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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes the results of existing and future traffic conditions for the NE 238 Drive/NE Treehill Drive intersection in Wood Village, Oregon. The purpose of the report is to address existing/future year safety and capacity concerns at this intersection. This traffic analysis considers the following scenarios for opening year (2020) and future design year (2040):

Scenario 1 - Existing street condition
a) Capacity analysis for full access movements with stop control on NE Treehill Drive
b) Signal warrant and capacity analysis
c) Capacity analysis with westbound left turns prohibited.

Scenario 2 - Existing street condition with NE Hawthorne Ave to NE Treehill Drive connection
a) Capacity analysis for full access movements with stop control on NE Treehill Drive
b) Signal warrant and capacity analysis
c) Capacity analysis with westbound left turns prohibited.

The analysis is conducted consistent with the procedures and methods for signal warrants as outlined in the Manual on Traffic Control Devises (MUTCD), 2009 Edition, the Oregon Department of transportation's (ODOT) Analysis Procedure Manual and Multnomah County Design and Construction Manual.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The results of the analysis are summarized below.

- With westbound left-turn prohibited, the study intersection is forecasted to operate within the County's acceptable LOS "D" during weekday evening peak traffic hour; but, not during weekday morning peak traffic hour conditions under Scenarios 1 and 2 through year 2040.
- With stop sign control, the study intersection is projected to not operate at the County's acceptable LOS during weekday morning and evening peak traffic hour conditions under Scenarios 1 and 2 through year 2040.
- The study intersection does not meet any of the MUTCD signal warrants under Scenarios 1 and 2 through year 2040 traffic conditions.


## CONCLUSION

While with the westbound left-turn prohibited the intersection does not fully meet the County's operational standard, its operation is better than with the condition that allows left-turns out of NE Treehill Drive. To fully meet the intersection operational standard (LOS "D") from "Multnomah County Design and Construction Manual", a second northbound through lane on NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive through the NE Treehill Drive intersection would be required.

## INTRODUCTION

Multnomah County is proposing to make improvements to NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive between NE Halsey Street and NE Glisan Street in Wood Village to improve freight, bicycle, and pedestrian movement. The project is identified in Metro's East Metro Connections Plan to improve freight traffic between 1-84 and East Multnomah County, including removing the existing restriction of trucks longer than 40 feet on NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive. The project will be widening the existing road, construct shared bicycle/pedestrian paths, improve illumination, landscaping and drainage. The road will be widened from an existing curb-to-curb width of approximately 34 feet to 41 feet to increase space for passing vehicles through the road curvature. No additional lanes will be added. The new 10 -foot shared bicycle/pedestrian paths will increase the existing total cross section width from approximately 40 feet to 61 feet.

As part of the project the NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive/NE Treehill Drive intersection is being evaluated to determine the need for a traffic signal.

## EXISTING CONDITION

The study intersection is located approximately 350 feet south of the signalized intersection of NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive/NE Arata Road/NE Maple Boulevard and approximately 0.6 miles north of the signalized intersection of NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive/NE Glisan Street. This intersection is a three-legged intersection with a stop control for the westbound approach. At this intersection NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive runs north-south and NE Treehill Drive intersects NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive on the east side of the roadway. Site vicinity map is included in Attachment A for reference.

North of the study location on the west side NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive there is an access to several residential dwelling's parking lot. This access is located approximately 60 feet from the center of the access to the center of NE Treehill Drive. For this study, the NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive/NE Treehill Drive intersection will be evaluated as a four-legged intersection due to intersection's configuration and the proximity of this driveway to NE Treehill Drive/ NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive intersection.

NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive is classified as a minor arterial in the Multnomah County Transportation System Plan (TSP). It has two southbound lanes, a two-way left turn-lane, a northbound lane with a wide shoulder and sidewalk on the east side of NE 238 Drive near its intersection at NE Treehill Drive. NE Treehill Drive is an unmarked two-way uncontrolled road that intersects NE 238th Drive from the east. This street serves multifamily residential development and Treehill Day School. The driveway that intersects NE $238{ }^{\text {th }}$ Drive on the west side is approximately 40 feet wide and service four dwelling units.

A physical description of each roadway is summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1
Existing Roadway Facilities

| Roadway | Classification | No. of <br> Lanes | Speed | Typical Pedestrian <br> Corridor Sidewalk <br> Width <br> /Configuration* | Bicycle <br> Facilities | Street <br> Parking | Sidewalk |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NE 238 <br> Drive | Minor <br> Arterial | 1 NB lane <br> 2 SB lanes | 35 mph | $6^{\prime}$ (NB only) | None | NB only <br> (North <br> of | Eastside <br> only <br> Treehill <br> Drive) |
| NE <br> Treehill <br> Drive | Local Street | 1 lane each <br> direction | Not <br> Posted | None | None | None | None |

* = Information obtained from google map not field verified.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities: Review of project site vicinity and traffic count data revealed that a maximum of 5 pedestrians crossed NE Treehill Drive on the east side of the intersection during the morning and afternoon peak traffic hours. There were no bicyclist or pedestrians crossing NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive or NE Treehill Drive on the west side of the intersection during the study period. There are bicycle lane lanes on NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive that start approximately 1000 feet north of Treehill Drive. There are no bicycle lanes at the study location. Sidewalk on the east side of NE 238 Drive near its intersection at NE Treehill Drive is existing. Currently, Multnomah County has a plan to provide shared bicycle/pedestrian paths as part of the NE 238 Drive between NE Halsey Street and NE Glisan Street project to improve freight, bicycle and pedestrian movement.

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS

This section describes the methodology used to assess the traffic conditions, presents the existing turning movement traffic volumes and determines the operating conditions for the study location.

The operating conditions at the study intersection was evaluated using the latest Highway Capacity Manual Operations Methodology (HCM 6 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition) contained in the SYNCHRO software package. Adequacy at the study locations is determined based on the Multnomah County's Level-of-Service (LOS) criteria. Section 1.1.5 of the Multnomah County Design Manual (Reference 1) requires that all new and improved arterial and major collector roadways in urban areas operate at LOS "D" or better during the design hour. If approved by the County Engineer, local streets intersecting arterials or collectors may be LOS " F " during the peak hour.

The LOS criteria for un-signalized intersections are different than the criteria used for signalized intersections. For an un-signalized intersection, the LOS is defined for each minor movement and not for the intersection. LOS criteria for signalized and un-signalized intersections is described in detail in Appendix A of the Multnomah County Design Manual (Reference 1) and the HCM 2016 (Reference 3).

Traffic Counts: As part of this analysis, data collection effort was conducted at the intersection of NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive/NE Treehill Drive on Thursday, April 5, 2018. The counts were gathered from 5:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. (14-hour counts) on April 5, 2018. The morning and evening peak traffic hour turning-movement volumes and the eight-highest traffic counts were obtained from these counts as per the project scope.

Projected future Year 2020 and Year 2040 traffic volumes were calculated by applying an annual traffic growth rate of 1\%. The annual growth rate was calculated based on average daily traffic (ADT) volumes for Year 2015, Year 2027 and Year 2040 provided by Metro. A copy of the ADT and traffic counts are included in Attachment A for reference.

Year 2018, Year 2020 and Year 2040 morning and evening peak hour traffic volumes for the study location are shown in Figures 1, 2 and 3 below. The volumes on all approaches to the intersection are rounded to the nearest 5 vehicles except on the approaches with less than 3 vehicles.
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Figure 1: Existing Year 2018 Volume
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## Scenario 1 - Existing Conditions

## A. Intersection Capacity Analysis

The following section evaluates the LOS for the study location assuming stop sign control, traffic signal control and raised median control for right-in/right-out operation at the study intersection.

1. Stop Controlled Morning and Evening Peak Traffic Hour Volume Condition: Based on the above methodology, operational analysis was performed for the Year 2018, Year 2020 and Year 2040 traffic volumes with stop sign control. The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 2. The worksheets for the analysis are presented in Attachment B.

Table 2
Peak Hour Traffic Condition with Stop Sign Control

| 2018 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  |  | 2018 Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  |  | County Standard Met? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | V/C | LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | V/C |  |
| E | 44.3 | 0.04 | E | 44.6 | 0.35 | N |
| 2020 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  |  | 2020 Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  |  | County Standard Met? |
| LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | V/C | LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | V/C |  |
| E | 45.6 | 0.04 | E | 49 | 0.38 | N |
| 2040 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  |  | 2040 Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  |  | County Standard Met? |
| LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | V/C | LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | V/C |  |
| F | 110.5 | 0.80 | F | 125.5 | 0.74 | N |

[^0] Control Delay = seconds/vehicle (sec/veh).

As shown in Table 2 above, the study location will not operate within the County's LOS standard in existing year 2018, year 2020 and year 2040 traffic condition during weekday morning and evening peak traffic hours.
2. Signal Controlled Morning and Evening Peak Traffic Hour Condition: Based on the methodology noted above, operational analysis was performed for the Year 2018, Year 2020 and Year 2040 traffic volumes with traffic signal control. The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 3. The worksheets for the analysis are presented in Attachment B.

Table 3
Scenario 1 - Peak Hour Traffic Condition with Signal Control

| 2018 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  |  | 2018 Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  |  | County <br> Standard Met? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | V/C | LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | v/C |  |
| A | 8.7 | 0.77 | B | 12.2 | 0.85 | Yes |
| 2020 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  |  | 2020 Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  |  | County Standard Met? |
| LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | V/C | LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | v/C |  |
| E | 76.6 | 1.25 | B | 11.0 | 0.82 | No |
| 2040 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  |  | 2040 Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  |  | County <br> Standard Met? |
| LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | v/C | LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | v/C |  |
| F | 116.5 | 1.41 | C | 20.6 | 0.99 | No |

$\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ reported is for the movement with the highest volume to capacity ratio.

