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## TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS Northern Lights

## I. Executive Summary

## A. Site Location and Study Area

Northern Lights is a proposed 17 -lot subdivision, that will house a main and accessory dwelling unit, that is located in Teton County northeast of the City of Tetonia positioned on two (2) parcels; the two (2) parcels make up a total of 80 acres. Figure 1 shows the location of the proposed development.


Figure 1-Location Map

## 1. Development Description and Phasing

The projected land use for the build-out year of the proposed development is comprised of 17 main dwelling units and 17 accessory dwelling units ( 34 units total).

This traffic impact study evaluates the existing transportation conditions, the buildout condition, and a horizon year 20 years beyond the buildout year. The following analyses were performed:
> 2022 existing background traffic
> 2027 buildout year background traffic
> 2027 buildout year background plus site traffic
> 2047 horizon year background traffic
> 2047 buildout year background plus site traffic

## B. Conclusions and Recommendations

After evaluating the proposed development within the context of zoning; projected land use; existing transportation system; background traffic counts for the principal roadways within the study impact area; projected traffic for horizon years corresponding with project opening, project buildout, and a 20 -year horizon year; the findings of the Traffic Impact Study are summarized below. In order to simplify the forecasted traffic conditions as they have progressed through this study, the following three (3) tables were produced. The first table shows the forecasted progression of the roadway segments, the second table shows the intersections, and the third shows the left or right turn.

Table 1-Segment Traffic Conditions Progression Each Horizon Year

| Segment 1: 3000W | Northeast <br> V/C Ratio | LOS | Southwest <br> V/C Ratio | LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | 0.014 | A | 0.008 | A |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | 0.016 | A | 0.010 | A |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | 0.027 | A | 0.016 | A |


| Segment 2: 2000w | Northbound <br> V/C Ratio | LOS | Southbound <br> V/C Ratio | LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | 0.011 | A | 0.012 | A |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | 0.022 | A | 0.018 | A |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | 0.030 | A | 0.026 | A |

Table 2 - Intersection Traffic Conditions Progression Each Horizon Year

| Int 1: Hwy 33/3000w | Northeast <br> Max L0S | Southeast <br> Max L0S | Northwest <br> Max Los | Southwest <br> Max Los |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A | B |
| 2027 Background Traffic | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A | B |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A | B |
| 2047 Background Traffic | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A | C |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A | D |


| Int 2: Hwy 33/2000w | Eastbound <br> Max LOS | Westbound <br> Max LOS | Northbound <br> Max LOS | Southbound <br> Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | A | A | B | C |
| 2027 Background Traffic | A | A | C | C |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | A | A | C | C |
| 2047 Background Traffic | A | A | E | F |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | A | A | E | F |


| Int 3: 7000N/1750w | Eastbound <br> Max LOS | Westbound <br> Max LOS | Northbound <br> Max LOS | Southbound <br> Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | A | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A |
| 2027 Background Traffic | A | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | A | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A |
| 2047 Background Traffic | A | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | A | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A |


| Int 4: 7000N/Solstice East (New) | Eastbound <br> Max LOS | Westbound Max LOS | Northbound Max LOS | Southbound Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 2027 Background Traffic | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | A | A | A | n/a |
| 2047 Background Traffic | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | A | A | A | n/a |


$\left.$| Int 5: 7000N/Solstice West |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (New) | | Eastbound |
| :---: |
| Max LOS | | Westbound |
| :---: |
| Max LOS | | Northbound |
| :---: |
| Max LOS |$\quad$| Southbound |
| :---: |
| Max LOS | \right\rvert\,

Table 3-Left and Right Turn Lane Progression Each Horizon Year

| Int 1: Hwy 33/3000w | Left Turn Lane |  | Right Turn Lane |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Southeast | Northwest | Southeast | Northwest |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | Warranted | n/a | n/a | Not Warranted |
| 2027 Background Traffic | Warranted | n/a | n/a | Not Warranted |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | Warranted | n/a | n/a | Not Warranted |
| 2047 Background Traffic | Warranted | n/a | n/a | Warranted |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | Warranted | n/a | n/a | Warranted |


| Int 2: Hwy 33/2000W | Left Turn Lane |  | Right Turn Lane |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Eastbound | Westbound |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | Warranted | Warranted | Not Warranted | Not Warranted |
| 2027 Background Traffic | Warranted | Warranted | Not Warranted | Not Warranted |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | Warranted | Warranted | Not Warranted | Not Warranted |
| 2047 Background Traffic | Warranted | Warranted | Not Warranted | Warranted |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | Warranted | Warranted | Not Warranted | Warranted |

## C. Existing Traffic Conditions (2022)

The existing traffic conditions were analyzed with the existing intersection control and lane configurations, all the road segments and intersections are operating within minimum operational thresholds except:

* Int. 1 Hwy 33/3000W: Southeast bound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
* Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Eastbound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
* Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Westbound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
(1) Mitigating Measures

It is recommended that a left turn lane be constructed on Hwy 33 for the southeast bound traffic at Int. 1 and that left turn lanes be constructed for both the eastbound and westbound traffic on Hwy 33 at Int. 2.

## D. Projected Traffic

The build-out conditions are expected to generate approximately 325 trips for the MADT and 26 trips during PM peak hour by year 2027.

## E. 2027 Buildout Year Traffic Conditions Results

All segment capacity and intersection delay times/LOS are projected to operate within the minimum allowable operational thresholds. It was determined that for the 2022 existing conditions, left turn lanes are warranted at Intersection 1 and Intersection 2. For the 2027 buildout conditions, no new left turn lanes are warranted with or without the proposed development.
(1) Mitigating Measures

For the 2027 buildout scenario no deficiencies were forecasted, therefore no mitigation measures are recommended.

## F. 2047 Horizon Year Traffic Conditions Results

The forecasted 2047 traffic conditions were analyzed with the existing intersection control and lane configurations, all the road segments and intersections are within minimum operational thresholds except:

* Int 1 Hwy 33/3000W: Northwest bound, right turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
* Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Northbound traffic left, thru, and right turning movement's LOS is E, without or with the development
* Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Southbound traffic left, thru, and right turning movement's LOS is F, without or with the development
* Int 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Westbound, right turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
(1) Mitigating Measures

Analysis shows that the addition of left turn lanes for both the eastbound and westbound traffic (warranted for the 2022 Existing Conditions), a westbound right turn lane (warranted for the 2047 Horizon Year), a northbound right and left turn lane (warranted for the 2047 Horizon Year), a southbound right and left turn lane (warranted for the 2047 Horizon Year) will create a road network that will operate within the minimum allowable thresholds.

## G. Overall Study Summary

As can be seen from the tables shown previously, the development is forecasted to have minimal impact to the traffic network within the study area. All segments and intersections are forecasted to operate below the allowable operation thresholds throughout the study time period. As can be seen in the tables presented in this chapter, the LOS at each intersection for each turning movement without or with the development are the same except for the southwest traffic in the 2047 Horizon Year (reference the red highlighted cell in Table ES-2). Even though the southwest traffic without and with the development is difference, they are still forecasted to operate at an acceptable level through the 2047 Horizon Year.

This study also determined that all the intersections, each direction, within the study area on Hwy 33 warrant a left turn lane for the current/existing conditions. Additionally, right turn lanes are warranted within the next 25 years for the northwest bound traffic at Int. 1 Hwy 33/3000W and for the westbound traffic at Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W without or with the development.

## II. Introduction and Summary

Northern Lights is a proposed 17 -lot subdivision located in Teton County but within the impact area of the City of Tetonia. Each lot will consist of a main and an accessory dwelling unit; 34 total units. The Teton County Planning \& Zoning Commission approved the Concept Plan for the subdivision and the Tetonia Planning \& Zoning Commission, and the Tetonia City Council approved the Preliminary Plat submittal. The application for Preliminary Plat submittal is currently begin presented to the Teton County Planning \& Zoning Commission for consideration. The application for Preliminary Plat Submittal has several stipulations that apply to a proposed subdivision including the requirement for a Public Service / Fiscal Analysis to ascertain the financial impact the proposed development may have on public services.

Civilize, PLLC has been retained to prepare a Traffic Impact Study for the Northern Lights project in accordance with the requirements of Teton County.

## A. Project Identification

The following table lists important project identification information and contact information for the project.
Table 4-Project Information Table

| Project Name | Victor Hotel and Workforce Housing |
| :--- | :--- |
| Owner | Tony \& Anne Campbell |
| Owner Address | 718 Meadow Hills Drive <br> Richland, WA 99352 |
| Owner Telephone Number | (509) 948-4441 |
| Owner Email | anne@campbelltrainingsolutions.com |
| Engineer | Civilize, PLLC |
| Engineer Contact Person | Brent E. "Husk" Crowther, P.E. |
| Engineer Address | 3853 W. Mountain View Dr. <br> Rexburg, ID 83440 |
| Engineer Project Number | $01-21-0011$ |
| Engineer Telephone Number | $208-351-2824$ |
| Engineer Email | bcrowther@civilize.design |

## B. Location

Northern Lights is a proposed 17 -lot subdivision, that will house a main and accessory dwelling unit, that is located in Teton County northeast of the City of Tetonia positioned on two (2) parcels; the two (2) parcels make up a total of 80 acres. Figure 1 shows the location of the proposed development.


