position |
| 014 | IMP STRT | IMPROPER START FROM STOPPED POSITION |
| 015 | IMP LGHT | IMPROPER OR NO LIGHTS (VEHICLE IN TRAFFIC) |
| 016 | INATTENT | INATTENTION (FAILURE TO DIM LIGHTS PRIOR TO 4/1/97) |
| 017 | UNSF VEH | DRIVING UNSAFE VEHICLE (NO OTHER ERROR APPARENT) |
| 018 | Oth PARK | ENTERING/EXITING PARKED POSITION w/ InSufficient Clearance; other improper parking maneuver |
| 019 | DIS DRIV | DISREGARDED OTHER DRIVER'S SIGNAL |
| 020 | DIS SGNL | disRegarded traffic Signal |
| 021 | RAN STOP | DISREGARDED STOP SIGN OR FLASHING RED |
| 022 | DIS SIGN | DISREGARDED WARNING SIGN, FLARES OR FLASHING AMBER |
| 023 | DIS OFCR | DISREGARDED POLICE OFFICER OR FLAGMAN |
| 024 | DIS EMER | DISREGARDED SIREN OR WARNING OF EMERGENCY VEHICLE |
| 025 | DIS RR | DISREGARDED RR SIGNAL, RR SIGN, OR RR FLAGMAN |
| 026 | REAR-END | FAILED TO AVOID Stopped or parked vehicle ahead other than school bus |
| 027 | BIKE ROW | DId Not have RIGht-OF-WAY OVER PEDALCYCLIST |
| 028 | No Row | DID NOT HAVE RIGHT-OF-WAY |
| 029 | PED ROW | FAILED TO Yield Right-of-wAy to pedestrian |
| 030 | PAS CURV | PASSING ON A CURVE |
| 031 | PAS WRNG | PASSING ON THE WRONG SIDE |
| 032 | PAS TANG | PASSING ON STRAIGHT ROAD UNDER UNSAFE CONDITIONS |
| 033 | PAS X -WK | PASSED VEHICLE StOpped at crosswalk for pedestrian |
| 034 | PAS INTR | PASSING AT INTERSECTION |
| 035 | PAS HILL | PASSING ON CREST OF HILL |
| 036 | N/PAS ZN | PASSING IN "NO PASSING" ZONE |
| 037 | PAS TRAF | PASSING IN FRONT OF ONCOMING TRAFFIC |
| 038 | CUT-IN | CUtting in (two lanes - two way only) |
| 039 | WRNGSIDE | DRIVING ON WRONG SIDE OF THE ROAD (2-WAY Undivided roadways) |
| 040 | THRU MED | DRIVING THROUGH SAFETY ZONE OR OVER ISLAND |
| 041 | F/ST BUS | FAILED TO STOP FOR SCHOOL BUS |

## ERROR CODE TRANSLATION LIST

## ERROR SHORT

| CODE | DESCRIPTION | FULL DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 042 | F/SLO MV | FAILED TO DECREASE SPEed FOR SLOWER MOVIng Vehicle |
| 043 | TOO CLOSE | FOLLOWING TOO CLOSELY (MUST BE ON OFFICER'S REPORT) |
| 044 | STRDL LN | Straddilvg OR DRIVING ON WRONG LANES |
| 045 | IMP CHg | Improper change of traffic lanes |
| 046 | WRNG WAY | WRONG WAY ON ONE-WAY ROADWAY; WRONG SIDE DIVIDED ROAD |
| 047 | BASCRULE | DRIVING TOO FAST FOR CONDITIONS (NOT EXCEEDING POSTED SPEED) |
| 048 | OPN DOOR | OPENED DOOR INTO ADJACENT TRAFFIC LANE |
| 049 | Impeding | IMPEDING TRAFFIC |
| 050 | SPEED | DRIVING In EXCESS Of POSTED SPEED |
| 051 | RECKLESS | RECKLESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 052 | CARELESS | CARELESS DRIVING (PER PAR) |
| 053 | RACING | SPEED RACING (PER PAR) |
| 054 | $\mathrm{X} \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{SGNL}$ | CROSSING AT INTERSECTION, NO TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRESENT |
| 055 | X W/SGNL | CROSSING AT INTERSECTION, TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRESENT |
| 056 | DIAGONAL | CROSSING AT INTERSECTION - DIAGONALLY |
| 057 | BTWN INT | CROSSING BETWEEN INTERSECTIONS |
| 059 | W/TRAF-S | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON SHOULDER WITH TRAFFIC |
| 060 | A/TRAF-S | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON ShOULDER FACING TRAFFIC |
| 061 | W/TRAF-P | WALKIng, Running, Riding, etc., on Pavement with traffic |
| 062 | A/TRAF-P | WALKING, RUNNING, RIDING, ETC., ON PAVEMENT FACING TRAFFIC |
| 063 | PLAYINRD | PLAYING IN STREET OR ROAD |
| 064 | PUSH MV | PUSHING OR WORKING ON VEHICLE IN ROAD OR ON SHOULDER |
| 065 | WORK IN RD | WORKING IN ROADWAY OR ALONG SHOULDER |
| 070 | LAY ON RD | StANDING OR LYING IN ROADWAY |
| 071 | NM IMP USE | IMPROPER USE OF TRAFFIC LANE BY NON-MOTORIST |
| 073 | ELUDING | ELUDING / Attempt to elude |
| 079 | F NEG CURV | FAILED TO NEGOTIATE A CURVE |
| 080 | FAIL LN | FAiled to maintain lane |
| 081 | OFF RD | RAN OfF Road |
| 082 | No CLEAR | DRIVER MISJUDGED CLEARANCE |
| 083 | OVRSTEER | OVER-CORRECTING |
| 084 | NOT USED | CODE NOT IN USE |
| 085 | OVRLOAD | OVERLOADING OR IMPROPER LOADING OF VEHICLE WIth CARGO OR PASSENGERS |
| 097 | UNA DIS TC | UNABLE TO DETERMINE WHICH DRIVER DISREGARDED TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE |

## EVENT CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| EVENT | SHORT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CODE | DESCRIPTION | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| 001 | FEL/JUMP | OCCUPANT FELL, JUMPED OR WAS EJECTED FROM MOVING VEHICLE |
| 002 | INTERER | PASSENGER INTERFERED WITH DRIVER |
| 003 | BUG INTF | ANIMAL OR INSECT IN VEHICL INTERFERED WITH DRIVER |
| 004 | INDRCT PED | PEDESTRIAN INDIRECTLY INOLVED (NOT STRUCK) |
| 005 | SUB-PED | "SUB-PED" PEDESTRIAN INJURED SUBSEQUENT TO COLLISION, ETC. |
| 006 | INDRCT BIK | PEDALCYCLIST INDIRECTLY INVOLVED (NOT STRUCK) |
| 007 | HITCHKR | HITCHHIKER (SOLICITING A RIDE) |
| 008 | PSNGR TOW | PASSENGER OR NON-MOTORIST BEING TOWED OR PUSHED ON CONVEYANCE |
| 009 | ON/OFF V | GETTING ON/OFF STOPPED/PARKED VEHICLE (OCCUPANTS ONLY; MUST HAVE PHYSICAL CONTACT |
| 010 | SUB OTRN | OVERTURNED AFTER FIRST HARMFUL EVENT |