Control delay and LOS reported is for intersection. Control Delay = seconds/vehicle (sec/veh)

As shown in Table 3 above, the study location will operate within the County's LOS standard in year 2018 traffic condition during weekday morning and evening peak traffic hours. The intersection is also forecasted to operate within the County's acceptable LOS in year 2020 and year 2040 traffic condition during the weekday evening peak hour; but, not during weekday morning peak traffic hour.
3. Morning and Evening Peak Traffic Hour with Westbound Left-Turns Prohibited: Based on the methodology noted above, operational analysis was performed for the Year 2018, Year 2020 and Year 2040 traffic volumes with westbound left-turns prohibited operation. The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 4 below. As shown in Figures 1 through 3, the left-turn traffic is assumed to
turn right at the intersection and make a series of left and right turns to access southbound NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive. The worksheets for the analysis are presented in Attachment B.

Table 4
Scenario 1 - Peak Hour Traffic Condition with Westbound Left Turns Prohibited

| 2018 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  |  | 2018 Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  |  | County Standard Met? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | v/C | LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | V/C |  |
| E | 49.1 | 0.04 | C | 15.3 | 0.12 | N |
| 2020 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  |  | 2020 Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  |  | County Standard Met? |
| LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | V/C | LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | v/C |  |
| E | 49 | 0.04 | C | 15.7 | 0.13 | N |
| 2040 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  |  | 2040 Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  |  | County Standard Met? |
| LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | v/C | LOS | Control Delay sec/veh | v/C |  |
| F | 118.2 | 0.09 | C | 19.3 | 0.19 | N |

* LOS, Control Delay \& V/C reported are for the movement with the highest delay and worst LOS. Control Delay = seconds/vehicle (sec/veh).

As shown in Table 4 above, the study location will operate within the County's LOS standard in existing year 2018, year 2020 and year 2040 traffic condition during weekday evening peak traffic hours; but, not during weekday morning peak traffic hour.

## B. Signal Warrant Analysis

Year 2020 Traffic Volume: As part of the traffic safety analysis, traffic signal warrants for the study location's year 2020 traffic volume and geometry were evaluated. The purpose of the traffic signal warrants is to provide an indication for when a signal should be installed. Traffic signal warrants are intended to identify the minimum conditions for when a signal might be justified at a particular location. There are nine signal warrants in the MUTCD (Reference 2 ) as listed below:

1) Warrant 1, Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume.
2) Warrant 2, Four-Hour Vehicular Volume.
3) Warrant 3, Peak Hour.
4) Warrant 4, Pedestrian Volume.
5) Warrant 5, School Crossing.
6) Warrant 6, Coordinated Signal System.
7) Warrant 7, Crash Experience.
8) Warrant 8, Roadway Network.
9) Warrant 9, Intersection near a Grade Crossing.

## Signal Warrant 1: Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume

The Eight-Hour Vehicle Volume signal warrant is intended for applications where volume of intersecting traffic is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal, and the volumes are present during at least 8 hours of an average day. This warrant is comprised of two separate conditions. These conditions are Condition A (Minimum Vehicular Volume) and Condition B (Interruption of Continuous Traffic).

As stated in paragraphs 01 and 02 of Section 4C. 01 to 4C. 02 of the MUTCD (Reference 2) "The Minimum Vehicular Volume, Condition A, is intended for application at locations where a large volume of intersecting traffic is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal; and, the Interruption of Continuous Traffic, Condition B, is intended for application at locations where Condition A is not satisfied and where the traffic volume on a major street is so heavy that traffic on a minor intersecting street suffers excessive delay or conflict in entering or crossing the major street.

According to paragraph 03 of the section noted above, "If Condition A is satisfied, then Warrant 1 is satisfied and analyses of Condition B and the combination of Conditions A and B are not needed. Similarly, if Condition B is satisfied, then Warrant 1 is satisfied and an analysis of the combination of Conditions $A$ and $B$ is not needed.

Combination of Conditions $A$ and $B$ may be used if neither Condition $A$ nor Condition $B$ is satisfied and adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay/ inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems. This condition is intended to be used at intersection where the major street speed exceeds 40 mph , or if the intersection is within the built-up area of an isolated community having a population of less than 10,000.

Response: To satisfy the requirements in Condition A, the study location would need to have 600 vehicles per hour on NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive and 150 vehicles per hour on the highest traffic approach on NE Treehill Drive/Driveway. For the study location to meet the requirements in Condition B, 900 vehicles per hour along NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive and 75 vehicles per hour on the approach with the highest traffic volume on NE Treehill Drive/Driveway would be needed.

Combination of Condition A and Condition B was not evaluated as the major street roadway is below 40 mph and the City of Wood Village is not an isolated community as the City is within the Portland Metropolitan area. An isolated community is one that either is a long distance from highly populated settlements or lacks transportation links that are typical in more populated areas. Table 5 summarizes the year 2020 highest eight-hour traffic signal warrant analysis for Condition A and Condition B. The
preliminary signal warrant analysis worksheet for Warrant \#1 is included in Attachment C of this report for reference.

Table 5
Scenario 1 *Year 2020 Highest Eight-Hour Intersection Volume

| Hour | Major Street |  |  | Sum of Major <br> Street <br> Volumes> <br> **600/900? | Minor <br> Street <br> Highest <br> Approach | Sum of Minor <br> Street <br> Volumes > <br> **150/75? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NE 238 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ <br> Drive (NB) | NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive (SB) | Total Vehicles |  | NE Treehill Drive (WB) |  |
| 5:00 PM | 731 | 1144 | 1876 | Yes/Yes | 48 | No/No |
| 4:00 PM | 811 | 1005 | 1816 | Yes/Yes | 42 | No/No |
| 3:00 PM | 794 | 991 | 1785 | Yes/Yes | 31 | No/No |
| 7:00 AM | 1031 | 702 | 1733 | Yes/Yes | 62 | No/No |
| 2:00 PM | 731 | 928 | 1660 | Yes/Yes | 20 | No/No |
| 1:00 PM | 803 | 768 | 1571 | Yes/Yes | 22 | No/No |
| 12:00 PM | 786 | 779 | 1566 | Yes/Yes | 29 | No/No |
| 6:00 PM | 638 | 846 | 1483 | Yes/Yes | 31 | No/No |

*=Year 2018 traffic volumes are projected to Year 2020 traffic volumes by applying 2\% growth
** $=$ Condition A/Condition B
As shown in Table 5, traffic volumes for the major street meets the volume criteria but not the minor street volume criteria for Condition A or Condition B for Year 2020. Based on the analysis, a traffic signal is not justified at this intersection for Warrant 1 due to low volume on the minor street.

## Signal Warrant 2: Four-Hour Vehicular Volume

As stated in paragraph 01 Section 4C. 03 of the MUTCD (Reference 2) "The Four-Hour Vehicular Volume signal warrant conditions are intended to be applied where the volume of intersecting traffic is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic signal. Paragraph 02 of Section 4C. 03 states that "The need for a traffic control signal shall be considered if an engineering study finds that, for each of any 4 hours of an average day, the plotted points representing the vehicles per hour on the major (total of both approaches) and the corresponding vehicles per hour on the higher-volume minor-street approach (one direction only) all fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-1 for the existing combination of approach
lanes. On the minor street, the higher volume shall not be required to be on the same approach during each of these 4 hours.

Figure 4C-1. Warrant 2, Four-Hour Vehicular Volume


Response: As shown on the MUTCD Figure 4C-1 excerpt and Table 5 above, NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive meets the traffic volume for major street volume threshold; however, the highest traffic volume on NE Treehill Drive, does not meet the minor street higher-volume approach threshold. As shown on Figure $4 \mathrm{C}-1$ of MUTCD, 80 vehicles per hour is the lowest threshold volume for an intersection with 2 or more lanes on a major street and one lane on a minor street approach. Because the controlling minor street approach volumes are 62 vehicles per hour or less the required threshold for Signal Warrant 2 is not met.

## Signal Warrant 3: Peak-Hour Vehicular Volume

Paragraph 01 Section 4C. 04 of the MUTCD states that "The peak hour signal warrant is intended for use at a location where traffic conditions are such that for a minimum of 1 hour of an average day, the minorstreet traffic suffers undue delay when entering or crossing the major street. As stated in paragraph 02 of Section 4C. 04 (Reference 2), "This signal warrant shall be applied only in unusual cases, such as office complexes, manufacturing plants, industrial complexes, of high-occupancy vehicle facilities that attract or discharge large numbers of vehicles over a short time."

Response: The study location is a typical local street/minor arterial intersection. Therefore, the peak hour signal warrant does not apply for the study location.

## Signal Warrant 4: Pedestrian Volume

Paragraph 01 Section 4C. 05 of the MUTCD states that "The Pedestrian Volume signal warrant is intended for application where the traffic volume on a major street is so heavy that pedestrians experience excessive delay in crossing the major street." According to Paragraph 02 of this section, "The need for a traffic control signal at an intersection or midblock crossing shall be considered if an engineering study finds that one of the following criteria is met:
A. For each of any 4 hours of an average day, the plotted points representing the vehicles per hour on the major street (total of both approaches) and the corresponding pedestrians per hour crossing the major street (total of all crossings) all fall above the curve in Figure 4C-5; or
B. For 1 hour (any four per hour on the major street (total of both approaches) and the corresponding pedestrians per hour crossing the major street (total of all crossings) falls above the curve in Figure 4C-7.