Figure 2 - Location Map

## C. Applicable Regulations

The Teton County Code, Title 9 Subdivision Regulations, Chapter 3 Procedure for Approval, Section 2 Subdivision or Planned Unit Development, Paragraph C Preliminary Plat Phase, Paragraph 3 Regulations That May Apply, Item d Traffic Impact Study states:

> Due to the impact that a subdivision or PUD may have on traffic levels, congestion levels, and levels of service on roads, the applicant for a proposed subdivision containing more than ten (10) lots or a proposed PUD containing more than ten (10) lots or dwelling units shall traffic impact study prepared by a professional engineer. A TIS may also be required if the Planning Administrator, the Commission, or the Board think that the condition of one or more of the roads that would provide access between the proposed development and the nearest State Highway is so poor that traffic from ten (10) or fewer lots or dwelling units could create public safety risks or interfere with the efficient flow of traffic. Each required traffic impact study shall meet the following standards: (amd. 11-14-08)

## D. Purpose of Report and Study Objectives

The purpose of the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is to evaluate the traffic impacts resulting from the proposed development and to make recommendations for mitigation to the impacts if such prove necessary. This study discusses:

- The proposed development
- The study approach
- The area conditions
- Existing 2022 traffic volumes and conditions
- Projected traffic from the development
- Buildout 2027 traffic volumes and conditions without and with the development
- 20-Year Horizon Year traffic volumes and conditions without and with the development
- Conclusions, recommendations, and possible mitigation measures


## III. Proposed Development

## A. Description of On-Site Development

## 1. Description

The development plans call for 17 single family residences and 17 accessory dwelling units. The Traffic Impact Study (TIS) will be based on the that type of development.

## 2. Location

As presented previously, the proposed development is located northeast of Tetonia and is comprised of two (2) parcels totaling 80 acres. The parcel numbers and legal descriptions are:

- RP06N45E280010, NE4 NE4 SEC 28 T6N R4 5E
- RP06N45E273000, NW4 NW4 SEC 27 T6N R4 5E


## 3. Zoning

Currently, Teton County lists the west parcel as FH-10 Foothills and the east parcel as RA-35 Rural Agriculture. The following map, from the Teton County GIS page, shows the zoning of the area


Figure 3-Zoning Map

## 4. Site Plan

The Concept Master Plan has been prepared and presented to Teton County who approved the plan at the concept plan hearing. That plan is presented in the following figure and a larger version presented in Exhibit A - Proposed Site Plan. Although the site configuration may change slightly in the future, the Site Master Plan represents the best information regarding anticipated future development for land use and will be the basis of traffic projections generated by the proposed development.


Figure 4 - Site Plan

## 5. Land Use and Intensity

The development as proposed consists of 17 single family residences lots. As stated earlier, the 17 lots will consist of a main and accessory dwelling unit for a total of 34 dwellings. While future development may occur in the area of the proposed project, that development is not currently defined and will not be considered in the traffic modeling, rather that responsibility will be relegated to future developers.

## 6. Phasing and Timing

## a. Existing Conditions

The traffic counts were obtained in November of 2022. The existing condition year will be considered 2022.

## b. Buildout Conditions

It is estimated that buildout will occur in five (5) years. The buildout conditions will be considered for 2027
c. 20-Year Horizon Year

The 20-year longer term traffic conditions occur 20 years after buildout. Therefore, the 20-year horizon year will be projected to year 2047. As mentioned earlier, this TIS will not consider additional traffic that may be generated from unknown developments within the study area.

## IV. Study Approach

## A. Full TIS or Minor TIS

The scope of this TIS is based on ITD's Requirements for Transportation Impact Studies (Supplement to Board Policy B-12-06) as well as the guidance document titled Transportation Impact Analyses for Site Development.published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). These requirements outline a full or minor TIS as:

- A full TIS shall be required for developments that will generate more than 100 vph or 1000 vpd .
- A minor TIS is required for developments that will generate up to 99 vph or 999 vpd .

This development is forecasted to generate less than 99 vph , and less than 999 vpd , thus a minor TIS will be performed. Since this is determined to be a minor TIS, only the pm peak hour will be analyzed as recommended by the Requirements for Transportation Impact Studies by ITD

## B. Study Period

The following study periods were identified for analysis:

1. 2022 (Existing)
2. 2027 (Project Buildout)
3. 2047 (Horizon year)

The following time intervals were identified for analysis:

1. Weekend PM peak hour

## C. Segments and Intersections to be Studied

For roadway segments or links, the requirements state that if a segment experiences a directional increase of 250 vpd , and/or 25 vph vehicles in the peak hour should be included in the study. In total, it is forecasted that the development at buildout will generate 325 vpd and 26 vph .

It is assumed that $10 \%$ of the generated traffic will use 7000 N to access Hwy 33 to the west. The traffic will travel from the development on 7000 N to and from 3000 W then to and from Hwy 33 on 3000 W . The segment, on this path to Hwy 33, that currently has the highest hourly volume is 3000W. Even though this segment does not experience the minimum requirement for analysis, this 550 ft segment of 3000W north of Hwy 33 will be analyzed in this study.

It is assumed that $90 \%$ of the generated traffic will use 7000 N to access Hwy 33 to the south. The traffic will travel from the development on 7000 N to and from 1750 W , then to and from 1750 W to and from 6000 N , then to and from 6000 N to 2000 W , then to and from Hwy 33 on 2000 W . The segment, on this path to Hwy 33, that currently has the highest hourly volume is 2000 W . Even though this segment does not experience the minimum requirement for analysis, this 1200 ft segment of 3000 W north of Hwy 33 will be analyzed in this study.

The traffic from the development will use two (2) intersections on Hwy 33. This study will analyze these two (2) intersections on Hwy 33 along with the intersection of $7000 \mathrm{~N} / 1750 \mathrm{~W}$ and the two (2) new intersections created by the development for a total of five (5) intersections.

## D. Study Methodology, Limitations and Assumptions

## 1. Traffic Model

The data gathered will be entered into the Synchro Traffic Modeling Software Version 11. The traffic volumes (in vehicles per hour) during the pm peak hour will be entered into the traffic model. The following steps will be followed in this TIS:

1. PM peak traffic turning off and on 3000 W at the intersection of Hwy $33 / 3000 \mathrm{~N}$ will be visually counted
2. PM peak traffic turning off and on 2000 W at the intersection of Hwy $33 / 2000 \mathrm{~W}$ will be visually counted
3. PM peak traffic counts for all turning movements at the intersection of $7000 \mathrm{~N} / 1750 \mathrm{~W}$ will be visually counted
4. Hwy 33 data will be obtained from ITD
5. Since the data was visually collected out of peak season, the visual data will be seasonally adjusted to the peak month to match the data from ITD
6. The adjusted volumes will be entered into a model for the 2022 existing conditions to establish a baseline
7. The proposed development will be analyzed to determine the projected generated traffic
8. A growth factor will be multiplied to the 2022 existing volumes to determine the forecasted 2027 traffic volumes and conditions without the development
9. The projected generated traffic from the development will be added to the 2027 forecasted traffic volumes to determine the forecasted 2027 traffic volumes and conditions with the development
10. The growth factor will be multiplied to the 2022 existing volumes to determine the forecasted 2047 (20-years after anticipated buildout) traffic volumes and conditions without the development
11. The projected generated traffic from the development will be added to the 2047 forecasted traffic volumes to determine the forecasted 2047 traffic volumes and conditions with the development
12. If a poor Level of Service (LOS) is determined, mitigation measure will be discussed to improve the LOS

Along with entering in the traffic volumes into the model, a peak hour factor, as recommended by the Highway Capacity Manual HCM for rural roadways, of 0.88 and a $5 \%$ heavy vehicle factor will be used.

## 2. Anticipated Annual Growth

The growth will be based on the historical increase in traffic that the ITD has collected. This data show that in 2002 the ADT was 1951 vpd and the in 2022 the ADT was 3252 vpd. Using the population growth formula of $\mathrm{P}=\mathrm{P}^{*}\left(\exp \left(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{rt}}\right)\right)$, we get an annual average increase of $2.55 \%$. This increase will be used throughout this study.

## 3. Level of Service (LOS)

The traffic modeling software is used to determine the LOS. The LOS helps to determine when improvements are needed. The following sections discuss the difference between the segment and intersection LOS.

## a. Segment LOS

At the time of this study, the free flow speed (FFS) was not available for the specific road segment being analyzed to determine the LOS. Therefore, in order to determine the LOS for the road segment through this area, the volume to capacity ratio ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio) will be used. In order to determine the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, we divide the volume of the roadway by the capacity. According to the Highway Capacity Manual, the capacity of a two-lane highway is 1,700 vehicles per hour for each direction of travel. By dividing the peak hour by the peak hour capacity, we get a v/c ratio. The following table shows the correlation between the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio and the LOS. For this study, the mountainous terrain with $0 \%$ no passing will be used.