## EVENT CODE TRANSLATION LIST

EVENT SHORT

| EVENT CODE | SHORT DESCRIPTION | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 060 | MARKER | DELINEATOR OR MARKER (REFLECTOR POSTS) |
| 061 | MAILBOX | MAILBOX |
| 062 | TREE | TREE, STUMP OR SHRUBS |
| 063 | VEG OHED | tree branch or other vegetation overhead, etc. |
| 064 | WIRE/CBL | WIRE OR CABLE ACROSS OR OVER THE ROAD |
| 065 | TEMP SGN | TEMPORARY SIGN OR BARRICADE IN ROAD, ETC. |
| 066 | PERM SGN | PERMANENT SIGN OR BARRICADE IN/OFF ROAD |
| 067 | SLIDE | SLIDES, FALLEN OR FALLING ROCKS |
| 068 | FRGN OBJ | FOREIGN OBSTRUCTION/DEBRIS IN ROAD (NOT GRAVEL) |
| 069 | EQP WORK | EQUIPMENT WORKING IN/OFF ROAD |
| 070 | OTH EQP | OTHER EQUIPMENT IN OR OFF ROAD (INCLUDES PARKED TRAILER, BOAT) |
| 071 | MAIN EQP | WRECKER, STREET SWEEPER, SNOW PLOW OR SANDING EQUIPMENT |
| 072 | OTHER WALL | ROCK, BRICK OR OTHER SOLID WALL |
| 073 | IRRGL PVMT | OTHER BUMP (NOT SPEED BUMP), POTHOLE OR PAVEMENT IRREGULARITY (PER PAR) |
| 074 | OVERHD OBJ | OTHER OVERHEAD OBJECT (HIGHWAY SIGN, SIGNAL HEAD, ETC.); NOT BRIDGE |
| 075 | CAVE In | BRIDGE OR ROAD CAVE IN |
| 076 | HI WATER | HIGH WATER |
| 077 | SNO BANK | SNOW BANK |
| 078 | LO-HI EDGE | Low OR HIGH Shoulder at pavement edge |
| 079 | DITCH | CUT SLOPE OR DITCH EMBANKMENT |
| 080 | OBJ FRM MV | STRUCK BY ROCK OR OTHER OBJECT SET IN MOTION BY OTHER VEHICLE (INCL. LOST LOADS) |
| 081 | FLY-OBJ | STRUCK BY ROCK OR OTHER MOVING OR FLYING OBJECT (NOT SET IN MOTION BY VEHICLE) |
| 082 | VEH HID | VEHICLE OBSCURED VIEW |
| 083 | VEG HID | VEGEtATION OBSCURED VIEW |
| 084 | BLDG HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY Fence, SIGN, Phone booth, etc. |
| 085 | WIND GUST | WIND GUST |
| 086 | IMMERSED | VEHICLE IMMERSED In Body of water |
| 087 | FIRE/EXP | FIRE OR EXPLOSION |
| 088 | FENC/BLD | FENCE OR BUILDING, ETC. |
| 089 | OTHR CRASH | CRASH RELATED TO ANOTHER SEPARATE CRASH |
| 090 | TO 1 SIDE | TWO-WAY traffic on divided roadway all routed to one side |
| 091 | BUILDING | BUILDING OR OTHER STRUCTURE |
| 092 | PHANTOM | OTHER (PHANTOM) NON-CONTACT VEHICLE |
| 093 | CELL PHONE | CELL PHONE (ON PAR OR DRIVER IN USE) |
| 094 | VIOL GDL | teenage driver in violation of graduated license pgm |
| 095 | GUY WIRE | GUY WIRE |
| 096 | BERM | BERM (EARTHEN OR GRAVEL MOUND) |
| 097 | GRAVEL | GRAVEL IN ROADWA |
| 098 | ABR EDGE | ABRUPT EDGE |
| 099 | CELL WTNSD | CELL PHONE USE WItNESSED BY OTHER PARTICIPANT |
| 100 | UNK FIXD | FIXED OBJECT, UNKNOWN TYPE. |
| 101 | OTHER OBJ | NON-FIXED OBJECT, OTHER OR UNKNOWN TYPE |
| 102 | TEXTING | TEXTING |
| 103 | WZ WORKER | WORK ZONE WORKER |
| 104 | ON VEHICLE | PASSENGER RIDING ON VEHICLE EXTERIOR |
| 105 | PEDAL PSGR | PASSENGER RIDING ON PEDALCYCLE |
| 106 | MAN WHLCHR | PEDESTRIAN IN NON-MOTORIZED WHEELCHAIR |
| 107 | MTR WHLCHR | PEDESTRIAN IN MOTORIZED Wheelchair |
| 108 | OFFICER | LAW ENFORCEMENT / POLICE OFFICER |
| 109 | SUB-BIKE | "SUB-BIKE": PEDALCYCLIST INJURED SUBSEQUENT TO COLLISION, ETC. |
| 110 | N-MTR | NON-MOTORIST STRUCK VEHICLE |
| 111 | S CAR VS V | Street Car/trolley (on RAILS OR OVERheAd wire system) Struck vehicle |
| 112 | v VS S CAR | VEhICLE STRUCK STREET CAR/TROLLEY (ON RAILS OR OVERHEAD WIRE SYSTEM) |
| 113 | S CAR ROW | At OR ON Street car or trolley Right-of-way |
| 114 | RR EQUIP | VEHICLE STRUCK RAILROAD EQUIPMENT (NOT TRAIN) ON TRACKS |
| 115 | DSTRCT GPS | DISTRACTED BY NAVIGATION SYSTEM OR GPS DEVICE |
| 116 | DSTRCT OTH | DISTRACTED BY Other electronic device |
| 117 | RR GATE | RAIL CROSSING DROP-ARM GATE |

EVENT SHORT

| EVENT <br> CODE | SHORT <br> DESCRIPTION | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 118 | EXPNSN JNT | EXPANSION JOINT |
| 119 | JERSEY BAR | JERSEY BARRIER |
| 120 | WIRE BAR | WIRE OR CABLE MEDIAN BARRIER |
| 121 | FENCE | FENCE |
| 123 | OBJ IN VEH | LOOSE OBJECT IN VEHICLE STRUCK OCCUPANT |
| 124 | SLIPPERY | SLIDING OR SWERVING DUE TO WET, ICY, SLIPPERY OR LOOSE SURFACE (NOT GRAVEL) |
| 125 | SHLDR | SHOULDER GAVE WAY |
| 126 | BOULDER | ROCK (S), BOULDER (NOT GRAVEL; NOT ROCK SLIDE) |
| 127 | LAND SLIDE | ROCK SLIDE OR LAND SLIDE |
| 128 | CURVE INV | CURVE PRESENT AT CRASH LOCATION |
| 129 | HILL INV | VERTICAL GRADE / HILL PRESENT AT CRASH LOCATION |
| 130 | CURVE HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY CURVE |
| 131 | HILL HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY VERTICAL GRADE / HILL |
| 132 | WINDOW HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY VEHICLE WINDOW CONDITIONS |
| 133 | SPRAY HID | VIEW OBSCURED BY WATER SPRAY |

## FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION TRANSLATION LIST

## FUNC <br> CLASS DESCRIPTION

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

## INJURY SEVERITY CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| CODE | SHORT <br> DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | KILL | FATAL INJURY |
| 2 | INJA | INCAPACITATING INJURY - BLEEDING, BROKEN BONES |
| 3 | INJB | NON-INCAPACITATING INJURY |
| 4 | INJC | POSSIBLE INJURY - COMPLAINT OF PAIN |
| 5 | PRI | DIED PRIOR TO CRASH |
| 7 | NO<5 | NO INJURY - 0 TO 4 YEARS OF AGE |