For major streets with the posted or statuary speed limit or where the 85 -percentile speed exceeds 35 miles per hour (mph), Paragraph 03 of this section in MUTCD provides an option to use Figure 4C-6 rather than Figure 4C-5 to evaluate Criterion A in Paragraph 2, and Figure 4C-8 may be used in place of Figure 4C-7 to evaluate Criterion B in Paragraph 2.

Response: Pedestrian Volume requirement as shown in Figures 4C-5 through Figures 4C-8 in the MUTCD and described above were evaluated against the total traffic volume on NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive and the total pedestrian volume crossing NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive. The 4 highest hour pedestrian traffic crossing NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive and the highest total traffic volumes on both approaches of NE238th Drive during the same 6 hours are presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6
Pedestrian Four-Hour Volume

| Vehicle volumes in veh/hr. and |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Pedestrian volumes in ped/hr. |

As shown in Table 6 above, the number of pedestrians crossing the major street at the study location is significantly lower than the lower threshold volume ( $107 \mathrm{ped} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) in Figures $4 \mathrm{C}-5$ through $4 \mathrm{C}-8$ in the MUTCD manual (Reference 2). Therefore, the installation of a traffic signal control based on this warrant is not justified.

## Signal Warrant 5: School Crossing

Paragraph 01 Section 4C. 06 of the MUTCD states that "The School Crossing signal warrant is intended for application where the fact that school children cross the major street is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal. For the purpose of this warrant, the word "schoolchildren" includes elementary through high school student. "

Response: The study intersection is close to Treehill Day School, a preschool and after school day care. There are not elementary through high school students in close proximity to the intersection. Reynolds High School and Troutdale Elementary School are 1.1 miles and 2.2 miles from the study location, respectively. Based on site the 14 -hour traffic counts and review of the study location, significant number of students are not expected to cross NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Street at this location. Since there is neither an established school crossing nor a large numbers of school children in the study area, Signal Warrant \#5 is not met.

## Signal Warrant 6: Coordinated Signal System

Paragraph 01 Section 4C. 07 of the MUTCD states that "Progressive movement in a coordinated signal system sometimes necessitates installing traffic control signals at intersections where they would not otherwise be needed to maintain proper platooning of vehicles."

This signal warrant should not be applied where the resultant spacing of traffic control signals would be less than 1,000 feet.

Response: A traffic signal control at the study location and the adjacent traffic control signals will not collectively provide a progressive operation. The nearest traffic signal controls are located 350 feet to the north at NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive/NE Arata Road and 3,150 feet south at NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive/NE Glisan Street/SW Cherry Park. Since the resultant spacing of traffic control signals between the study location and NE Arata Road will be less than 1000 feet, Signal Warrant \#6 is not met.

## Signal Warrant 7: Crash Experience

Paragraphs 01 and 02 of Section 4C. 08 of the MUTCD states that "The Crash experience signal warrant conditions are intended for application where the severity and frequency of crashes are the principal reasons to consider installing a traffic control signal. The need for a traffic control signal shall be considered if an engineering study finds that all of the following criteria are met:
A. Adequate trial of alternatives with satisfactory observance and enforcement has failed to reduce the crash frequency; and
B. Five or more reported crashes, of types susceptible to correction by a traffic control signal, have occurred within a 12-month period, each crash involving personal injury or property damage), or apparently exceeding the applicable requirements for a reportable crash; and
C. For each of any 8 hours of an average day, the vehicles per hour (vph) in both of the 80 percent columns of Condition A in Table 4C-1 ( see Section 4C.02), or the vph in both of the 80 percent of Condition B in Table 4C-1 exists on the major-street and the higher-volume minor-street approach, respectively, to the intersection, or the volume of pedestrian traffic is not less than 80 percent of the requirements specified in the Pedestrian Volume warrant. These majorstreet and minor-street volumes shall be for the same 8 hours. On the minor street, the higher volume shall not be required to be on the same approach during each of the 8 hours.

Response: None of the criteria for the installation of a traffic signal based on Signal Warrant 7 is met. Review of crash data at the study intersection did not show crash patterns that can be reduced by the installation of a traffic signal control. There have only been 3 crashes from year 2011 to year 2015 (most recent five-year records) as shown in the attached crash report from ODOT. Of the 3 crashes that occurred, two crashes were rear-end type and the third crash was fixed object type. One rear-end crash involving vehicles traveling from south to north occurred in year 2011. The fixed object and the other rearend crash involving vehicles traveling from north to south occurred in 2015. The rear-end crash types are caused by drivers' failure to stop to avoid a parked or stopped vehicle and the fixed-object crash type is caused by a motorist driving at high speed.

Possible rear-end and fixed-object type crash reduction strategies include improving sight distance, installation of speed feedback signs, removal of unwarranted traffic signal control, speed enforcement and others depending on the crash type patterns at the study locations.

Table 7
Crash Experience

| Criteria |  | Fulfilled? <br> Yes | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |$|$

As shown in the Crash Experience summary table 7 above, none of the criteria listed above are met. Thus, a traffic signal is not justified at the study intersection based on this warrant.

## Warrant \#8: Roadway Network

Paragraph 01 of Section 4C. 09 of the MUTCD states that "Installing a traffic control signal at some intersections might be justified to encourage concentration and organization of traffic flow on a roadway network.

In addition, paragraph 02 of Section 4C. 09 of MUTCD states that "The need for a traffic control signal shall be considered if an engineering study finds that the common intersection of two or more major routes meets one or both of the following criteria:
A. The intersection has a total existing, or immediately projected, entering volume of at least 1,000 vehicles per hour during the peak hour of a typical weekday and has a five-year projected traffic volume, based on an engineering study, that meet one or more of Warrants 1,2 , and 3 during an average weekday; or
B. The intersection has a total existing or immediately projected entering volume of at least 1,000 vehicles per hour for each of any 5 hours of a non-normal business day (Saturday or Sunday)."

Response: The total entering volume of 1876 vehicles per hour at the study intersection currently exceeds the 1,000 entering vehicle thresholds for this warrant; however, the study location is not a common intersection of two or more major routes. NE Treehill Drive is a local street with poor street connectivity and it is not defined as a "major route" that would meet the intention of this warrant. A "major route" is the route with higher volume of traffic and with good street connectivity. Thus, a traffic signal is not justified at the study intersection based on this warrant.

## Warrant \#9: Intersection near a Grade Crossing

The Intersection near a Grade Crossing signal warrant is intended for use at a location where none of the conditions described in the other eight traffic warrants are met, but the proximity to the intersection of a grade crossing on an intersection approach controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic signal.

Response: The nearest railroad is approximately located 2,200 feet from the study location and passes under the NE 238th Street at I-84 Ramps. Since the study intersection is not near a grade crossing, Signal Warrant 9 is not met.

## Signal Warrant Findings

The signal warrant analysis review at the intersection of NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive and NE Treehill Drive identified that MUTCD Signal Warrants are not forecasted to be met for the year 2020 traffic condition.

Year 2040 Traffic Volume: Traffic signal warrants for the study location's Year 2040 traffic condition were evaluated consistent with the State of Oregon administrative rule (OAR 734-020-0460 (1). According to this administrative rule, only MUTCD Warrant 1 Case A and Case B will be used to project future needs for traffic signals beyond three years from the present time (Corrected to reflect numbering used in the Millennium Edition of the MUTCD). The ODOT Preliminary Signal Warrant (PWS) analysis worksheet was used to forecast year 2040 traffic signal need of the study intersection.

Per the ODOT Analysis Procedure Manual (AMP), version 1 (Reference 4), guidelines, the major street ADT count total volume approaching from both directions, including all turn movements, and the ADT counts for the highest approaching volume minus the right turning traffic volume on one direction of the minor street are included in the PWS analysis. According to the APM guidelines, right turning volumes of the highest approaching volume from a shared left-through-right lane are not included in the minor street ADT if the right-turn demand is less than $85 \%$ of the shared lane capacity for un-signalized intersection.

Consistent with the APM guidelines, none of the right turning volume from the highest volume approach from the westbound shared left-through-right lane are included. As shown in the Year 2040 Synchro unsignalized capacity analysis output in Attachment B, the minor street highest approach volume (westbound) lane capacity is 162 . The right turn discount for this intersection is $138(85 \% \times 162)$. As shown in the worksheet in Attachment B, the right-turn demand ( $27-138=-111$ ) is less than $85 \%$ of the of the shared lane capacity of the westbound approach.

The average daily traffic (ADT) that is shown in the PSW sheet is estimated by applying the K-factor to the evening peak hour traffic. The worksheet is included in Attachment B for reference. The K-factor, defined as the ratio of the design hour traffic (which is approximately equal to the evening peak hour traffic in urban areas) to the ADT was calculated using year 2040 ADT volumes and peak hour traffic volumes provided by Metro. The ADT and peak hour traffic volume work sheet is in Attachment A. As shown in the PSW worksheet, a traffic signal based on Year 2040 traffic volume conditions is not justified.

Based on the above analysis, none of the traffic signal warrant criteria will be satisfied through year 2040 traffic condition.

## Scenario 2 - Existing street condition with NE Hawthorne Avenue to NE Treehill Drive connection

## A. Intersection Capacity Analysis

The following section evaluates the study location's LOS with NE Treehill Drive to NE Hawthorne Avenue connection. Based on engineering judgement and knowledge of the study area's vicinity, it is anticipated that:

- Trips generated by residential development (approximately 10 single-family) near the intersection of NE Hawthorne Avenue/NE Treehill Drive are likely to use NE Treehill Drive to access NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive. Currently, trips from this development turn left on NE Maple Boulevard at its intersection with NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive/NE Arata Road to travel southbound on NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive.
- Approximately 10 trips for each of the morning and evening peak traffic hour will be generated by the single-family dwelling units. The trips generated by the 10 single-family dwelling units were estimated based on trip rates for Single-Family dwelling units (Land-use code \#210) obtained from the Trip Generation Manual, $9^{\text {th }}$ Edition (Reference 5) published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. The results of the calculation are summarized in Table 8 below.