Table 5 - LOS Criteria for General Two-Lane Highway Segments

| Level of Service Criteria for General Two-Lane Highway Segments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Time } \\ \text { LOS } \begin{array}{c} \text { Delay } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | V/C Ratio ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Level Terrain |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rolling Terrain |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mountainous Terrain |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Avg. ${ }^{\text {. }}$ <br> Speed | \% No-Passing Zone |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ <br> Speed | \% No-Passing Zone |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ <br> Speed | \% No-Passing Zone |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 | 0 |  | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 | 0 |  | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 |
| A | $\leq 30$ |  | 258 | 0.15 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 257 | 0.15 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 256 | 0.14 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| B | $\leq 45$ | $\geq 55$ | 0.27 | 0.24 | 0.21 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.16 | $\geq 54$ | 0.26 | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.13 | $\geq 54$ | 0.25 | 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.10 |
| C | $\leq 60$ | $\geq 52$ | 0.43 | 0.39 | 0.36 | 0.34 | 0.33 | 0.32 | $\geq 51$ | 0.42 | 0.39 | 0.35 | 0.32 | 0.30 | 0.28 | $\geq 49$ | 0.39 | 0.33 | 0.28 | 0.23 | 0.20 | 0.16 |
| D | $\leq 75$ | $\geq 50$ | 0.64 | 0.62 | 0.60 | 0.59 | 0.58 | 0.57 | $\geq 49$ | 0.62 | 0.57 | 0.52 | 0.48 | 0.46 | 0.43 | $\geq 45$ | 0.58 | 0.50 | 0.45 | 0.40 | 0.37 | 0.33 |
| E | > 75 | $\geq 45$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | $\geq 40$ | 0.97 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 0.90 | $\geq 35$ | 0.91 | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.82 | 0.80 | 0.78 |
| F | 100 | < 45 | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | < 40 | -- | -- | - | -- | -- | -- | <35 | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | - |

The following figure helps define each of the six (6) segment LOS levels. When a LOS decreases to a LOS of E , mitigation measures/improvements are recommended.


Figure 5 - Segment LOS

## b. Intersection LOS

The LOS for an intersection is determined by the control delay per vehicle. The LOS is broken down into six (6) categories A through F; A being the best, F being the worst and E being the start of failure. In other words, when a LOS decreases from a D to an E , improvements are recommended. The following bulleted items and table breakdown the six (6) categories and show the correlation between the delay time and a LOS.

- LOS A: The intersection has no congestion, has less than a 10 second control delay per vehicle, and is operating below $55 \%$ capacity.
- LOS B: The intersection has very little congestion, has a control delay per vehicle between 10 and 15 seconds, and is operating between $55 \%$ and $64 \%$ capacity.
- LOS C: The intersection has no major congestion, has a control delay per vehicle between 15 and 25 seconds, and is operating between $64 \%$ and $73 \%$ capacity.
- LOS D: The intersection normally has no congestion, has a control delay per vehicle between 25 and 35 seconds, and is operating between $73 \%$ and $82 \%$ capacity.
- LOS E: The intersection is right on the verge of congested conditions, has a control delay per vehicle between 35 and 50 seconds, and is operating between $82 \%$ and $91 \%$ capacity.
- LOS F: The intersection is over capacity and experiences congestion, has a control delay per vehicle between 50 seconds or more, and is operating between $91 \%$ and $100 \%$ capacity.

Table 6 - Control Delay per Vehicle to LOS Correlation Table

| Control Delay Per Vehicle (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\leq 10$ | A |
| 10 to 15 | B |
| 15 to 25 | C |
| 25 to 35 | D |
| 35 to 50 | E |
| $>50$ | F |

## 4. Left Turn and Right Turn Lane Warrant Analysis

The right-hand turn and left-hand turn lane warrants are analyzed following the guidance found in ITD's Traffic Manual: Idaho's Supplementary Guide to the MUTCD, which references NCHRP Report 745 -Left-Turn Accommodations at Unsignalized Intersections. In addition, the NCHRP 457 - Evaluating Intersection Improvements: An Engineering Study Guide was utilized for right-turn movements. The following figures show the left-turn and right-turn warrant charts for intersections on a two-lane rural highway.


Figure 6 - Left-Turn Warrant Chart


Figure 7 - Right-Turn Warrant Chart
Civilize, PLLC

## V. Area Conditions

## A. Study Area

## 1. Area of Influence and Significant Traffic Impact

The area of influence for this analysis includes the following roadway segments and intersections.

1. Segment $\# 1-3000 \mathrm{~W}$
2. Segment $\# 2-2000 \mathrm{~W}$
3. Intersection \#1 - Hwy $33 / 3000 \mathrm{~W}$
4. Intersection \#2 - Hwy $33 / 2000 \mathrm{~W}$
5. Intersection $\# 3-7000 \mathrm{~N} / 1750 \mathrm{~W}$
6. Intersection $\# 4-7000 \mathrm{~N} /$ Solstice Circle East (new intersection)
7. Intersection $\# 5-7000 \mathrm{~N} /$ Solstice Circle West (new intersection)

The area of influence is presented in the following figure.


Figure 8 -Area of Influence and Significant Traffic Impact

## B. Study Area Land Use

## 1. Existing Land Uses

The current land use is agricultural interspersed with scattered residential use. The City of Tetonia is a small rural community located just southwest of the development. The use can be observed in the various figures presented and in viewing the parcels using various commercial mapping platforms available to the public such as Google Earth, Bing Maps, and the Teton County GIS parcel viewer.

## 2. Existing Zoning

Currently, Teton County lists the west parcel as FH-10 Foothills and the east parcel as RA-35 Rural Agriculture. The use of the land reflects that zone.

## 3. Anticipated Future Development

The only known future development in the area is the proposed project which consists of 17 single family residences lots. As stated earlier, the County requires the study to assume that all 17 lots will consist of a main home and an accessory dwelling unit for a total of 34 dwellings.

## C. Site Accessibility

Access to the site will be by $2000 \mathrm{~W}, 6000 \mathrm{~N}$, and 1750 W to and from Hwy 33 and $7000 \mathrm{~N}, 3000 \mathrm{~W}$ to and from Hwy 33. The main access to the development will be off of 7000 N .

## a. Road Network Functional Classification.

For access guidelines, the Road Classification Map published by Teton County shows that 2000W, 6000 N, $1750 \mathrm{~W}, 7000$ N, and 3000 W are considered minor neighborhood while Highway 33 is considered a minor arterial; see the following figure for the Teton County Road Classification Map.


Figure 9 - Teton County Road Classification Map

## 1. Access Management

Access management within a city is intended to facilitate safe and convenient access and circulation for vehicular traffic, pedestrians, and bicycles within a jurisdiction. Access management for the state highway system intended to provide safe transit for reginal and interstate traffic. As such, the objectives of access management within a city can sometimes be different than those for a state highway system.

## a. Teton County

Access management for Teton County is governed by the publication Highway \& Street Guidelines for Design and Construction in Teton County, Idaho as amended April 11, 2013. A review of that publication does not reveal any specific requirements for access management.

## 2. Area Transportation Elements and Roadway System

## a. Existing Roadway Network

The existing roadway network consists of rural two-lane roadways.
b. Transit Service

TRPTA operates public transit services in the area but not on roadways within the study area of this Traffic Impact Study.
c. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no bicycle or pedestrian facilities on the roads in the vicinity of the development.
d. Future

Other than the roads for the proposed development, there are no known future road improvements in the vicinity.

## 3. Accident History

a. ITD Crash Data


Figure 10-LHTAC Crash Data
According to the Idaho Local Road Crash Data that was obtained from the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) there has been six (6) crashes within the influence area of this study; four (4) at the intersection of Hwy $33 / 3000$ N and two (2) at the intersection of Hwy $33 / 2000 \mathrm{~W}$ as depicted in the above Figure. Of these six (6) accidents, no fatalilites have been recorded and are below the base rate for a similar intersection types in Idaho.

## VI. Existing 2022 Traffic Volumes and Conditions

## A. Traffic Forecasting

There are diverse ways to forecast future traffic flow and patterns. A common forecasting method is to take the historic population and forecast the traffic from those values. However, in this situation, recreation and tourism is a major factor, therefore using traffic data trends from ITD traffic counts will provide more satisfactory results from which to draw conclusions and make recommendations for mitigation. This study will use traffic data obtained from the ITD to determine traffic conditions for the 2022 (existing), 2027 (Project buildout), and the 2047 (20-year after buildout) horizon years.

## B. Roadway Network

Within the area of influence there will be two (2) roadway segments, three (3) existing intersections, and two (2) future intersection studied. The segments and the intersections that will analyzed are:

1. Segment $\# 1-3000 \mathrm{~W}$
2. Segment \#2-2000W
3. Intersection \#1 - Hwy $33 / 3000 \mathrm{~W}$
4. Intersection \#2 - Hwy $33 / 2000 \mathrm{~W}$
5. Intersection $\# 3-7000 \mathrm{~N} / 1750 \mathrm{~W}$
6. Intersection \#4-7000N/Solstice Circle East (new intersection)
7. Intersection $\# 5-7000 \mathrm{~N} /$ Solstice Circle West (new intersection)

## C. Seasonal Adjustment

As a recreational destination, the traffic volumes fluctuate throughout the year with the summer months exhibiting the highest ADT. It has been determined that the peak month in 2022 was July with an ADT of $4,219 \mathrm{vpd}$. The visual counts were performed in November of 2022. The ITD data for November of 2022 shows that there was an ADT of 2,869 vpd. This indicated that the seasonal difference between when the visual counts were performed (November) and the peak month (July) is a difference of $47.1 \%$. Throughout this study, all visual counts in November will be increased by $47.1 \%$ to help represent the traffic in July.