## MEDIAN TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

SHORT

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

MILEAGE TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LTS

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

## MOVEMENT TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIST

| CODE | SHORT <br> DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | UNK | UNKNOWN |
| 1 | STRGHT | STRAIGHT AHEAD |
| 2 | TURN-R | TURNING RIGHT |
| 3 | TURN-L | TURNING LEFT |
| 4 | U-TURN | MAKING A U-TURN |
| 5 | BACK | BACKING |
| 6 | STOP | STOPPED IN TRAFFIC |
| 7 | PRKD-P | PARKED - PROPERLY |
| 8 | PRKD-I | PARKED - IMPROPERLY |

## pedestrian location code tranclation list

| CODE | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- |
| 00 | AT INTERSECTION - NOT IN ROADWAY |
| 01 | AT INTERSECTION - INSIDE CROSSWALK |
| 02 | AT INTERSECTION - IN ROADWAY, OUTSIDE CROSSWALK |
| 03 | AT INTERSECTION - IN ROADWAY, XWALK AVAIL UNKNWN |
| 04 | NOT AT INTERSECTION - IN ROADWAY |
| 05 | NOT AT INTERSECTION - ON SHOULDER |
| 06 | NOT AT INTERSECTION - ON MEDIAN |
| 07 | NOT AT INTERSECTION - WITHIN TRAFFIC RIGHT-OF-WAY |
| 08 | NOT AT |
| 09 | INTERSECTINN - IN BIKE PAAH OR PARKING LANE |
| 10 | NOT-AT INTERSECTION - ON SIDEWALK |
| 13 | OUTSIDE TRAFFICWAY BOUNDARIES |
| 13 | AT INTERSECTION - IN BIKE LANE |
| 14 | NOT AT INTERSECTINN - IN BIKE LANE |
| 15 | NOT AT INTERSECTION - INSIDE MAD-BLOCK CROSSWALK |
| 16 | NOT AT INTERSECTION - IN PARKING LANE |

ROAD CHARACTER CODE TRANSLATION LIST
SHORT

| CODE | DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | UNK | UNKNOWN |
| 1 | INTER | INTERSECTION |
| 2 | ALLEY | DRIVEWAY OR ALLEY |
| 3 | STRGHT | STRAIGHT ROADWAY |
| 4 | TRANS | TRANSITION |
| 5 | CURVE | CURVE (HORIZONTAL CURVE) |
| 6 | OPENAC | OPEN ACCESS OR TURNOUT |
| 7 | GRADE | GRADE (VERTICAL CURVE) |
| 8 | BRIDGE | BRIDGE STRUCTURE |
| 9 | TUNNEL | TUNNEL |

PARTICIPANT TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIS

| CODE | SHORT <br> DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | OCC | UNKNOWN OCCUPANT TYPE |
| 1 | DRVR | DRIVER |
| 2 | PSNG | PASSENGER |
| 3 | PED | PEDESTRIAN |
| 4 | CONV | PEDESTRIAN USING A PEDESTRIAN CONVEYA. |
| 5 | PTOW | PEDESTRAN TOWING OR TRAILERING AN OB. |
| 6 | BIKE | PEDALCYCLIST |
| 7 | BTOW | PEDALCYCLIST TOWING OR TRAILERING AN |
| 8 | PRKD | OCCUPANT OF A PARKED MOTOR VEHICLE |
| 9 | UNK | UNKNOWN TYPE OF NON-MOTORIST |