Table 8
Trip Estimate Calculation Summary

| Morning Peak Hour |  |  | Afternoon Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total | Total |
| $(10) * 0.25=2$ | $(10) * 0.75=8$ | 10 | $(10) * 0.63=6$ | $(10) * 0.37=4$ | 10 | 100 |

Trip distribution pattern for the additional trips at the study location was determined based on the existing turn movement counts, knowledge of existing land uses and engineering judgement. It is expected that 100\% of the new trips generated by the NE Hawthorn Avenue/NE Treehill Drive connection will travel on NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive with:

- $67 \%$ turning right from westbound NE Treehill Drive to NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive;
- 66\% turning left from southbound NE 238 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Drive to NE Treehill Drive;
- $33 \%$ turning left from westbound NE Treehill Drive to NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive; and,
- $34 \%$ from northbound NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive to NE Treehill Drive.

The number of trips assigned to each movement and the trip distribution percentages are presented in Figure 4 below.

The additional trips were added to the existing condition trips in Figures 2 and 3 in Scenario-1. The projected Year 2020 and Year 2040 plus the new trips at the study location are presented in Figures 5 and 6 below. Operational analysis assuming stop control, traffic signal control and right-in/right-out control for the total traffic volumes in Figures 5 and 6 was performed to assess the impact of connecting NE Treehill Drive to NE Hawthorne Road as described below.
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Figure 5: Future Year 2020 Volume plus New Trips
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Figure 6: Future Year 2040 Volume plus New Trips

1. Scenario 2 - Stop Controlled Morning and Evening Peak Traffic Hour Volume Condition: Based on the above methodology, operational analysis was performed for future year 2020 and year 2040 total traffic volumes (Figures 5 and 6) with stop sign control. The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 9. The worksheets for the analysis are presented in Attachment C.

Table 9
Peak Hour Traffic Condition with Stop Sign Control

| 2020 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  | 2020 Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  |  | County <br> Standard <br> Met? |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | Control Delay <br> sec/veh | V/C | LOS | Control Delay <br> sec/veh | V/C |  |  |
| E | 47.4 | 0.5 | E | 48.6 | 0.40 | N |  |
| 2040 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | Control Delay <br> sec/veh | V/C | LOS | Control Delay <br> sec/veh | V/C |  |  |
| F | 144.8 | 0.93 | F | 126.8 | 0.77 | N |  |

* LOS, Control Delay \& V/C reported are for the movement with the highest delay and worst LOS. Control Delay = seconds/vehicle (sec/veh).

As shown in Table 9, under this Scenario year 2020 and year 2040 weekday morning and evening peak traffic hour, the intersection will not operate within the County's acceptable LOS with stop-sign control.
2. Scenario 2- Signal Controlled Morning and Evening Peak Traffic Hour Condition: Based on the methodology noted above, operational analysis was performed for projected year 2020 and year 2040 total traffic volumes (in Figures 5 and 6 ) with traffic signal-control. The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 10. The worksheets for the analysis are presented in Attachment C .

Table 10
Scenario 2 - Peak Hour Traffic Condition with Signal Control

| 2020 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  | County Standard <br> Met? |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | Control Delay <br> Sec/Veh | V/C | LOS | Control Delay <br> Sec/Veh | V/C |  |
| E | 79.2 | 1.26 | B | 11.2 | 0.82 | N |


| 2040 Weekday AM Peak Traffic | 2040 Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  | County Standard <br> Met? |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | Control Delay <br> Sec/Veh | V/C | LOS | Control Delay <br> Sec/Veh | V/C |  |
| F | 118.5 | 1.41 | C | 29.2 | 1.06 | N |

V/C reported is for the movement with the highest volume to capacity ratio.

Control delay and LOS reported is for intersection. Control Delay = seconds/vehicle (sec/veh)

With installation of a traffic signal control, the study location is projected to operate within the County's acceptable LOS standard in year 2020 and year 2040 during evening peak traffic hour conditions as shown in Table 10 above. In year 2020 and year 2040 morning peak traffic hour condition, the signalized intersection is projected not to operate within the County's acceptable LOS standard.
3. Scenario 2 - Morning and Evening Peak Traffic Hour with Westbound Left-Turns Prohibited: Based on the methodology noted above, operational analysis was performed for projected year 2020 and year 2040 total traffic volumes (in Figures 5 and 6) with westbound left-turns prohibited operation. The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 11 below. As shown in Figures 5 and 6, the left-turn traffic is assumed to turn right at the intersection and make a series of left and right turns elsewhere to travel southbound on NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive. The worksheets for the analysis are presented in Attachment C.

Table 11
Scenario 2 - Peak Hour Traffic Condition with Westbound Left-Turns Prohibited

| 2020 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  |  | 2020 Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  |  | County Standard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | Control Delay Sec/Veh | V/C | LOS | Control Delay Sec/Veh | V/C |  |
| F | 51.9 | 0.04 | C | 15.8 | 0.14 | N |
| 2040 Weekday AM Peak Traffic |  |  | 2040 Weekday PM Peak Traffic |  |  | County Standard Met? |
| LOS | Control Delay Sec/Veh | V/C | LOS | Control Delay Sec/Veh | V/C |  |
| F | 144.3 | 0.11 | C | 19.4 | 0.21 | N |

[^1]Under Scenario 2, the study location is forecast to operate within the County's acceptable LOS standard in Year 2020 and Year 2040 evening peak traffic hour with westbound left-turn prohibit; but, not during the morning peak traffic hour. As shown in Table 11 above, in Year 2020 and Year 2040 the intersection is projected to operate at LOS " F " during the morning peak traffic hour and at LOS " C " during the evening peak traffic hours.

## B. Signal Warrant Analysis with NE Treehill Drive to NE Hawthorne Road Connection

Year 2020 Traffic Volume: Traffic signal warrants 1 and 2 described above were reevaluated to determine the need for traffic signal at the study location after NE Treehill Drive is connected to NE Hawthorne Road. All other warrants will not be impact by the NE Treehill Drive to NE Hawthorne Road connection as the volume of the intersecting traffic is not the principal reason to consider installing a traffic signal based on those warrants.

Signal warrants 1 and 2 were reevaluated based on the assumption that the NE Treehill Drive to NE Hawthorne Road connection will result on 100 new vehicles per day and that all new trips will occur during the eight highest traffic hours as shown in the worksheet in Appendix C .

Warrant \#1: The projected traffic signal need for the Year 2020 eight-hour volume with the new trips are summarized in Table 12 below.

Table 12
Scenario 2 *Year 2020 Highest Eight-Hour Intersection Volume

| Hour | Major Street |  |  | Sum of Major Street Volumes> **600/900? | Minor Street Highest Approach | Sum of Minor Street Volumes > **150/75? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NE 238 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ <br> Drive <br> (NB) | NE 238 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ <br> Drive <br> (SB) | Total Vehicles |  | NE Treehill Drive (WB) |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 5:00 } \\ \text { PM } \end{gathered}$ | 731 | 1144 | 1876 | Yes/Yes | 64 | No/No |
| $\begin{gathered} 4: 00 \\ \text { PM } \end{gathered}$ | 811 | 1005 | 1816 | Yes/Yes | 57 | No/No |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 3:00 } \\ \text { PM } \end{gathered}$ | 794 | 991 | 1785 | Yes/Yes | 42 | No/No |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7: 00 \\ & \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ | 1031 | 702 | 1733 | Yes/Yes | 84 | No/Yes |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2:00 } \\ \text { PM } \end{gathered}$ | 731 | 928 | 1660 | Yes/Yes | 27 | No/No |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 1:00 } \\ \text { PM } \end{gathered}$ | 803 | 768 | 1571 | Yes/Yes | 30 | No/No |
| $\begin{gathered} 12: 00 \\ \text { PM } \end{gathered}$ | 786 | 779 | 1566 | Yes/Yes | 39 | No/No |
| $\begin{gathered} 6: 00 \\ \text { PM } \end{gathered}$ | 638 | 846 | 1483 | Yes/Yes | 42 | No/No |

** $=$ Condition A/Condition B

As shown in Table 12, the traffic volume criteria for the installation of a traffic signal control based on Condition A is not justified because the traffic on the minor street highest volume approach is less than 150 vehicles per hour during the eight highest hours. The maximum traffic volume for the minor street highest volume approach during the morning peak traffic hour is 84 vehicles per hour. The traffic volume criteria for the installation of a traffic signal based on Condition B is forecast to be justified during the morning peak hour traffic only. Therefore, a traffic signal control at this intersection is not forecasted to be justified based on this warrant with the additional new trips.

Warrant \#2: As shown on Table 12 above, the maximum traffic volume for the minor street highest volume approach (westbound) during the morning peak traffic hour is forecast to be 84 vph ; and 64 vph or less during the remaining seven of the eight highest hours. As shown on Figure 4C-1 of the MUTCD excerpt on page 9 of this report, 80 vph is the lowest threshold volume for an intersection with 2 or more lanes on a major street and one lane on a minor street approach. Because the controlling minor street approach volume ( 64 vph or less) for seven of the eight highest hours is below the required threshold, Warrant \#2 is not met with the additional new trips.