## D. Existing 2022 Segment PM Peak Traffic Volumes

This section discusses the ADT, the peak hour flows, and the trip distribution for the existing traffic. As stated previously, the segments of 3000 W and 2000 W will be analyzed. Traffic counts in the study area were visually collected on November 4, 2022 during the pm peak hour.

## 1. Seg. 1-3000W Existing 2022 PM Peak Hr Flow

The results of this visual count show that there were 12 vph headed northeast and seven (7) vph headed southwest during pm peak hour. Increasing counts these by the $47.1 \%$ seasonal adjustment it is calculated that there are 23 vph headed northeast and 13 vph headed southwest.

## 2. Seg. 2-2000W Existing 2022 PM Peak Hr Flow

The results of this visual count show that there were 10 vph headed northbound and 20 vph headed southbound during pm peak hour. Increasing these counts by the $47.1 \%$ seasonal adjustment it is calculated that there are 18 vph headed northbound and 20 vph headed southbound.

## E. Existing 2022 PM Peak Intersection Traffic Volumes

## 1. Highway 33 Peak Hr Flow

The traffic volumes at the three (3) existing intersections were visually counted on November 4, 2022. However, for the two (2) intersections that include Hwy 33, only the turning movements off of Hwy 33 were counted. This is due to the fact that the ITD has counters on Hwy 33 that collect a number of different data items that provides a larger window of data. The data obtained from the ITD for Hwy 33 will be adjusted to the study area and added to the seasonally adjusted visual counts. The ITD website for Road Data features an interactive map that allows a query by road milepost for Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT), which is the total volume of traffic on a road for a year divided by the number of days (365) in a year. However, these values are annual averages rather than peak days that reflect summertime travel. ITD also maintains Automatic Traffic Recorders (ATRs) throughout the state including District 6, two (2) of these ATRs are located on Hwy 33; ATR 59 east of Newdale and ATR 239 south of Driggs. The ATR most relevant to this project is ATR \#59 near Newdale which records the traffic on Hwy 33. The monthly AADT for ATR \#59 in 2022 ranged from a low in January of 2,357 vpd to a high in July of 4,219 vpd. This study will focus on the July MADT or peak season and not the ADT. The following figure shows the locations of the ATRs in the area.


Figure 11: Hwy 33 ATR Locations

Furthermore, an adjustment needs to be made due to the fact that ATR 59 is 24 miles away from the study area. The ITD does have a database that has the ADT for each milepost along Hwy 33. In order to make these adjustments, the ADT difference between ATR 59 (Milepost 113) and the study area (Milepost 132 and Milepost 134) will be used. The following figure shows the mileposts along Hwy 33.


Figure 12: Hwy 33 Mileposts and ADT
The ITD website shows that the ADT at Milepost 113 to Milepost 130 is $3,500 \mathrm{vpd}$, at Milepost 132 is $5,400 \mathrm{vpd}$, and at Milepost 134 is $6,400 \mathrm{vpd}$. It is calculated that there is an increase in traffic of $54.3 \%$ between Milepost 113 and Milepost 132 and an increase of $18.5 \%$ between mileposts 132 and 134 .

Data retrieved at ATR 59 shows that the in July, the highest traffic day is Friday. Furthermore, the highest pm peak hour traffic occurs between 5:00 pm and 6:00 pm on Fridays with a monthly average pm peak of 407 vph with 192 vph traveling east and 214 vph traveling west.

The last step is to take the pm peak hour traffic and adjust them proportionately to the by the calculated increase; an increase of $54.3 \%$ from Milepost 113 to Milepost 132 and an increase of $18.5 \%$ from Milepost 132 to Milepost 134. The following table shows the calculated PM peak hour volumes that will be used in this study. These volumes will be used in analyzing the intersections.

Table 7 Existing Segment ADT, Peak Hour, and Trip Distribution Volumes

| Milepost | Year | ADT | July PM Peak | PM Peak <br> Eastbound | PM Peak <br> Westbound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 113 | 2022 | 3500 | 407 | 192 | 214 |
| 132 | 2022 | 5400 | 626 | 296 | 330 |
| 134 | 2022 | 6400 | 742 | 351 | 391 |

## 2. Int. 1 - Hwy 33/3000W Peak Hr Volume

The turning movements that were visually counted on November 4, 2022 were seasonally adjusted to July and were added to the collected July traffic counts provided by the ITD. The results are shown in the following figure.


Figure 13: Existing 2022 Conditions Hwy 33/3000W PM Peak Hr Volume

## 3. Int. 2 - Hwy 33/2000W Peak Hr Volume

The turning movements that were visually counted on November 4, 2022 were seasonally adjusted to July and were added to the collected July traffic counts provided by the ITD. The results are shown in the following figure.


Figure 14: Existing 2022 Conditions Hwy 33/2000W PM Peak Hr Volume

## 4. Int. $3-7000 \mathrm{~N} / 1750 \mathrm{~W}$ Peak Hr Volume

The traffic volumes that were collected on November 4, 2022 were seasonally adjusted to help emulate the peak month of July. The results are shown in the following figure.


Figure 15: Existing 2022 Conditions 7000N/1750W PM Peak Hr Volume

## 5. Int. $4-7000 \mathrm{~N} /$ Solstice Circle East Peak Hr Volume (New Intersection)

Due to the fact that this intersection does not exist for the existing conditions, no traffic counts were counted. This intersection will be analyzed in the buildout and 20-year after buildout horizon years.

## 6. Int. 5-7000N/Solstice Circle West Peak Hr Volume (New Intersection)

Due to the fact that this intersection does not exist for the existing conditions, no traffic counts were counted. This intersection will be analyzed in the buildout and 20-year after buildout horizon years.

## F. Existing 2022 Segment PM Peak Traffic Conditions

At the time of this study, the free flow speed (FFS) was not available for the specific road segment being analyzed. Therefore, in order to determine the LOS for the road segment through this area, the volume to capacity ratio ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio) will be used. In order to determine the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, we divide the volume of the roadway by the capacity. According to the Highway Capacity Manual, the capacity of a two-lane highway is 1,700 vehicles per hour for each direction of travel. By dividing the peak hour by the peak hour capacity, we get a $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio. The following table shows the correlation between the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio and the LOS.

Table 8 Level of Service Criteria for General Two-Lane Highway Segments

| Level of Service Criteria for General Two-Lane Highway Segments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { \% Time } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | V/C Ratio ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Level Terrain |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rolling Terrain |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mountainous Terrain |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avg. }{ }^{\circ} \\ & \text { Speed } \end{aligned}$ | \% No-Passing Zone |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avg. }{ }^{\circ} \\ & \text { Speed } \end{aligned}$ | \% No-Passing Zone |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. ${ }^{\text {. }}$ Speed | \% No-Passing Zone |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 | 0 |  | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 | 0 |  | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 |
| A | $\leq 30$ |  | $\geq 58$ | 0.15 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.04 | $\geq 57$ | 0.15 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.03 | $\geq 56$ | 0.14 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| B | $\leq 45$ | z 55 | 0.27 | 0.24 | 0.21 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.16 | $\geq 54$ | 0.26 | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.13 | $\geq 54$ | 0.25 | 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.10 |
| C | $\leq 60$ | z 52 | 0.43 | 0.39 | 0.36 | 0.34 | 0.33 | 0.32 | $\geq 51$ | 0.42 | 0.39 | 0.35 | 0.32 | 0.30 | 0.28 | $\geq 49$ | 0.39 | 0.33 | 0.28 | 0.23 | 0.20 | 0.16 |
| D | $\leq 75$ | $\geq 50$ | 0.64 | 0.62 | 0.60 | 0.59 | 0.58 | 0.57 | $\geq 49$ | 0.62 | 0.57 | 0.52 | 0.48 | 0.46 | 0.43 | 245 | 0.58 | 0.50 | 0.45 | 0.40 | 0.37 | 0.33 |
| E | > 75 | $\geq 45$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | $\geq 40$ | 0.97 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 0.90 | $\geq 35$ | 0.91 | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.82 | 0.80 | 0.78 |
| F | 100 | < 45 | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | < 40 | -- | -- | - | -- | -- | - | <35 | - | -- | -- | -- | - | -- |

## 1. Seg. 1 - 3000W Existing 2022 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The visual counts that were seasonally adjusted show that there were 23 vph heading northeast and 13 vph heading southwest during the pm peak hour. Dividing these volumes by 1700 vph , the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio is 0.014 for northeast bound traffic and 0.008 for southwest bound traffic. The terrain within the study area is considered level and a $0 \%$ no passing zone will be used. This results in a LOS of A for both directions.