## traffic Control device code translation list

| CODE | SHORT DESC | LONG DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 000 | NONE | NO CONTROL |
| 001 | TRE SIGNAL | TRAFFIC SIGNALS |
| 002 | FLASHBCN-R | FLASHING BEACON - RED (STOP) |
| 003 | FLASHBCN-A | FLASHING BEACON - AMBER (SLOW) |
| 004 | STOP SIGN | STOP SIGN |
| 005 | SLOW SIGN | SLOW SIGN |
| 006 | REG-SIGN | REGULATORY SIGN |
| 007 | YIELD | YIELD SIGN |
| 008 | WARNING | WARNING SIGN |
| 009 | CURVE | CURVE SIGN |
| 010 | SCHL X-ING | SCHOOL CROSSING SIGN OR SPECIAL SIGNAL |
| 011 | OFCR/FLAG | POLICE OFFICER, FLAGMAN - SCHOOL PATROL |
| 012 | BRDG-GATE | BRIDGE GATE - BARRIER |
| 013 | TEMP-BARR | TEMPORARY BARRIER |
| 014 | NO-PASS-ZN | NO PASSING ZONE |
| 015 | ONE-WAY | ONE-WAY STREET |
| 016 | CHANNEL | CHANNELIZATION |
| 017 | MEDIAN BAR | MEDIAN BARRIER |
| 018 | PILOT CAR | PILOT CAR |
| 019 | SP PED SIG | SPECIAL PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL |
| 020 | X-BUCK | CROSSBUCK |
| 021 | THR-GN-SIG | THROUGH GREEN ARROW OR SIGNAL |
| 022 | L-GRN-SIG | LEFT TURN GREEN ARROW, LANE MARKINGS, OR SIGNAL |
| 023 | R-GRN-SIG | RIGHT TURN GREEN ARROW, LANE MARKINGS, OR SIGNAL |
| 024 | WIGWAG | WIGWAG OR FLASHING LIGHTS W/O DROP-ARM GATE |
| 025 | X-BUCK WRN | CROSSBUCK AND ADVANCE WARNING |
| 026 | WW W/ GATE | FLASHING LIGHTS WITH DROP-ARM GATES |
| 027 | OVRHD SGNL | SUPPLEMENTAL OVERHEAD SIGNAL (RR XING ONLY) |
| 028 | SP RR STOP | SPECIAL RR STOP SIGN |
| 029 | ILUM GRD X | ILLUMINATED GRADE CROSSING |
| 037 | RAMP METER | METERED RAMPS |
| 038 | RUMBLE STR | RUMBLE STRIP |
| 090 | L-TURN REF | LEFT TURN REFUGE (WHEN REFUGE IS INVOLVED) |
| 091 | R-TURN ALL | RIGHT TURN AT ALL TIMES SIGN, ETC. |
| 092 | EMR SGN/FL | EMERGENCY SIGNS OR FLARES |
| 093 | ACCEL LANE | ACCELERATION OR DECELERATION LANES |
| 094 | R-TURN PRO | RIGHT TURN PROHIBITED ON RED AFTER STOPPING |
|  |  |  |

## vEHICLE TYPE CODE TRANSLATION LIS

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

WEATHER CONDITION CODE TRANSLATION LIST

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

## PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT REVIEW

The Fuel Center Transportation Impact Assessment has been prepared for a proposed fueling station within the existing Safeway site southwest of the River Road N/Chemawa Road NE/N intersection in Keizer. The assessment is a summary of existing traffic and pedestrian activities at the site and estimates of future traffic impacts after the development of a fueling station. The assessment analyses 5 separate driveways to and from the site. Two of the driveways are "right in, right out" and the other three driveways allow full left and right turns.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

The Assessment provides a detailed analysis of the existing conditions, including driveway construction that does not allow for a smooth flow of traffic into or out of the site. The two right in, right out driveways are not constructed adequately to control the movement as designed and a few vehicles make left turns where left turns are prohibited. The main entrance to the Safeway building does not have adequate lanes for the stacking that occurs during peak traffic periods. Some interior drive aisles are designed in such a way that traffic backs up in the drive aisles due to vehicles stacking waiting to make a left turn onto Chemawa Road. New traffic counts at the five intersections have been provided for periods of peak traffic flows.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The Assessment contains recommendations to solve current traffic issues at the site as well as mitigate for increased traffic from the proposed fueling station. New construction for the two right in, right out driveways has been recommended to improve drivability as well as to discourage left turns. New construction is proposed for the southerly driveway on River Road to improve drivability and the pedestrian crossing.

Major changes at the main entrance to the Safeway building have been recommended that include reconstruction of the driveway to provide a wider entry, reduce the vertical "bump" at the curb and reconfiguring the first parking lot drive aisle and pedestrian crossing area within the site.

## PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FINDINGS

The Public Works Department finds that the Transportation Impact Assessment adequately studies the existing conditions and makes recommendations that will mitigate the increased traffic in and through the site from the proposed fueling station.

The existing main entrance driveway width exceeds the standard width for a commercial driveway as specified in the City of Keizer Design Standards. The proposed modification of the driveway will require a small increase in the current width which is acceptable to the Public Works Department.

All plans for the proposed improvements shall be reviewed by the Public Works Department for compliance with the City of Keizer Design Standards.

Storm water detention and treatment for all additional impervious surfaces shall be required.

Additional pedestrian and traffic control devices, storm water control and other design criteria that may be required will be reviewed for adequacy when preliminary engineering plans have been submitted as part of a Development Permit or Land Use Application.
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# TO: PLANNING COMMISSION <br> THRU: NATE BROWN, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR FROM: SHANE WITHAM, SENIOR PLANNER 

DATE: March 7, 2017
SUBJECT: Proposed text amendments relating to the allowance of gasoline service stations within the Chemawa/River Road restriction area.

## Attachments:

- Section 2.110 (Commercial Mixed Use) - draft
- Staff Report and attachments from February 6, 2017 Council Meeting
- Council Resolution \#R2017-2748
- Updated Transportation Impact Assessment (dated Feb 28, 2017)


## DISCUSSION:

At the February 6, 2017 City Council meeting, Safeway submitted a request to initiate the Text Amendment process to allow a "Gasoline Service Station" as an accessory use to a "grocery supermarket" in the Commercial Mixed Use (CM) zone. Currently, this use is prohibited in the Chemawa/River Road restriction area, as described in Section 2.110.05 Use Restrictions of the Keizer Development Code (KDC). The staff report from the February 6, 2017 City Council meeting, Safeway's request and supporting information, as well as the resultant council adopted Resolution (R2017-2748) initiating the Text Amendment process, are attached for your reference (attachment A).