Year 2040 Traffic Volume: MUTCD Warrant 1 Case A and Case B were reevaluated using the ODOT Preliminary Signal Warrant (PWS) analysis worksheet and the procedure discussed above under year 2040 traffic condition signal need for Scenario 1. As in Scenario 1, the right turning volume from the highest volume approach on the westbound shared left-through-right lane are not included. Based on information contained in the year 2040 un-signalized capacity analysis Synchro output for the evening peak traffic hour, the minor street lane capacity is 56 vph and the right-turn discount for the approach is estimated to be 48 vph ( $85 \%$ $x 56)$. Because the right-turn demand $(30-48=-18)$ is less than $85 \%$ of the shared lane capacity of the westbound approach, right-turns for the signal analysis are not included.

The worksheets for the right-turn discount and signal analysis are included in Attachment C. As shown in the PSW worksheet, a traffic signal based on year 2040 traffic volume conditions is not justified for Scenario - 2.

## Findings

The analysis resulted in the following findings:

## Scenario 1 -Existing Condition

- With stop sign control, the study intersection is forecasted to operate at a LOS "E" or worse under year 2018, year 2020 and year 2040 weekday morning and evening peak hour traffic conditions. The poor LOS at the intersection is due to high delay experienced by traffic entering NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive from the eastbound and westbound approaches. Review of the intersection analysis output reveals that the intersection's performance can be improved to the Multnomah County's acceptable LOS "D" by adding a northbound through lane on NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive through the NE Treehill Drive intersection.
- With traffic signal control, the study intersection is forecasted to operate at LOS "C" or better during the morning and evening peak hours for all study periods except during weekday morning peak hour under year 2020 and year 2040 conditions. Under year 2020 and year 2040 morning peak traffic hour condition the intersection is forecasted to operate at LOS " E " and " F ", respectively. The poor LOS is due to insufficient capacity on the northbound approach. The northbound approach is forecasted to operate at LOS " F ". To improve the intersection's performance a northbound through lane on NE $2388^{\text {th }}$ Drive through NE Treehill Drive intersection will need to be added.
- With westbound left-turn prohibited, the intersection is forecasted to operate within the County's LOS standard in year 2018, year 2020 and year 2040 traffic conditions during weekday evening peak traffic hours; but, not during weekday morning peak traffic hours. The poor LOS at the intersection is due to high delay experienced by traffic entering NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive from the eastbound and westbound approaches. This intersection's performance can be improved to the Multnomah County's acceptable LOS " D " by adding a northbound through lane on NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive.
- The study intersection does not meet any of the MUTCD signal warrants under Scenario 1 in year 2020 and year 2040 traffic condition.


## Scenario 2 - Existing Condition with NE Treehill Drive/NE Hawthorne Avenue Connection

- With stop sign control, the NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive/NE Treehill Drive is forecasted to operate at a LOS "E" or worse under year 2020 and year 2040 morning and evening peak traffic hour conditions. The poor LOS at the intersection is due to high delay experienced by traffic entering NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive from the eastbound and westbound approaches. This intersection's performance can be improved to the Multnomah County's acceptable LOS "D" by adding a northbound through lane on NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive through the NE Treehill Drive Intersection.
- With traffic signal Control, the study intersection is forecasted to operate at LOS "C" or better during the evening peak traffic hour conditions. Under year 2020 and year 2040 morning peak traffic hour condition the intersection is forecasted to operate at LOS " E " and " $F$ ", respectively. The poor LOS is due to insufficient capacity on the northbound approach. The northbound approach is forecasted to operate at LOS " F ". To improve the intersection's performance a northbound through lane will need to be added.
- With westbound left-turn prohibited, the intersection is forecasted to operate at the County's acceptable LOS standard in Year 2020 and Year 2040 evening peak traffic hour; but not during the morning peak traffic condition. To improve the intersection's performance a northbound through lane on NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive through NE Treehill Drive intersection will need to be added.
- The study intersection does not meet any of the MUTCD signal warrants under Scenario 2 in year 2020 and year 2040 traffic conditions.


## CONCLUSIONS

The intersection of NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive and NE Treehill Drive does not meet traffic signal warrant criteria through 2040 traffic conditions, with and without the connection to NE Hawthorne Avenue. With westbound leftturn prohibited, the study intersection is forecasted to operate at the County's operational standard during weekday evening peak traffic hours; but, not during weekday morning peak traffic hours. While with the westbound left-turn prohibited the intersection does not fully meet the County's operational standard, its operation is better than with the condition that allows left turns out of NE Treehill Drive. To fully meet the intersection operational standard (LOS "D") from "Multnomah County Design and Construction Manual", a second northbound through lane on NE $238^{\text {th }}$ Drive through the NE Treehill Drive intersection would be required.

We believe the above analysis, adequately address the safety and capacity concerns. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us at (541) 680-3411.
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ATTACHMENT A
VICINITY MAP ADT/ANNUAL GROWTH RATE/K-FACTOR TRAFFIC COUNTS \& PROJECT YEAR 202 0/ YEAR 2040 VOLUMES

## VICINITY MAP




| Existing Eight Highest Hours |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hour Beginning | Major Street |  |  |  |  | Minor Street |  |  |
|  | NE 238th Drive (NB) | NE 238th <br> Drive (NB <br> RT) | NE 238th Drive (SB) | NE 238th Drive (SB LT) | Total | NE <br> Treehill Drive (WB LT) | NE Treehill Drive (WB RT) | Total WB LT |
| 5:00 PM | 698 | 19 | 1067 | 55 | 1839 | 25 | 22 | 25 |
| 4:00 PM | 772 | 23 | 955 | 30 | 1780 | 14 | 28 | 14 |
| 3:00 PM | 759 | 19 | 944 | 28 | 1750 | 12 | 19 | 12 |
| 7:00 AM | 1003 | 8 | 662 | 26 | 1699 | 14 | 48 | 14 |
| 2:00 PM | 706 | 11 | 898 | 12 | 1627 | 8 | 12 | 8 |
| 1:00 PM | 779 | 8 | 739 | 14 | 1540 | 5 | 17 | 5 |
| 12:00 PM | 766 | 5 | 746 | 18 | 1535 | 6 | 23 | 6 |
| 6:00 PM | 610 | 15 | 803 | 26 | 1454 | 11 | 20 | 11 |

2- year growth 1.02

Project Year 2020 Eight Highest Hours ( Existing Year Plus 2\%)

| Hour Beginning | Major Street |  |  |  |  | Minor Street Highest Approach |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NE 238th Drive (NB) | NE 238th <br> Drive (NB <br> RT) | NE 238th Drive (SB) | NE 238th Drive (SB LT) | Total | NE <br> Treehill Drive (WB LT) | NE Treehill <br> Drive <br> (WB RT) | Total WB |
| 5:00 PM | 712 | 19 | 1088 | 56 | 1876 | 26 | 22 | 48 |
| 4:00 PM | 787 | 23 | 974 | 31 | 1816 | 14 | 28 | 42 |
| 3:00 PM | 774 | 19 | 963 | 29 | 1785 | 12 | 19 | 31 |
| 7:00 AM | 1023 | 8 | 675 | 27 | 1733 | 14 | 48 | 62 |
| 2:00 PM | 720 | 11 | 916 | 12 | 1660 | 8 | 12 | 20 |
| 1:00 PM | 795 | 8 | 754 | 14 | 1571 | 5 | 17 | 22 |
| 12:00 PM | 781 | 5 | 761 | 18 | 1566 | 6 | 23 | 29 |
| 6:00 PM | 622 | 15 | 819 | 27 | 1483 | 11 | 20 | 31 |





|  | 2027 ADT |  |  |  | 2027 Truck Peak Hour |  |  |  | 2027 PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Passenger } \\ \text { Cars } \end{gathered}$ | Medium Trucks | Heavy Trucks | Total | Passenger Cars | Medium Trucks | Heavy Trucks | Total | Passenger Cars | Medium Trucks | Heavy Trucks |
| Northbound | 8667 | 8562 | 36 | 69 |  |  | 3 | 3 |  | 534 |  |  |
| Southbound | 14446 | 14133 | 97 | 216 |  |  | 6 | 13 |  | 1050 |  |  |
| Both Directions | 23113 | 22695 | 133 | 285 |  |  | 9 | 16 |  | 1584 |  |  |


|  | 2040 ADT |  |  |  | 2040 Truck Peak Hour |  |  |  | 2040 PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Passenger Cars | Medium Trucks | Heavy Trucks | Total | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Passenger } \\ \text { Cars } \end{array}$ | Medium Trucks | Heavy Trucks | Total | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Passenger } \\ \text { Cars } \end{array}$ | Medium Trucks | Heavy Trucks |
| Northbound | 9378 | 9199 | 60 | 119 |  |  | 6 | 6 |  | 552 |  |  |
| Southbound | 15409 | 14947 | 140 | 322 |  |  | 10 | 22 |  | 1106 |  |  |
| Both Directions | 24787 | 24146 | 200 | 441 |  |  | 16 | 28 |  | 1658 |  |  |


|  |  | K-Factor <br> (Ratio of |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour |  |  |


| 11.50 | 12 | 1.0 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13.22 | 12 | 1.1 |  |
| 12.57 | 12 | 1.0 | 14 |


| 20.65 | 25 | 0.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20.77 | 25 | 0.8 |
| 20.72 | 25 | 0.8 |