## a. Seg. 1: 3000W Existing 2022 Mitigation Measures

Since the worst LOS is an A, no improvements are warranted for the existing segment conditions.

## 2. Seg. 2: 2000W Existing 2022 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The visual counts that were seasonally adjusted show that there are 18 vph heading northbound and 20 vph heading southbound during the pm peak hour. Dividing these volumes by 1700 vph , the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio is 0.011 for northbound and 0.012 for southbound. The terrain within the study area is considered level and a $0 \%$ no passing zone will be used. This results in a LOS of A for both directions.

## a. Seg. 2: 2000W Existing 2022 Mitigation Measures

Since the worst LOS is an A, no improvements are warranted for the existing segment conditions.

## G. Existing 2022 Intersection PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

In order to determine how well an intersection is functioning, the intersection's Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) for the peak hour is analyzed. The MOEs include:

1. Level of Service (LOS)
2. Control Delay
3. Volume/Capacity Ratio (V/C Ratio)
4. $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queue

Using the traffic volumes and turning movements shown previously, the 2022 existing MOEs for the intersections can be determined.

## 1. Int. 1 - Hwy 33/3000W Existing 2022 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The traffic volumes, identified at the beginning of this chapter, were entered into the computer modeling software Synchro. The results from the model for Intersection 1 are shown in the following figure.

Table 9 -Int. 1 - Existing (2022) Peak Hr MOEs

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {SBL }}$ | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| © Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | T |  | t |  |  | ¢ |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 9 | 4 | 330 | 16 | 7 | 296 |
| - Future Volume (vph) | 9 | 4 | 330 | 16 | 7 | 296 |
| - Sign Control | Stop | - | Free | - | - | Free |
| $\infty$ Median Width ( tt ) | 12 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC [s] | 6.4 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 | - |
| - Follow Up Time, tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 |  |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| - Control Delay [s] | 13.2 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| - Level of Service | B | B | A | A | A | A |
| - Queue Length 95th (ft) | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| - Approach Delay [s] | 13.2 |  | 0.0 | = | - | 0.3 |

## 2. Int. 2 - Hwy 33/2000W Existing 2022 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The traffic volumes, identified at the beginning of this chapter, were entered into the computer modeling software Synchro. The results from the model for Intersection 2 are shown in the following figure.

Table 10 -Int. 2 - Existing (2022) Peak Hr MOEs

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  |  |  |  | WBT WB |  |  |  |  |  |  | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | ¢ |  |  | * |  |
| - Traffic Volume [vph] | 4 | 351 | 6 | 1 | 391 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 7 |
| - Future Volume (vph] | 4 | 351 | 6 | 1 | 391 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 7 |
| - Sign Control | - | Free | - | - | Free | - | - | Stop | - | - | Stop | - |
| $\infty$ Median Width ( ft ) | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC (s) | 4.1 | - | - | 4.1 | - | - | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| - Follow Up Time, FF (s) | 2.2 | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 |
| - Control Delay [s] | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.7 | 13.7 | 13.7 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 15.8 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | B | B | C | C | C |
| - Queue Length 95th ( t ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| - Approach Delay [s] | - | 0.1 | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | 13.7 | - | - | 15.8 | - |

## 3. Int. 3 - 7000N/1750W Existing 2022 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The traffic volumes, identified at the beginning of this chapter, were entered into the computer modeling software Synchro. The results from the model for Intersection 3 are shown in the following figure.

Table 11 -Int. 3 - Existing (2022) Peak Hr MOEs

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  | EBR |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{4 B R}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | W/ |  |  | * | F |  |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| - Future Volume (vph) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| $\bigcirc$ - Sign Control | Stop | - | - | Free | Free | - |
| $\infty$ Median Width ( ft ) | 12 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | $\square$ | - |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 | - | - | - |
| O Follow Up Time, tF [s] | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 | - | - | - |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| - Control Delay [s] | 8.5 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| - Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\bigcirc$ Approach Delay (s) | 8.5 | - | - | 2.4 | 0.0 | - |

## 4. Int. 4 - 7000N/Solstice Circle East Existing 2022 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions (New Intersection)

Due to the fact that this intersection does not exist for the existing conditions, no delays are recorded. This intersection will be analyzed in the buildout and 20-year after buildout horizon years.

## 5. Int. 5 - 7000N/Solstice Circle West Existing 2022 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions (New Intersection)

Due to the fact that this intersection does not exist for the existing conditions, no delays are recorded. This intersection will be analyzed in the buildout and 20-year after buildout horizon years.

## H. Turn Lane Warrants Based on Safety Analysis of Intersections

## 1. Existing Conditions Left Turn Lane Analysis

Intersection \#1 and \#2 were evaluated for safety using ITD guidelines which recommend using the National Cooperative Highway Research Report 745 -Left-Turn Accommodations at Unsignalized Intersections (NCHRP 745) to evaluate left-hand turns and National Cooperative Highway Research Report 457: Evaluating Intersection Improvements: An Engineering Study Guide (NCHRP 457) to evaluate right-turn movements to determine if turning movements are consistent with national standards for safety based on traffic volumes. These guidelines show that if a three-leg intersection has traffic higher than 200 vph per lane on the major roadway and more than 150 vph per lane on a four-leg intersection, a left turn is warranted (see left-turn lane warrant chart in Chapter 4). Based on the ITD guidelines, a left turn lane is warranted for the southwest bound traffic at Intersection 1 and are warranted for both eastbound and westbound traffic at Intersection 2 (see Appendix F for the left-turn worksheet).

## 2. Existing Conditions Right Turn Lane Analysis

The Right-hand turn warrant analysis follows the guidance found in ITD's Traffic Manual: Idaho's Supplementary Guide to the MUTCD (reference the right-turn lane warrant chart in Chapter 4). Based on these guidelines, no right turning lanes are warranted for existing conditions (see Appendix $G$ for the right-turn worksheet).

## I. Analysis of Existing 2022 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions Summary

This chapter has identified the following:

## 1. Segments

b. Seg. 1: 3000W

The segment/link v/c ratio results in a LOS of A. Therefore, in accordance with ITD guidelines, no improvements are warranted for the existing conditions.
c. Seg. 2: 2000W

The segment/link v/c ratio results in a LOS of A. Therefore, in accordance with ITD guidelines, no improvements are warranted for the existing conditions.

## d. Segment Summary

The following table is a summary of each segment's $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio and LOS for each direction.

$$
\text { Table } 12 \text {-Existing } 2022 \text { Segments Traffic Condition Summary }
$$

| 3000W | 2022 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direction | v/c | LOS |
| Northeast | 0.014 | A |
| Southwest | 0.008 | A | | Direction | v/c | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northbound | 0.011 | A |
| Southbound | 0.012 | A |

## 2. Intersections

a. Int. 1: Hwy 33/3000W

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of B during the PM peak hour of the day.
b. Int. 2: Hwy 33/2000W

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of C during the PM peak hour of the day.
c. Int. 3: 7000N/1750W

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of A during the PM peak hour of the day.

## d. Int. 4-7000N/Solstice Circle East (New Intersection)

Due to the fact that this intersection does not exist for the existing conditions, no delays are recorded. This intersection will be analyzed in the buildout and 20-year after buildout horizon years.

## e. Int. 5-7000N/Solstice Circle West (New Intersection)

Due to the fact that this intersection does not exist for the existing conditions, no delays are recorded. This intersection will be analyzed in the buildout and 20-year after buildout horizon years.

## f. Intersection Summary

The following table is a summary of each intersection's LOS and delay time for each turning movement.

## Table 13 -Existing 2022 Intersections Traffic Condition Summary

| Int 1 - Hwy 33/3000W - Build LOS and Delay Times |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Northeastbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2022 Traffic | n/a | n/a | n/a | 7 | 296 | n/a | n/a | 330 | 16 | 9 | n/a | 4 |
| LOS | n/a | n/a | n/a | A | A | n/a | n/a | A | A | B | n/a | B |
| Delay | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.1 | 0.3 | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 13.2 | n/a | 13.2 |


| Int 2 - Hwy 33/2000W - Build LOS and Delay Times |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2022 Traffic | 4 | 351 | 6 | 1 | 391 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 7 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | B | B | C | C | C |
| Delay | 0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 13.7 | 13.7 | 13.7 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 15.8 |


| Int 3-7000N/1750W - Build LOS and Delay Times |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2022 Traffic | 1 | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 | 3 | n/a | n/a | 4 | 1 |
| LOS | A | n/a | A | n/a | n/a | n/a | A | A | n/a | n/a | A | A |
| Delay | 8.5 | n/a | 8.5 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 2.4 | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 |

## 3. Turn Lane Analysis

## a. Left Turn Lane Analysis

Left turns lanes are warranted for the southwest bound traffic at Intersection 1 and are warranted for both eastbound and westbound traffic at Intersection 2.

## b. Right Turn Lane Analysis

Right turns lanes are not warranted for either intersection on Hwy 33 for the existing conditions.