As was addressed in the February 6, 2017 staff report, it is the opinion of staff that it is most appropriate to look at the broader, overall policy questions surrounding the Chemawa/River Rd use restriction area and list of prohibited uses to determine what, if any action should be taken, as opposed to taking only a finite look at a use-specific proposal for Safeway. Staff feels this broad view approach would ensure the greatest equity throughout the restriction area and by answering the relevant policy related questions at the onset; it would determine what standards and allowances are appropriate within the restriction area and City as a whole. This approach would ultimately guide whether amendments to the KDC are appropriate and whether additional considerations should be made.

However, as staff began crafting an appropriate recommendation for Planning Commission to consider based upon these broader policy questions, it became clear this larger discussion cannot adequately be addressed without additional information and work being done, including extensive public involvement. As you know, the City is currently embarking upon a TGM grant process for the development of revitalization area plans that will directly affect the Chemawa/River Rd area. This process will be ongoing over the course of the next year or more and will include public outreach, as well as considerations of the overall projected growth patterns and transportation and infrastructure impacts that are expected. With these considerations in mind, staff has come to the conclusion it would be premature to consider broad policy changes at this time, and feels it is most appropriate to delay the larger
discussion until after completion of the grant process, or that most likely, they will be considered as a part of the revitalization area plan process. Therefore, the proposal for your consideration is not necessarily what staff would consider as the ideal approach, but due to the City's commitment to consider Safeway's proposal, along with the ability to appropriately mitigate and process the future development of a gasoline service station on the site, staff feels the recommended text amendment represents an acceptable option, and demonstrates consistency with the goals for development within the restriction area.

Staff has identified the following four options for Planning Commission to consider in response to Safeway's request and Council Resolution (R2017-2748). Staff is recommending that Planning Commission move a recommendation of Option 4 forward for Council consideration. Listed below are the four identified options along with a brief discussion of each, for your consideration:

## 1. Make no change to the $\mathrm{KDC} /$ take no action:

Discussion: This would allow the revitalization area grant process to fully guide the discussion and determine appropriate changes to the restriction area. It would retain any and all options for redevelopment, without encumbering the site with improvements that could impede future pedestrian oriented development. However, taking no action clearly impacts Safeway's desire to provide additional services to shoppers and impedes economic development to a certain extent. It also would delay any possible change to address Safeway's request for a significant amount of time, since the grant process is just getting underway, and it is not expected to be completed for at least a year or more. Most compelling is the fact that taking no action does not address the specific request, or consider the merits of the Safeway proposal. Staff feels that while taking no action is an option, it is not the most responsive approach.

## 2. Eliminate Chemawa/River restriction area completely:

Discussion: This approach would simply lift the existing prohibitions within the restriction area. The argument can be made the restriction area is mostly built out or has been re-developed since the creation of the prohibited use areas, and therefore the restriction has served its purpose over the past 20 years of existence. It may be an advantage with the revitalization area grant process to have a clean slate with no pre-conceived notions or barriers encumbering the dialogue that is to happen. Some point to the recently allowed interpretation at Schoolhouse Square allowing a drive thru coffee shop to be moved from elsewhere on the site as an example the restriction area is no longer necessary. Wider sidewalks and pedestrian oriented amenities are being provided along the frontage of the property, as well as creation of storefront windows which are consistent with a downtown feel. Eliminating the restriction area would provide the greatest equity city wide, since there would be no special prohibitions on uses based solely on a geographic area, and instead would be tied to the underlying zone.

This approach, however, would only be advisable if the decision were predicated on the greater policy discussion of why the restrictions were established in the first place. The restriction area was created to address issues relating to transportation impacts and safety, aesthetics, pedestrian orientation, and economic development goals. Since the revitalization area grant process will specifically look at growth and transportation impacts, it would be premature to simply eliminate the restriction area prior to going through the grant process and public engagement activities associated with it. If the restriction area is eliminated carte blanche, there is a likely possibility of lost opportunities. It is envisioned the grant process may result in greater restrictions, revisions to existing area plans, possible different zoning designations or overlay districts, or even performance based standards that will govern future redevelopment.

## 3. Text Amendment as proposed by Safeway:

Discussion: Safeway's request to Council proposes to amend the KDC to allow a gasoline service station as an accessory use to a grocery supermarket. This approach represents a streamlined and simple process that is very specific to one or possibly two properties within the restriction area. This proposal does not fully address the policy issues established with the restricted area or provide equity city/area wide. It would rely on non-binding commitments for providing appropriate mitigations needed to address the identified goals and objectives of adopted plans since no additional process would be required outside of the building permit approval process. Though Safeway is a good community partner, a more binding and reliable process to require mitigations would be necessary.