ATTACHMENT B

## SCENARIO 1- EXISTING STREET CONDITION SYNCHRO WORKSHEET ODOT CRASH DATA RECORDS

RIGHT TURN VOLUME DISCOUNT WORKSHEET ODOT PRELIMINARY SIGNAL WARRANT WORKSHEET







| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  | 7 | $\hat{1}$ |  | 7 | 个 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 715 | 20 | 55 | 1085 | 5 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 715 | 20 | 55 | 1085 | 5 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control S | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - |  | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1000 | - | - | 1000 | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| Mumt Flow | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 22 | 5 | 777 | 22 | 60 | 1179 | 5 |  |







|  | 4 |  | 7 | 7 |  | 4 | $4$ | 4 | \% | $\pm$ | $\downarrow$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 1005 | 10 | 25 | 660 | 0 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 1005 | 10 | 25 | 660 | 0 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1841 | 1841 | 1841 | 1826 | 1826 | 1826 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 1104 | 11 | 27 | 725 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Cap, veh/h | 2 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 0 | 75 | 80 | 1429 | 14 | 304 | 2724 | 0 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 557 | 0 | 1114 | 361 | 0 | 1242 | 717 | 1819 | 18 | 493 | 3561 | 0 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 3 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1115 | 27 | 725 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 1672 | 0 | 0 | 1604 | 0 | 0 | 717 | 0 | 1837 | 493 | 1735 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 29.7 | 2.8 | 5.1 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 29.7 | 32.6 | 5.1 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.33 |  | 0.67 | 0.23 |  | 0.77 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 7 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 1443 | 304 | 2724 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.73 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.77 | 0.09 | 0.27 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 335 | 0 | 0 | 322 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 1443 | 304 | 2724 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 44.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 41.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 14.2 | 2.6 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 40.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 84.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 51.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 14.7 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | A | A | D | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 3 |  |  | 71 |  |  | 1115 |  |  | 752 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 84.9 |  |  | 51.7 |  |  | 9.3 |  |  | 3.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | D |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R c$ ), $s$ |  | 75.0 |  | 4.9 |  | 75.0 |  | 9.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 70.5 |  | 18.0 |  | 70.5 |  | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l1), s |  | 31.7 |  | 2.2 |  | 34.6 |  | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 12.9 |  | 0.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 8.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | * |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | * | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 700 | 20 | 55 | 1065 | 5 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 700 | 20 | 55 | 1065 | 5 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1841 | 1841 | 1841 | 1856 | 1856 | 1856 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 22 | 5 | 753 | 22 | 59 | 1145 | 5 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Cap, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 5 | 60 | 0 | 49 | 359 | 888 | 26 | 322 | 1796 | 8 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1610 | 923 | 0 | 752 | 481 | 1779 | 52 | 690 | 3600 | 16 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 775 | 59 | 561 | 589 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 0 | 0 | 1610 | 1675 | 0 | 0 | 481 | 0 | 1831 | 690 | 1763 | 1853 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 2.5 | 7.3 | 7.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 13.9 | 7.3 | 7.3 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.55 |  | 0.45 | 1.00 |  | 0.03 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 5 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 359 | 0 | 914 | 322 | 879 | 924 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.85 | 0.18 | 0.64 | 0.64 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 803 | 836 | 0 | 0 | 359 | 0 | 914 | 322 | 879 | 924 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.5 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 6.8 | 12.8 | 5.7 | 5.7 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.1 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 1.2 | 3.5 | 3.4 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.6 | 16.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 14.1 | 9.2 | 9.1 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | C | B | A | A | A | A | B | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1 |  |  | 49 |  |  | 780 |  |  | 1209 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 32.6 |  |  | 16.9 |  |  | 16.4 |  |  | 9.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 20.0 | 4.5 | 20.0 | 6.5 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 13.4 | 2.0 | 15.9 | 2.9 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 12.2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | B |

## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

|  | 4 |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  | \% | $\hat{\square}$ |  | \% | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 1025 | 10 | 25 | 670 | 0 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 1025 | 10 | 25 | 670 | 0 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1841 | 1841 | 1841 | 1826 | 1826 | 1826 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 1114 | 11 | 27 | 728 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | - | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Cap, veh/h | 2 | 0 | 5 | 28 | 0 | 95 | 228 | 894 | 9 | 228 | 1705 | 0 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 557 | 0 | 1114 | 370 | 0 | 1248 | 715 | 1820 | 18 | 489 | 3561 | 0 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 3 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1125 | 27 | 728 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1672 | 0 | 0 | 1618 | 0 | 0 | 715 | 0 | 1837 | 489 | 1735 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 4.3 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.33 |  | 0.67 | 0.23 |  | 0.77 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 7 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 228 | 0 | 903 | 228 | 1705 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio( X ) | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.57 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.25 | 0.12 | 0.43 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 821 | 0 | 0 | 795 | 0 | 0 | 228 | 0 | 903 | 228 | 1705 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 15.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 15.8 | 5.2 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 38.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 119.9 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.5 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 53.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 127.9 | 16.0 | 5.3 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | F | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 3 |  |  | 70 |  |  | 1125 |  |  | 755 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 53.8 |  |  | 18.1 |  |  | 127.9 |  |  | 5.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |  | A |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 20.0 |  | 4.6 |  | 20.0 |  | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 15.5 |  | 15.5 |  | 15.5 |  | 15.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s |  | 17.5 |  | 2.1 |  | 17.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 76.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | ${ }_{\$}$ |  | \% | F |  | \% | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 715 | 20 | 55 | 1085 | 5 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 715 | 20 | 55 | 1085 | 5 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1841 | 1841 | 1841 | 1856 | 1856 | 1856 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 22 | 5 | 777 | 22 | 60 | 1179 | 5 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Cap, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 5 | 61 | 0 | 49 | 356 | 949 | 27 | 329 | 1919 | 8 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1610 | 922 | 0 | 751 | 466 | 1781 | 50 | 675 | 3600 | 15 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 799 | 60 | 577 | 607 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 0 | 0 | 1610 | 1674 | 0 | 0 | 466 | 0 | 1832 | 675 | 1763 | 1853 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 12.2 | 2.7 | 7.7 | 7.7 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 12.2 | 14.9 | 7.7 | 7.7 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.55 |  | 0.45 | 1.00 |  | 0.03 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 5 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 356 | 0 | 976 | 329 | 940 | 988 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.82 | 0.18 | 0.61 | 0.61 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 858 | 892 | 0 | 0 | 356 | 0 | 976 | 329 | 940 | 988 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(1) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.8 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 12.7 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.5 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%oile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 37.3 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 14.1 | 13.9 | 8.5 | 8.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | D | B | A | A | A | A | B | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1 |  |  | 49 |  |  | 804 |  |  | 1244 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 37.3 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 14.1 |  |  | 8.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 22.5 | 4.5 | 22.5 | 6.7 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 14.2 | 2.0 | 16.9 | 3.0 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 11.0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | $B$ |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\cdots$ | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 | , | $\frac{1}{1}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | * |  | ${ }^{1}$ | F |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 1225 | 10 | 30 | 805 | 0 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 1225 | 10 | 30 | 805 | 0 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1841 | 1841 | 1841 | 1826 | 1826 | 1826 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 1332 | 11 | 33 | 875 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Cap, veh/h | 2 | 0 | 5 | 35 | 0 | 104 | 208 | 948 | 8 | 208 | 1804 | 0 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 557 | 0 | 1114 | 410 | 0 | 1212 | 624 | 1823 | 15 | 397 | 3561 | 0 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 3 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1343 | 33 | 875 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 1672 | 0 | 0 | 1622 | 0 | 0 | 624 | 0 | 1838 | 397 | 1735 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.33 |  | 0.67 | 0.25 |  | 0.75 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 7 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 208 | 0 | 956 | 208 | 1804 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.62 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.41 | 0.16 | 0.49 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 869 | 0 | 0 | 843 | 0 | 0 | 208 | 0 | 956 | 208 | 1804 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 17.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 17.3 | 5.3 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 38.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 188.8 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 53.1 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 55.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 197.1 | 18.9 | 6.3 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | F | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 3 |  |  | 87 |  |  | 1343 |  |  | 908 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 55.4 |  |  | 19.8 |  |  | 197.1 |  |  | 6.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |  | A |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s |  | 22.5 |  | 4.6 |  | 22.5 |  | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 18.0 |  | 18.0 |  | 18.0 |  | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 20.0 |  | 2.1 |  | 20.0 |  | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 116.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 2040 PM Signal Control

2: NE 238th Drive \& Driveway/NE Treehill Dr
08/01/2018

|  | 4 |  | 7 | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | \% |  | $\downarrow$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 25 | 5 | 855 | 25 | 65 | 1300 | 5 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 25 | 5 | 855 | 25 | 65 | 1300 | 5 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1841 | 1841 | 1841 | 1856 | 1856 | 1856 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 27 | 5 | 929 | 27 | 71 | 1413 | 5 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Cap, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 5 | 69 | 0 | 56 | 294 | 940 | 27 | 218 | 1902 | 7 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1610 | 920 | 0 | 753 | 373 | 1780 | 52 | 583 | 3603 | 13 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 956 | 71 | 691 | 727 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 0 | 0 | 1610 | 1673 | 0 | 0 | 373 | 0 | 1831 | 583 | 1763 | 1853 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 17.6 | 0.4 | 10.4 | 10.4 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 17.6 | 18.0 | 10.4 | 10.4 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.55 |  | 0.45 | 1.00 |  | 0.03 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 5 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 294 | 0 | 967 | 218 | 931 | 978 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.48 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.32 | 0.74 | 0.74 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 850 | 884 | 0 | 0 | 294 | 0 | 967 | 218 | 931 | 978 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.0 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 17.0 | 6.2 | 6.2 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.9 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 26.3 | 3.9 | 5.3 | 5.1 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 37.9 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 34.3 | 20.9 | 11.6 | 11.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | D | B | A | A | B | A | C | C | B | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 961 |  |  | 1489 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 37.9 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 34.2 |  |  | 11.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R c$ ), $s$ |  | 22.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 22.5 |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 18.0 |  | 18.0 |  | 18.0 |  | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l1), s |  | 19.6 |  | 2.0 |  | 20.0 |  | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 20.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  |  | F | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 5 | 700 | 20 | 55 | 1065 | 5 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 5 | 700 | 20 | 55 | 1065 | 5 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 5 | 753 | 22 | 59 | 1145 | 5 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  |  | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{1}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 5 | 715 | 20 | 55 | 1085 | 5 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 5 | 715 | 20 | 55 | 1085 | 5 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - |  | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1000 | - |  | 1000 | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  | 0 |  | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 5 | 777 | 22 | 60 | 1179 | 5 |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  |  | 「 | \% | $\hat{1}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 中 ${ }_{\text {d }}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 1225 | 10 | 30 | 805 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 1225 | 10 | 30 | 805 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - |  | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1000 | - |  | 1000 | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 1332 | 11 | 33 | 875 | 0 |  |