## 4. Overall Summary for 2022

In summary, the following is determined to be operating at an unacceptable level for the existing conditions:

1. Int. 1 Hwy 33/3000W: Southeast bound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
2. Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Eastbound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
3. Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Westbound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels

## 5. Mitigation Measures for the 2022 Existing Conditions

It is recommended that a left turn lane be constructed on Hwy 33 for the southeast bound traffic at Int. 1 and that left turn lanes be constructed for both the eastbound and westbound traffic on Hwy 33 at Int. 2.

## VII. Projected Traffic

## A. Site Traffic

It is anticipated that buildout of the development will be complete by 2027.

## 1. Trip Generation

In order to determine the trips generated by the proposed development, the ITE Trip Generation $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition Manual was used. This study will use traffic data obtained from the ITD to determine traffic conditions for the 2022 (existing), 2027 (Project buildout), and the 2047 (Future) horizon years.

## a. Buildout (2027)

The following two (2) tables show the land use and trip generation for the ADT and the peak hour.
Table 14- Land Use and Trip Generation (ADT) for Buildout (2027)

| Land Use Category | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Size | Units | Trip Generation per unit | Total Trips | Internal Capture <br> Trips |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pass-by } \\ \text { Trips } \end{gathered}$ | Primary Trips Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weekday Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Family Detached Housing (Main) | 210 | 17 | Dwelling Untis | 9.57 | 163 | 0\% | 0 | - - | 163 |
| Single-Family Detached Housing (Accessory) | 210 | 17 | Dwelling Untis | 9.57 | 163 | 0\% | 0 | - - | 163 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 325 |  | 0 | 0 | 325 |

Table 15- Land Use and Trip Generation (Peak Hour) for Buildout (2027)

| Land Use Category | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Size | Units | Trip Generation per unit | Total Trips | Internal Capture Trips |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Pass-by } \\ \text { Trips } \end{array}$ |  | Primary <br> Trips Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weekday Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Family Detached Housing (Main) | 210 | 17 | Dwelling Untis | 0.76 | 13 | 0\% | 0 | - | - | 13 |
| Single-Family Detached Housing (Accessory) | 210 | 17 | Dwelling Untis | 0.76 | 13 | 0\% | 0 | - | - | 13 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 26 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 26 |

## 2. Trip Distribution

Trip distribution is a percentage indicating what percentage of traffic is entering or exiting the study area. The ITE Trip Generation Handbook outlines the trip distribution for each land use. The following two (2) tables show the land use, trip generation, and trip distribution for the ADT and the peak hour.
Table 16- Trip Distribution (ADT) for Buildout (2027)

| Land Use Category | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Size | Units | Trip Generation per unit | Total <br> Trips | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Internal } \\ \text { Capture } \\ \text { Trips } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pass-by } \\ \text { Trips } \end{gathered}$ |  | Primary <br> Trips Total | Primary <br> Trips <br> Entering |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Primary } \\ \text { Trips } \\ \text { Exiting } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weekday Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Family Detached Housing (Main) | 210 | 17 | Dwelling Untis | 9.57 | 163 | 0\% | 0 | - | - | 163 | 50\% | 81 | 50\% | 81 |
| Single-Family Detached Housing (Accessory) | 210 | 17 | Dwelling Untis | 9.57 | 163 | 0\% | 0 | - | - | 163 | 50\% | 81 | 50\% | 81 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 325 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 325 |  | 163 |  | 163 |
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Table 17- Trip Distribution (Peak Hour) for Buildout (2027)

| Land Use Category | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Size | Units | Trip Generation per unit | Total Trips |  |  |  |  | Primary <br> Trips Total | $\begin{array}{\|r} \hline \text { Prin } \\ \text { Tr } \\ \text { Ent } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Prim } \\ \text { Tri] } \\ \text { Exiti } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weekday Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Family Detached Housing (Main) | 210 | 17 | Dwelling Untis | 0.76 | 13 | 0\% | 0 | - | - | 13 | 64\% | 8 | 36\% | 5 |
| Single-Family Detached Housing (Accessory) | 210 | 17 | Dwelling Untis | 0.76 | 13 | 0\% | 0 | - | - | 13 | 64\% | 8 | 36\% | 5 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 26 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 26 |  | 17 |  | 9 |

## 3. Modal Split

Modal split is the determination of different travel modes (automobile, heavy vehicles, walk, etc.) from an origin to a given destination. Analyzing the pedestrian traffic is outside the scope of this study and it is assumed that no heavy vehicles will be generated from the development. A standard $5 \%$ heavy vehicle percentage will be applied to this study.

## 4. Trip Assignment

It is assumed that $10 \%$ of the generated traffic will travel to and from Intersection 1 and $90 \%$ will travel to and from Intersection 2 and 3.
a. Intersection 1: Hwy 33/3000W

When the $10 \%$ of the generated traffic reaches this intersection, it is assumed that the traffic will follow the existing traffic percentages presented in Chapter 6; 67\% using Hwy 33 to and from Tetonia and $33 \%$ using Hwy 33 to and from the Hwy $33 / H w y ~ 32$ intersection.
b. Intersection 2: Hwy 33/2000W

When traffic enters/exits the development, it is assumed that $90 \%$ will use 7000 N to and from Intersection 3. From there, it is assumed that $95 \%$ of the traffic will use 1750 W south of the intersection to and from 6000 N , to and from 2000 W , and then to and from Intersection 2 on Hwy 33; the remaining $5 \%$ will use 1750 W north of the intersection. When the traffic reaches Intersection 2, it is assumed that the traffic will follow the existing traffic percentages presented in Chapter 6; $57 \%$ turning left, $9 \%$ thru, and $35 \%$ turning right.
C. Intersection 3: 7000N/1750W

It is assumed that when the $90 \%$ of traffic generated from the development will travel to and from Intersection 1. When the traffic reaches this intersection, $95 \%$ will use the south leg, heading to and from Hwy 33, and the remaining $5 \%$ will use the north leg of the intersection

## d. Intersection 4: 7000N/Solstice Circle East

From the site plan, it is assumed that nine (9) lots (lots 6-14) will access 7000N via the east access.

## e. Intersection 5: 7000N/Solstice Circle West

From the site plan, it is assumed that eight (8) lots (lots $1-5$ and lots $15-17$ ) will access 7000 N via the west access.

## B. Through Traffic (Non-Site Traffic)

## 1. Non-Site Traffic for anticipated Development in Study Area

## a. Method of Projections

Pass-by trips are made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a destination without a route diversion. In other words, a pass-by trip is when the traffic on an adjacent roadway is attracted to a certain land use in a development as non-site traffic. The trip generally goes from origin to generator and then returns to the origin. The proposed development does not have any land uses that would be considered pass-by trips.

## b. Trip Distribution

This section is not applicable due to the fact that single-family detached housing is not considered a nonsite traffic generator.

## c. Modal Split

This section is not applicable due to the fact that single-family detached housing is not considered a nonsite traffic generator.

## d. Trip Assignment

This section is not applicable due to the fact that single-family detached housing is not considered a nonsite traffic generator.

## C. Total Traffic

The total trips generated by the development and the impact to each intersection for the 2027 Buildout are shown in the following figures.


Figure 16- Intersection 1 Hwy 33/3000W PM Peak Generated Traffic


Figure 17- Intersection 2 Hwy 33/2000W PM Peak Generated Traffic


Figure 18- Intersection 3 7000N/1750W PM Peak Generated Traffic


Figure 19- Intersection 4 Solstice Circle East PM Peak Generated Traffic


Figure 20- Intersection 4 Solstice Circle West PM Peak Generated Traffic

## VIII. 2027 Horizon Year Traffic Analysis (Buildout)

## A. On-Site Development

Buildout is assumed to be complete by the year 2027.

## B. Traffic Forecasting

The traffic counts from Chapter 6 were increased by the annual growth rate percentages to establish the background traffic. This chapter will analyze two (2) scenarios for each segment and intersection; 2027 background traffic (without the development) and 2027 background plus site traffic (with the development).

## C. Roadway Network

Within the area of influence there will be two (2) roadway segments, three (3) existing intersections, and two (2) future intersection studied. The segments and the intersections that will analyzed are:

1. Segment $\# 1-3000 \mathrm{~W}$
2. Segment \#2-2000W
3. Intersection \#1 - Hwy $33 / 3000 \mathrm{~W}$
4. Intersection \#2 - Hwy $33 / 2000 \mathrm{~W}$
5. Intersection $\# 3-7000 \mathrm{~N} / 1750 \mathrm{~W}$
6. Intersection $\# 4-7000 \mathrm{~N} /$ Solstice Circle East (new intersection)
7. Intersection $\# 5-7000 \mathrm{~N} /$ Solstice Circle West (new intersection)

## D. 2027 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes

## 1. Seg. 1 - 3000W 2027 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes

a. 2027 Background 3000W PM Peak Hour Flow

The traffic volumes for the 2022 Existing Conditions were increased by the annual growth rate to forecast the 2027 Background Traffic. The results of this forecast 26 vph headed northeast and 15 vph headed southwest during pm peak hour.
b. 2027 Background plus Site Traffic 3000W PM Peak Hour Flow

The traffic generated by the development was added to the 2027 Background Traffic. The results of this forecast 28 vph headed northeast and 17 vph headed southwest during pm peak hour after buildout.
2. Seg. 2-2000W 2027 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes
a. 2027 Background 2000W PM Peak Hour Flow

The traffic volumes for the 2022 Existing Conditions were increased by the annual growth rate to forecast the 2027 Background Traffic. The results of this forecast 20 vph headed northbound and 23 vph headed southbound during pm peak hour.
b. 2027 Background plus Site Traffic 2000W PM Peak Hour Flow

The traffic generated by the development was added to the 2027 Background Traffic. The results of this forecast 37 vph headed northbound and 30 vph headed southbound during pm peak hour after buildout.