## 4. Text amendment as proposed by Staff:

Discussion: Staff is proposing a text amendment similar to the Safeway proposal, with the major exception being the accessory use is only to be allowed subject to Conditional Use Permit approval. The CUP process provides a vehicle to ensure appropriate mitigation measures be required. It requires additional land use approval process with an appeal period which ensures transparency and full review of concerns and issues associated with the proposed development plan. It allows for Safeway's economic development goals to be pursued without greater lost opportunities for pedestrian/non-automobile oriented development throughout the restriction area. It requires policy considerations of the restriction area as applied to the specific request, which we feel is appropriate considering the site and goals and policies of the restriction area.

## CONCLUSION:

Staff is recommending that any proposal for a gasoline service station within the Chemawa/River Rd restriction area be subject to Conditional Use Permit approval. This process is to be heard by staff. The specific draft text amendment language to Section 2.110 (attachment B) is included for your consideration.

This proposed language will allow Safeway to move forward with their proposal, but not in an outright permitted manner while still keeping the general intent of the use restrictions. Through the CUP process, appropriate mitigation measures will be required to ensure the intent and purpose of the goals and policies within the restriction area can be met. The following mitigation measures and conditions have been identified by staff, in conjunction with the Public Works Department, Keizer Fire District, and Police Department to ensure development of a gasoline service station addresses the issues of transportation impacts and safety, aesthetics and pedestrian orientation:

- Provide 6’ wide, separated sidewalks and stamped concrete crosswalks along River Rd and Chemawa Rd frontage.
- Provide enhanced parking lot landscaping in order to provide additional screening and buffering of the gas station development.
- Provide traffic control improvements on site to help guide vehicles efficiently and safely, and to avoid stacking/queuing onto public streets.
- Require greater setbacks to keep auto uses away from street frontages and retain ability for future pedestrian oriented development. Proposed setback of 100 feet or more.
- Requirement of TIA and implement mitigation measures as appropriate. Safeway has provided a revised traffic study which will be analyzed by the City's Traffic Engineer to ensure traffic impacts and safety concerns are adequately addressed.


## RECOMMENDATION:

That the Planning Commission consider the proposal and forward a recommendation to the City Council it be adopted.

| From: | moirsden@aol.com |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Brown, Nate; Witham, Shane |
| Subject: | PC Meeting |
| Date: | Friday, March 24, 2017 5:14:26 PM |

## Nate \& Shane

I watched PC meeting regarding Safeway and the gas station issue. PC members wanted to know about the old old gas station that
was where Keizer Corner is----well they had leaky tanks and DEQ shut area after the station as gone. Next to where Bouchers is we had a Contaminated dirt pile for years until DEQ finally authorized the dirt pile removed. The gas station went away as I recall when river road was originally widened. Under the County's watch, long before K was incorporated. I would be happy to discuss with you or Shane my memory where the gas station \& safeway are concerned. It is scary when I hear you all say none of you were here when things happened. The other source I would recommend would be Jim Keller or Jerry McGee. If you want me to tell you what I remember or know just let me know.
I can also tell you some of the Council's thinking when I was active. Guess that is why I have gray hair!!!!

Jacque

# Keizer Planning Commission Report <br> Proposed Gas Station in Keizer Safeway 

March 15, 2017

Introduction: Jeff Cowan Keizer Fire Chief Friday begins my $10^{\text {th }}$ year here. St Patrick's Day is a great commemoration for my 36 year career.

I am here tonight to provide our concerns about a proposed addition of a gas station at the Keizer Safeway.

- It's important to note that we have not spent 10 minutes officially talking about this and I have not seen a plan for the proposal.
- River Road Traffic and the Chemawa Intersection has me concerned about exceeding safety and traffic flow abilities all the time. The memorial on the corner of Chemawa and River is a sad reminder that all you have to do is step off a curb to get one in your honor. The Safeway entrance on Chemawa on Chemawa road is dangerous just ask one of our Keizer Police officers... It has not been a year since his accident last summer in front of our station.
- A proposed fueling station in the parking lot is a dismay to me as just this Monday, the parking lot was full at $4: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ with people dashing in amongst moving vehicles, I don't know how a gas station will make that better.


## Traffic Impact Analysis: Kittelson \& Associates Transportation Engineers

- Feb 28, 2017 Report evaluation of the current and proposed addition of the fueling station has a serious glaring omission: It is silent to the fire station across the street. The evaluation only reviews the parking lot to the perimeter of the parking lot and stops there.
- The methodology is a 2000 standard based on a 2007 transportation plan.
- Table 4, Page 19, shows that the entrances on to River Road exceed Critical Crash Rate safety.
- Peak Traffic is greater than the ninety fifth percentile (>95\%) at the entrances onto River Road.
- The parking lot photos from elevated views are not realistic and are deceiving in the parking lot size, depth, and occupancy of vehicles. They do not show real time or peak time views. They are simply illustrations.