CRASH SUMMARIES BY YEAR BY COLLISION TYPE
NE 238th Dr \& NE Treehill Dr
January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2015

| COLLISION TYPE | FATAL CRASHES | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NON- } \\ \text { FATAL } \\ \text { CRASHES } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY | TOTAL CRASHES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PEOPLE } \\ & \text { KILLED } \end{aligned}$ | PEOPLE INJURED | TRUCKS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DRY } \\ & \text { SURF } \end{aligned}$ | WET SURF | DAY | DARK | INTERSECTION | INTERSECTION RELATED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OFF- } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR: 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FIXED / OTHER OBJECT | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| REAR-END | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2015 TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| YEAR: 2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAR-END | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| FINAL TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 |

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.

Project Year 2040 PM Peak Traffic Hour (Existing Year Plus 22\%)

$\left.$|  | Major Street |  |  |  | Minor Street |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hour Beginning | NE 238th <br> Drive (NB) | NE 238th <br> Drive (NB <br> RT) | NE 238th <br> Drive (SB) | NE 238th <br> Drive <br> (SB LT) | Total | Treehill <br> Drive <br> (WB LT) | NE <br> Treehill <br> Drive (WB <br> RT) | | Total WB |
| :---: |
| LT | \right\rvert\,

## Right-turn Volume Discount

Shared left-through-right lane capacity $=162$
Right-turn discount $=0.85 \times 162=138$
Right-turn volume $=27$
Right -turn volume to include $=27-138=-111$

> Minor
> Minor Approach K factor: $\square$
> ${ }^{1}$ Capacity obtained from unsignalized intersection analysis
> For guidance on preliminary signal warrant analysis, refer to the Analysis Procedures Manual.
> Last Updated: February 2009

| Oregon Department of Transportation <br> Transportation Development Branch <br> Transportation Planning Analysis Unit |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Preliminary Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major Street: NE 238th Drive |  |  | Minor Street: NE Treehill Drive |  |  |
| Project: | NE 238th Dr/NE Dr Traffic Ar |  | City/County: Multnomah County |  |  |
| Year: | 2040 |  | Alternative: Existing Condition |  |  |
| Preliminary Signal Warrant Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Approach lanes |  | ADT on major street approaching from both directions |  | ADT on minor street, highest approaching volume |  |
| Major | Minor | Percent of standard warrants |  | Percent of standard warrants |  |
| Street | Street | 100 | 70 | 100 | 70 |
| Case A: Minimum Vehicular Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 8850 | 6200 | 2650 | 1850 |
| 2 or more | 1 | 10600 | 7400 | 2650 | 1850 |
| 2 or more | 2 or more | 10600 | 7400 | 3550 | 2500 |
| 1 | 2 or more | 8850 | 6200 | 3550 | 2500 |
| Case B: Interruption of Continuous Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  | 13300 | 9300 | 1350 | 950 |
| 2 or more | 1 | 15900 | 11100 | 1350 | 950 |
| 2 or more | 2 or more | 15900 | 11100 | 1750 | 1250 |
| 1 | 2 or more | 13300 | 9300 | 1750 | 1250 |
| X | 100 percent of standard warrants |  |  |  |  |
|  | 70 percent of standard warrants ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Preliminary Signal Warrant Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Street | Number of Lanes | Warrant Volumes | Approach Volumes | Warrant Met |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Case } \\ \text { A } \end{gathered}$ | Major | 2 | 10600 | 8847 | N |
|  | Minor | 1 | 2650 | 140 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Case } \\ \text { B } \end{gathered}$ | Major | 2 | 15900 | 8847 | N |
|  | Minor | 1 | 1350 | 140 |  |
| Analyst and Date: |  |  | Reviewer and Date: |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Meeting preliminary signal warrants does not guarantee that a signal will be installed. When preliminary signal warrants are met, project analysts need to coordinate with Region Traffic to initiate the traffic signal engineering investigation as outlined in the Traffic Manual. Before a signal can be installed, the engineering investigation must be conducted or reviewed by the Region Traffic Manager who will forward signal recommendations to headquarters. Traffic signal warrants must be met and the State Traffic Engineer's approval obtained before a traffic signal can be installed on a state highway.
${ }^{2}$ Used due to 85th percentile speed in excess of 40 mph or isolated community with population of less than 10,000.
ATTACHMENT CSCENARIO 2 - EXISTING STREET CONDITION WITHNE HAWTHORNE AVENUE CONNECTIONSYNCHRO WORKSHEET
NEW ADT TRIP DISTRIBUTION WORKSHEETRIGHT TURN VOLUME DISCOUNT WORKSHEETODOT PRELIMINARY SIGNAL WARRANT WORKSHEET

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | F |  | 7 | 性 |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 5 | 715 | 20 | 60 | 1085 | 5 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 5 | 715 | 20 | 60 | 1085 | 5 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control S | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - |  | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |  | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  | 0 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  |
| Mumt Flow | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 27 | 5 | 777 | 22 | 65 | 1179 | 5 |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | F |  | \% | 中 |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 1225 | 10 | 30 | 805 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 1225 | 10 | 30 | 805 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control S | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - |  | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - |  | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  | 0 |  | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  |
| Mumt Flow | 1 | 0 | 2 | 27 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 1332 | 11 | 33 | 875 | 0 |  |





| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  | \% | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 1 | - | 2 | 20 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 1025 | 10 | 25 | 670 | 0 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 1025 | 10 | 25 | 670 | 0 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1841 | 1841 | 1841 | 1826 | 1826 | 1826 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 1114 | 11 | 27 | 728 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Cap, veh/h | 2 | 0 | 5 | 37 | 0 | 101 | 226 | 886 | 9 | 226 | 1690 | 0 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 557 | 0 | 1114 | 436 | 0 | 1189 | 715 | 1820 | 18 | 489 | 3561 | 0 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 3 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1125 | 27 | 728 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1672 | 0 | 0 | 1625 | 0 | 0 | 715 | 0 | 1837 | 489 | 1735 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 4.3 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.33 |  | 0.67 | 0.27 |  | 0.73 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 7 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 226 | 0 | 895 | 226 | 1690 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.26 | 0.12 | 0.43 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 814 | 0 | 0 | 792 | 0 | 0 | 226 | 0 | 895 | 226 | 1690 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 15.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 15.9 | 5.3 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 38.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 124.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.5 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 53.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 133.0 | 16.1 | 5.5 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | F | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 3 |  |  | 82 |  |  | 1125 |  |  | 755 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 53.9 |  |  | 18.1 |  |  | 133.0 |  |  | 5.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |  | A |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 20.0 | 4.6 | 20.0 | 7.2 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s | 17.5 | 2.1 | 17.5 | 3.5 |
| Green Ext Time (p_C), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  | 79.2 |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS | E |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