## E. 2027 PM Peak Intersection Traffic Volumes

The traffic volumes for the 2022 Existing Conditions were increased by the annual growth rate to forecast the 2027 Background Traffic for each intersection. The following sections show the forecasted intersection traffic volumes without and with the proposed development.

1. Int. 1 - Hwy 33/3000W 2027 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes


Figure 21: Hwy 33/3000W 2027 Traffic Volumes without and with the Development
2. Int. 2 - Hwy 33/2000W 2027 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes


Figure 22: Hwy 33/2000W 2027 Traffic Volumes without and with the Development
3. Int. 3 - 7000N/1750W 2027 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes


Figure 23: 7000N/1750W 2027 Traffic Volumes without and with the Development

## 4. Int. 4 - 7000N/Solstice East 2027 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes

Since this intersection only exists with the development, only traffic volumes with the development are included.


Figure 24: 7000N/Solstice Circle East 2027 Traffic Volumes with the Development

## 5. Int. 5-7000N/Solstice West 2027 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes

Since this intersection only exists with the development, only traffic volumes with the development are included.


Figure 25: 7000N/Solstice Circle West 2027 Traffic Volumes with the Development

## F. 2027 Segment PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The traffic counts shown previously in the chapter were used to determine the forecasted conditions without and with the proposed development. The following sections identify the projected LOS for each segment for both scenarios.

## 1. Seg. 1 - 3000W 2027 PM Peak Hr Segment Traffic Conditions

a. Seg. 1-2027 Background 3000W PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The visual counts that were seasonally adjusted show that there were 26 vph heading northeast and 15 vph heading southwest during the pm peak hour. Dividing these volumes by 1700 vph , the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio is 0.015 for northeast bound traffic and 0.009 for southwest bound traffic. The terrain within the study area is considered level and a $0 \%$ no passing zone will be used. This results in a LOS of A for both directions.
b. Seg. 1-2027 Background plus Site Traffic 3000W PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions The traffic generated by the development was added to the 2027 Background Traffic. The results show that there are 28 vph heading northeast and 17 vph heading southwest during the pm peak hour. Dividing these volumes by 1700 vph , the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio is 0.016 for northeast bound traffic and 0.010 for southwest bound traffic. The terrain within the study area is considered level and a $0 \%$ no passing zone will be used. This results in a LOS of A for both directions.
c. Seg. 1-2027 Background plus Site Traffic 3000W PM Peak Hr Mitigation Measures Since the worst LOS is an A, no improvements are warranted for the existing segment conditions.

## 2. Seg. 2 - 2000W 2027 PM Peak Hr Segment Traffic Conditions

## a. Seg. 2-2027 Background 2000W PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The visual counts that were seasonally adjusted show that there are 20 vph heading northbound and 23 vph heading southbound during the pm peak hour. Dividing these volumes by 1700 vph , the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio is 0.012 for northbound and 0.013 for southbound. The terrain within the study area is considered level and a $0 \%$ no passing zone will be used. This results in a LOS of A for both directions.
b. Seg. 2 - 2027 Background plus Site Traffic 2000W PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions The traffic generated by the development was added to the 2027 Background Traffic. The results show that there are 37 vph heading northbound and 30 vph heading southbound during the pm peak hour. Dividing these volumes by 1700 vph , the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio is 0.022 for northbound and 0.018 for southbound. The terrain within the study area is considered level and a $0 \%$ no passing zone will be used. This results in a LOS of A for both directions.
c. Seg. 2-2027 Background plus Site Traffic 2000W PM Peak Hr Mitigation Measures Since the worst LOS is an A, no improvements are warranted for the existing segment conditions.

## G. 2027 Intersection PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

In order to determine how well an intersection is functioning, the intersection's Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) for the peak hour is analyzed. The MOEs include:

1. Level of Service (LOS)
2. Control Delay
3. Volume/Capacity Ratio (V/C Ratio)
4. $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queue

Using the traffic volumes and turning movements shown previously, the 2027 MOEs for the intersections, without and with the development, can be determined.

## 1. Int. 1 - Hwy 33/3000W 2027 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The traffic volumes, identified at the beginning of this chapter, were entered into the computer modeling software Synchro. The results from the model for Intersection 1, without and with the development, are shown in the following figures.

Table 18-Int. 1 - 2027 Peak Hr MOEs without the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  |  | $\dagger_{\text {NBT }}$ | NBR | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\text { SBL }}$ | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | \% |  | $\hat{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 10 | 5 | 375 | 18 | 8 | 336 |
| - Future Volume (vph) | 10 | 5 | 375 | 18 | 8 | 336 |
| - Sign Control | Stop | - | Free | - | - | Free |
| $\infty$ Median Width ( ft ) | 12 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC [s] | 6.4 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 |  |
| - Follow Up Time, tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| - Control Delay [s] | 14.2 | 14.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| - Level of Service | B | B | A | A | A | A |
| - Queue Length 95th (it) | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| - Approach Delay (s) | 14.2 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.3 |

Table 19 -Int. 1 - 2027 Peak Hr MOEs with the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {SBL }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | M |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | (1) |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 11 | 6 | 375 | 19 | 9 | 336 |
| - Future Volume (vph) | 11 | 6 | 375 | 19 | 9 | 336 |
| - Sign Control | Stop | - | Free | - | - | Free |
| ©o Median Width (tt) | 12 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC [s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Follow Up Time, FF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| - Control Delay [s] | 14.0 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| - Level of Service | B | B | A | A | A | A |
| - Queue Length 95th ( ft ) | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| - Approach Delay [s] | 14.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.3 |

## 2. Int. 2 - Hwy 33/2000W 2027 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The traffic volumes, identified at the beginning of this chapter, were entered into the computer modeling software Synchro. The results from the model for Intersection 2, without and with the development, are shown in the following figures.

Table 20-Int. 2 - 2027 Peak Hr MOEs without the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  | $\rightarrow$ <br> EBT | EBR |  | * |  | $4$ |  | NBR |  | SBT | $\frac{\downarrow}{S B R}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) |  | * |  |  | \$ |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 399 | 7 | 2 | 444 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 2 | 8 |
| - Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 399 | 7 | 2 | 444 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 2 | 8 |
| - Sign Control | - | Free | - | - | Free | - | - | Stop | - | - | Stop | - |
| $\infty$ Median Width (ft) | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC [s) | 4.1 | - | - | 4.1 | - | - | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| - Follow Up Time, tF (s) | 2.2 | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| - Control Delay [s] | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 18.1 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A | C | C | C | C | C | C |
| - Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| - Approach Delay [s] | - | 0.1 | - | - | 0.1 | - | - | 15.6 | - | - | 18.1 | - |

Table 21 -Int. 2 - 2027 Peak Hr MOEs with the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  | $\rightarrow$ <br> EBT | EBR | wBL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{4 B R}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| So Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 4 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 8 | 399 | 7 | 2 | 444 | 26 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 17 | 3 | 10 |
| O Future Volume (vph) | 8 | 399 | 7 | 2 | 444 | 26 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 17 | 3 | 10 |
| - Sign Control | - | Free | - | - | Free | - | - | Stop | - | - | Stop | - |
| $\infty$ Median Width (ft) | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC (s) | 4.1 | - | - | 4.1 | - | - | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| - Follow Up Time, tF (s) | 2.2 | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| - Control Delay [s] | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 18.9 | 18.9 | 18.9 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A | C | C | C | C | C | C |
| - Queue Length 95th (ft) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| $\bigcirc$ Approach Delay (s) | - | 0.3 | - | - | 0.1 | - | - | 16.1 | - | - | 18.9 | - |

## 3. Int. 3 - 7000N/1750W 2027 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The traffic volumes, identified at the beginning of this chapter, were entered into the computer modeling software Synchro. The results from the model for Intersection 3, without and with the development, are shown in the following figures.

Table 22-Int. 3-2027 Peak Hr MOEs without the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  | EBR | NBL |  | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| - Future Volume (vph) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| - Sign Control | Stop | - | - | Free | Free | - |
| $\infty$ Median Width (ft) | 12 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | $\square$ | - |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC [s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 | - | - | - |
| - Follow Up Time, F (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 | - | - | - |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| O Control Delay [s] | 8.5 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| - Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - Approach Delay [s] | 8.5 | - | - | 2.9 | 0.0 | - |

Table 23-Int. 3-2027 Peak Hr MOEs with the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  |  | NBL |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & \text { SBR } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| © Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |
| - Traffic Volume [vph] | [ | 8 | 16 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| - Future Volume (vph) | 3 | 8 | 16 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| - Sign Control | Stop | - | - | Free | Free | - |
| $\infty$ Median Width ( ft ) | 12 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC [s] | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 | - | - | - |
| - Follow Up Time, FF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 | - | - | - |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| - Control Delay [s] | 8.5 | 8.5 | 0.1 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| - Queue Length 95th (ft) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\bigcirc$ Approach Delay (s) | 8.5 | - | - | 6.2 | 0.0 | - |

## 4. Int. 4 - 7000N/Solstice Circle East 2027 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions (New Intersection)

Since this intersection only exists with the development, only traffic volumes with the development are included.