## Keizer Fire District Response Data:

- Keizer Fire District responds out of our station about 15 times a day... some days more... some less. Entering the intersection onto River Road, the three lanes facing west, in emergency response mode, the lanes are typically full and our emergency vehicles face traffic in the on-coming lane as it is the only method that allows it. The intersection is at maximum to allow emergency response vehicles through.
- For every response out... There is a return trip to the station which requires our vehicles to sit in the peak traffic back up which we have already identified is at the ninety fifth percentile. ( $>95 \%$ ) during peak hours.
- Safeway itself generates 20 calls a year on average and Shari's adds another 6. ( 26 calls per year, 5 year average). Emergency Response in an already full parking lot is a problem for responders.


## Summary:

In summary, I have not spent 10 minutes talking with the city or anyone regarding this project. I have not seen a plan or proposal. The discussion was brought to our attention by the activity of the planning commission. I asked for a copy of the traffic survey and reviewed it. Our primary concern is emergency response and the safety to our Keizer citizens.

| From: | Leff Cowan |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Brown, Nate |
| Subject: | RE: Safeway supplemental staff report |
| Date: | Thursday, March 23, 2017 11:03:14 AM |
| Attachments: | Keizer Planning Commission Report March 15, 2017.docx |

Hi Nate,
Simply put...

- There is not a sufficient traffic impact study.
- There is not a sufficient traffic engineering remedy.
- There is not enough scientific data to evaluate the impacts to egress, and in fact shows failing intersections.
- The information is silent to the impact to emergency response for the Fire Station.
- There has not been a sufficient staff review and discussion.
- The Fire District is a separate public safety entity whose only concern is emergency response and public safety.
- The Fire District has not seen a plan or proposal at this time. We are working conceptually only.


## Chief Cowan

From: Brown, Nate [mailto:brownn@keizer.org] Sent: Wednesday, March 22, 2017 4:10 PM
To: Jeff Cowan
Subject: Safeway supplemental staff report
Chief,
As we are working on the supplemental staff report we would like to address the District's concerns specifically. Right now I'm not exactly sure what your concerns are other than the fact that they didn't provide any analysis specific to the potential conflict with the Fire apparatus for any additional trips in their report. Could you help me out by giving me an email that expresses the specifics of your concerns if this doesn't capture what your testimony was directed at? It seemed like you were reading from some written material, if so this would be helpful to include. I could then reference this in my information.

Thanks.


1120 NW Couch Street
10th Floor
Portland, OR 97209-4128
( +1.503 .727 .2000
(F) +1.503.727.2222

PerkinsCoie.com
D. +1.503.727.2024
F. +1.503 .346 .2024

## VIA EMAIL ONLY

Mr. Hersch Sangster, Chair
City of Keizer Planning Commission
Keizer Civic Center
930 Chemawa Rd NE
Keizer, OR 97303

## Re: City of Keizer Proposed Text Amendments Relating to Fuel Centers in the Commercial Mixed Use Zone - Request for Continuance

Dear Chair Sangster and Members of the Planning Commission:
This office represents Safeway, Inc. ("Safeway"), the original petitioner requesting a text amendment to the Keizer Development Code to allow a fuel center in conjunction with a grocery supermarket in the Commercial Mixed Use zone ("Text Amendment").

Safeway requests that the Planning Commission continue its consideration of the Text Amendment to its May meeting or such later date when the Planning Commission's agenda can accommodate the item.

As you recall, the Planning Commission previously granted a continuance to allow Safeway the opportunity to conduct research and analysis about the issue of merchandise sales at its fuel centers. Safeway has conducted its research and analysis and is awaiting formal corporate direction on how to proceed in responding to this issue at this site. Although Safeway had originally hoped to receive that direction by April 12, it will not occur until after meetings scheduled for later in April.

Safeway appreciates the Planning Commission's patience and courtesies. If the Planning Commission grants the requested continuance, Safeway looks forward to presenting further testimony to the Planning Commission at the continued hearing date.

In the event the Planning Commission declines Safeway's continuance request and decides to make a final recommendation on the Text Amendment at the April meeting,

Mr. Hersch Sangster, Chair
April 4, 2017
Page 2

Safeway requests that the Planning Commission strike the proposed total prohibition on all "accessory sales of other merchandise," as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the Commercial Mixed Use zoning district, and it arbitrarily and adversely affects the value of any fuel center Safeway might develop on its property. Again, Safeway anticipates being able to provide additional commentary and potential alternatives if the Planning Commission grants a continuance.

I have asked City staff to place a copy of this letter before you and to include a copy in the official record for this matter. Thank you in advance for allowing the time for a full and fair consideration of this important policy issue.

Very truly yours,


Seth J. King
SJK
cc: Mr. Shannon Johnson (via email)
Mr. Nate Brown (via email)
Mr. Shane Witham (via email)
Client (via email)
Mr. Mark Whitlow (via email)


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Safeway Gas Station - Internalization and Pass-by Survey Results prepared by Heffron Transportation, Inc., April 2001.