|  | 4 |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | \$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | * | 个 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 5 | 715 | 20 | 60 | 1085 | 5 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 5 | 715 | 20 | 60 | 1085 | 5 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1841 | 1841 | 1841 | 1856 | 1856 | 1856 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 27 | 5 | 777 | 22 | 65 | 1179 | 5 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Cap, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 5 | 59 | 0 | 59 | 353 | 945 | 27 | 325 | 1910 | 8 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1610 | 844 | 0 | 844 | 466 | 1781 | 50 | 675 | 3600 | 15 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 799 | 65 | 577 | 607 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 0 | 0 | 1610 | 1689 | 0 | 0 | 466 | 0 | 1832 | 675 | 1763 | 1853 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 12.3 | 3.0 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 12.3 | 15.3 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.50 |  | 0.50 | 1.00 |  | 0.03 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 |
| Lane Grp Cap (c), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 5 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 353 | 0 | 972 | 325 | 935 | 983 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.46 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.82 | 0.20 | 0.62 | 0.62 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 854 | 896 | 0 | 0 | 353 | 0 | 972 | 325 | 935 | 983 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.9 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 13.0 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 37.6 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 8.6 | 8.5 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | D | B | A | A | A | A | B | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1 |  |  | 54 |  |  | 804 |  |  | 1249 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 37.6 |  |  | 17.9 |  |  | 14.4 |  |  | 8.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 22.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 22.5 |  | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 18.0 |  | 18.0 |  | 18.0 |  | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s |  | 14.3 |  | 2.0 |  | 17.3 |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 1.9 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.5 |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 11.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ |  |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 1225 | 10 | 30 | 805 | 0 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 1225 | 10 | 30 | 805 | 0 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1841 | 1841 | 1841 | 1826 | 1826 | 1826 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 2 | 27 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 1332 | 11 | 33 | 875 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Cap, veh/h | 2 | 0 | 5 | 41 | 0 | 109 | 207 | 941 | 8 | 207 | 1792 | 0 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 557 | 0 | 1114 | 448 | 0 | 1178 | 624 | 1823 | 15 | 397 | 3561 | 0 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 3 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1343 | 33 | 875 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1672 | 0 | 0 | 1626 | 0 | 0 | 624 | 0 | 1838 | 397 | 1735 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 5.7 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.33 |  | 0.67 | 0.28 |  | 0.72 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap (c), veh/h | 7 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 0 | 949 | 207 | 1792 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.41 | 0.16 | 0.49 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 863 | 0 | 0 | 840 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 0 | 949 | 207 | 1792 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 17.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 17.4 | 5.4 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 38.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 192.9 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 54.0 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 55.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 201.4 | 19.1 | 6.4 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | A | A | C | A | A | A | A | F | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 3 |  |  | 98 |  |  | 1343 |  |  | 908 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 55.5 |  |  | 20.1 |  |  | 201.4 |  |  | 6.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | A |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 22.5 |  | 4.6 |  | 22.5 |  | 7.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 18.0 |  | 18.0 |  | 18.0 |  | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s |  | 20.0 |  | 2.1 |  | 20.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 118.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 虫 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 5 | 855 | 25 | 70 | 1300 | 5 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 5 | 855 | 25 | 70 | 1300 | 5 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1841 | 1841 | 1841 | 1826 | 1826 | 1826 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 33 | 5 | 929 | 27 | 76 | 1413 | 5 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Cap, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 5 | 66 | 0 | 66 | 286 | 875 | 25 | 228 | 1743 | 6 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1610 | 832 | 0 | 832 | 373 | 1780 | 52 | 573 | 3546 | 13 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 956 | 76 | 691 | 727 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 0 | 0 | 1610 | 1663 | 0 | 0 | 373 | 0 | 1831 | 573 | 1735 | 1824 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 10.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 10.6 | 10.6 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.50 |  | 0.50 | 1.00 |  | 0.03 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 5 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 286 | 0 | 900 | 228 | 853 | 896 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 1.06 | 0.33 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 791 | 818 | 0 | 0 | 286 | 0 | 900 | 228 | 853 | 896 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.7 | 13.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 15.8 | 6.8 | 6.8 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.7 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 47.8 | 0.8 | 5.9 | 5.7 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.4 | 0.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.4 | 16.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 0.0 | 55.9 | 16.6 | 12.7 | 12.5 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | C | B | A | A | B | A | F | B | B | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1 |  |  | 66 |  |  | 961 |  |  | 1494 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 33.4 |  |  | 16.9 |  |  | 55.6 |  |  | 12.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | B |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 20.0 | 4.5 | 20.0 | 7.0 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 17.5 | 2.0 | 17.5 | 3.2 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 29.2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.









NEW ADT TRIP DISTRIBUTION

| Existing Eight Highest Hours |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Major Street |  |  |  |  | Minor Street |  |  | Treehill Drive |  |
| Hour Beginning | NE 238th Drive (NB) | NE 238th <br> Drive (NB RT) | NE 238th Drive (SB) | NE 238th Drive (SB LT) | Total | NE <br> Treehill Drive (WB LT) | NE <br> Treehill Drive (WB RT) | Total WB | Highest 8- <br> Hour <br> Percentage | New Trips |
| 5:00 PM | 698 | 19 | 1067 | 55 | 1839 | 25 | 22 | 47 | 0.17 | 17 |
| 4:00 PM | 772 | 23 | 955 | 30 | 1780 | 14 | 28 | 42 | 0.15 | 15 |
| 3:00 PM | 759 | 19 | 944 | 28 | 1750 | 12 | 19 | 31 | 0.11 | 11 |
| 7:00 AM | 1003 | 8 | 662 | 26 | 1699 | 14 | 48 | 62 | 0.22 | 22 |
| 2:00 PM | 706 | 11 | 898 | 12 | 1627 | 8 | 12 | 20 | 0.07 | 7 |
| 1:00 PM | 779 | 8 | 739 | 14 | 1540 | 5 | 17 | 22 | 0.08 | 8 |
| 12:00 PM | 766 | 5 | 746 | 18 | 1535 | 6 | 23 | 29 | 0.10 | 10 |
| 6:00 PM | 610 | 15 | 803 | 26 | 1454 | 11 | 20 | 31 | 0.11 | 11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | 284 | Total ADT | 100 |

2- year growth 1.02
Project Year 2020 Eight Highest Hours plus New Trips( Existing Year Plus 2\%)

| Hour Beginning | Major Street |  |  |  |  | Minor Street Highest Approach |  |  | Treehill Drive |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NE 238th <br> Drive (NB) | NE 238th Drive (NB RT) | NE 238th <br> Drive (SB) | NE 238th <br> Drive (SB LT) | Total | NE <br> Treehill Drive (WB LT) | NE <br> Treehill Drive (WB RT) | Total WB | Highest 8- <br> Hour <br> Percentage | New Trips | Highest 8- <br> Hour plus <br> New Trips |
| 5:00 PM | 712 | 19 | 1088 | 56 | 1876 | 26 | 22 | 48 | 0.17 | 17 | 64 |
| 4:00 PM | 787 | 23 | 974 | 31 | 1816 | 14 | 28 | 42 | 0.15 | 15 | 57 |
| 3:00 PM | 774 | 19 | 963 | 29 | 1785 | 12 | 19 | 31 | 0.11 | 11 | 42 |
| 7:00 AM | 1023 | 8 | 675 | 27 | 1733 | 14 | 48 | 62 | 0.22 | 22 | 84 |
| 2:00 PM | 720 | 11 | 916 | 12 | 1660 | 8 | 12 | 20 | 0.07 | 7 | 27 |
| 1:00 PM | 795 | 8 | 754 | 14 | 1571 | 5 | 17 | 22 | 0.08 | 8 | 30 |
| 12:00 PM | 781 | 5 | 761 | 18 | 1566 | 6 | 23 | 29 | 0.10 | 10 | 39 |
| 6:00 PM | 622 | 15 | 819 | 27 | 1483 | 11 | 20 | 31 | 0.11 | 11 | 42 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 286 | Total ADT | 100 |  |

## Scenario-2

Project Year 2040 PM Peak Traffic Hour plus New Trips (Existing Year Plus 22\%)

|  | Major Street |  |  |  |  | Minor Street |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hour Beginning | NE 238th <br> Drive (NB) | NE 238th Drive (NB RT) | NE 238th Drive (SB) | NE 238th Drive (SB LT) | Total | NE Treehill Drive (WB LT) | NE <br> Treehill Drive (WB RT) | Total WB |
| 5:00 PM | 855 | 25 | 1300 | 70 | 2250 | 30 | 30 | 60 |

Right-turn Volume Discount
Shared left-through-right lane capacity $=56$
Right-turn discount $=0.85 \times 56=48$
Right-turn volume $=30$
Right -turn volume to include $=30-48=-18$

${ }^{1}$ Capacity obtained from unsignalized intersection analysis
For guidance on preliminary signal warrant analysis, refer to the Analysis Procedures Manual.
Last Updated: February 2009

| Oregon Department of Transportation <br> Transportation Development Branch <br> Transportation Planning Analysis Unit |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Preliminary Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major Street: NE 238th Drive |  |  | Minor Street: NE Treehill Drive |  |  |
| Project: | NE 238th Dr/NE Dr Traffic Ar |  | City/County: Multnomah County |  |  |
| Year: | 2040 |  | Alternative: Treehill to Hawthorne Connect |  |  |
| Preliminary Signal Warrant Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Approach lanes |  | ADT on major street approaching from both directions |  | ADT on minor street, highest approaching volume |  |
| Major | Minor | Percent of standard warrants |  | Percent of standard warrants |  |
| Street | Street | 100 | 70 | 100 | 70 |
| Case A: Minimum Vehicular Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 8850 | 6200 | 2650 | 1850 |
| 2 or more | 1 | 10600 | 7400 | 2650 | 1850 |
| 2 or more | 2 or more | 10600 | 7400 | 3550 | 2500 |
| 1 | 2 or more | 8850 | 6200 | 3550 | 2500 |
| Case B: Interruption of Continuous Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 13300 | 9300 | 1350 | 950 |
| 2 or more | 1 | 15900 | 11100 | 1350 | 950 |
| 2 or more | 2 or more | 15900 | 11100 | 1750 | 1250 |
| 1 | 2 or more | 13300 | 9300 | 1750 | 1250 |
| X | 100 percent of standard warrants |  |  |  |  |
|  | 70 percent of standard warrants ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Preliminary Signal Warrant Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Street | Number of Lanes | Warrant Volumes | Approach Volumes | Warrant Met |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Case } \\ \text { A } \end{gathered}$ | Major | 2 | 10600 | 16071 | N |
|  | Minor | 1 | 2650 | 214 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Case } \\ \text { B } \end{gathered}$ | Major | 2 | 15900 | 16071 | N |
|  | Minor | 1 | 1350 | 214 |  |
| Analyst and Date: |  |  | Reviewer and Date: |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Meeting preliminary signal warrants does not guarantee that a signal will be installed. When preliminary signal warrants are met, project analysts need to coordinate with Region Traffic to initiate the traffic signal engineering investigation as outlined in the Traffic Manual. Before a signal can be installed, the engineering investigation must be conducted or reviewed by the Region Traffic Manager who will forward signal recommendations to headquarters. Traffic signal warrants must be met and the State Traffic Engineer's approval obtained before a traffic signal can be installed on a state highway.
${ }^{2}$ Used due to 85th percentile speed in excess of 40 mph or isolated community with population of less than 10,000.


[^0]:    * LOS, Control Delay \& V/C reported are for the movement with the highest delay and worst LOS.

[^1]:    * LOS, Control Delay \& V/C reported are for the movement with the highest delay and worst LOS.

    Control Delay = seconds/vehicle (sec/veh).