Table 24-Int. 4-2027 Peak Hr MOEs with the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  | EBR | WBL | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WBT } \\ & \text { WB } \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{4}{N B L}$ | NBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | t |  |  | * | \% |  |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 7 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 1 | 4 |
| - Future Volume (vph) | 7 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 1 | 4 |
| - Sign Control | Free | - | - | Free | Stop | - |
| $\infty$ Median Width ( t ( ) | [] | - | - | 0 | 12 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | $\square$ | - |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC [s] | - | - | 4.1 | - | 6.4 | 6.2 |
| - Follow Up Time, tF [s] | - | - | 2.2 | - | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| O Control Delay [s] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 8.4 | 8.4 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| - Queue Length 95th ( t () | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\bigcirc$ Approach Delay [s] | 0.0 | - | - | 3.1 | 8.4 | - |

## 5. Int. 5 - 7000N/Solstice Circle West 2027 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions (New Intersection)

Since this intersection only exists with the development, only traffic volumes with the development are included.

Table 25-Int. 5-2027 Peak Hr MOEs with the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | *- | $4$ | NBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| - Future Volume (vph] | 5 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| - Sign Control | Free | - | - | Free | Stop | - |
| $\infty$ Median Width ( ft ) | [] | - | - | 0 | 12 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | $\square$ | - |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC [s] | - | - | 4.1 | - | 6.4 | 6.2 |
| - Follow Up Time, FF (s) | - | - | 2.2 | - | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| - Control Delay [s] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 8.4 | 8.4 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| - Queue Length 95th ( ft ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\bigcirc$ Approach Delay [s] | 0.0 | - | - | 4.5 | 8.4 | - |

## H. Turn Lane Warrants Based on Safety Analysis of Intersections

## 1. 2027 Left Turn Lane Analysis

Intersection \#1 and \#2 were evaluated for safety using ITD guidelines which recommend using the National Cooperative Highway Research Report 745 -Left-Turn Accommodations at Unsignalized Intersections (NCHRP 745) to evaluate left-hand turns and National Cooperative Highway Research Report 457: Evaluating Intersection Improvements: An Engineering Study Guide (NCHRP 457) to evaluate right-turn movements to determine if turning movements are consistent with national standards for safety based on traffic volumes. These guidelines show that if a three-leg intersection has traffic higher than 200 vph per lane on the major roadway and more than 150 vph per lane on a four-leg intersection, a left turn is warranted (see left-turn lane warrant chart in Chapter 4). Based on the ITD guidelines, no new turn-lanes are warranted from the increase (including the projected traffic generated by the proposed development) in traffic from 2022 to 2027 (see Appendix K for the left-turn worksheet).

## 2. $\mathbf{2 0 2 7}$ Right Turn Lane Analysis

The Right-hand turn warrant analysis follows the guidance found in ITD's Traffic Manual: Idaho's Supplementary Guide to the MUTCD (reference the right-turn lane warrant chart in Chapter 4). Based on these guidelines, no right turning lanes are warranted for existing conditions (see Appendix K for the right-turn worksheet).

## I. 2027 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions Summary without and with the Development

This chapter has identified the following:

## 1. Segments

d. Seg. 1: 3000W without the Development

The segment/link v/c ratio results in a LOS of A. Therefore, in accordance with ITD guidelines, no improvements are warranted for the existing conditions.
e. Seg. 1: 3000W with the Development

The segment/link v/c ratio results in a LOS of A. Therefore, in accordance with ITD guidelines, no improvements are warranted for the existing conditions.
f. Seg. 2: 2000W without the Development

The segment/link v/c ratio results in a LOS of A. Therefore, in accordance with ITD guidelines, no improvements are warranted for the existing conditions.
g. Seg. 2: 2000W with the Development

The segment/link v/c ratio results in a LOS of A. Therefore, in accordance with ITD guidelines, no improvements are warranted for the existing conditions.

## h. Segment Summary

The following tables are a summary of each segment's $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio and LOS for each direction without and with the development.

Table 26 -Seg. 1 3000W 2027 Segments Traffic Condition Summary

| 3000W | 2022 |  | 2027 |  | 3000W | 2022 |  | 2027 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direction | v/c | LOS | v/c | LOS | Direction | v/c | LOS | v/c | LOS |
| Northeast | 0.014 | A | 0.015 | A | Northeast | 0.014 | A | 0.016 | A |
| Southwest | 0.008 | A | 0.009 | A | Southwest | 0.008 | A | 0.010 | A |
| Without the Development |  |  |  |  | With the Development |  |  |  |  |

Table 27 -Seg. 2 2000W 2027 Segments Traffic Condition Summary

| 2000 W | 2022 |  | 2027 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direction | v/c | LOS | v/c | LOS |
| Northbound | 0.011 | A | 0.012 | A |
| Southbound | 0.012 | A | 0.013 | A |
| Without the Development |  |  |  |  |


| 2000 W | 2022 |  | 2027 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direction | v/c | LOS | v/c | LOS |
| Northbound | 0.011 | A | 0.022 | A |
| Southbound | 0.012 | A | 0.018 | A |
| With the Development |  |  |  |  |

## 2. Intersections

a. Int. 1: Hwy 33/3000W without the Development

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of B during the PM peak hour of the day.
b. Int. 1: Hwy 33/3000W with the Development

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of B during the PM peak hour of the day.
c. Int. 2: Hwy 33/2000W without the Development

The delay times, v/c ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of C during the PM peak hour of the day.
d. Int. 2: Hwy 33/2000W with the Development

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of C during the PM peak hour of the day.
e. Int. 3: 7000N/1750W without the Development

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of A during the PM peak hour of the day.
f. Int. 3: 7000N/1750W with the Development

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of A during the PM peak hour of the day.
g. Int. 4-7000N/Solstice Circle East (New Intersection) with the Development The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of A during the PM peak hour of the day.
h. Int. 5-7000N/Solstice Circle West (New Intersection) with the Development The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of A during the PM peak hour of the day.

## i. Intersection Summary

The following tables are a summary of each intersection's LOS and delay time for each turning movement. It should be noted that by adding the trips generated by the development, none of the LOS's degraded.

Table 28 -Int. 12027 Traffic Condition Summary without and with the Development

| Int 1 - Hwy 33/3000W - Build LOS and Delay Times without the Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Northeastbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2027 Traffic | n/a | n/a | n/a | 8 | 336 | n/a | n/a | 375 | 18 | 10 | n/a | 5 |
| LOS | n/a | n/a | n/a | A | A | n/a | n/a | A | A | B | n/a | B |
| Delay | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.1 | 0.3 | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 14.2 | n/a | 14.2 |


| Int 1 - Hwy 33/3000W - Build LOS and Delay Times with the Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Northeastbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2027 Traffic | n/a | n/a | n/a | 9 | 336 | n/a | n/a | 375 | 19 | 11 | n/a | 6 |
| LOS | n/a | n/a | n/a | A | A | n/a | n/a | A | A | B | n/a | B |
| Delay | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.1 | 0.3 | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 14 | n/a | 14 |

Table 29 -Int. 22027 Traffic Condition Summary without and with the Development

|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2027 Traffic | 5 | 399 | 7 | 2 | 444 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 2 | 8 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | C | C | C | C | C | C |
| Delay | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 18.1 |


| Int 2 - Hwy 33/2000W - Build LOS and Delay Times with the Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2027 Traffic | 8 | 399 | 7 | 2 | 444 | 26 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 17 | 3 | 10 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | C | C | C | C | C | C |
| Delay | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 18.9 | 18.9 | 18.9 |

Table 30 -Int. 32027 Traffic Condition Summary without and with the Development

|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2027 Traffic | 2 | n/a | 2 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 2 | 3 | n/a | n/a | 5 | 2 |
| LOS | A | n/a | A | n/a | n/a | n/a | A | A | n/a | n/a | A | A |
| Delay | 8.5 | n/a | 8.5 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 2.9 | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 |


|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2027 Traffic | 3 | n/a | 8 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 16 | 3 | n/a | n/a | 5 | 3 |
| LOS | A | n/a | A | n/a | n/a | n/a | A | A | n/a | n/a | A | A |
| Delay | 8.5 | n/a | 8.5 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.1 | 6.2 | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 |

Table 31 -Int. 42027 Traffic Condition Summary with the Development

|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2027 Traffic | n/a | 7 | 1 | 8 | 11 | n/a | 1 | n/a | 4 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| LOS | n/a | A | A | A | A | n/a | A | n/a | A | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Delay | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.1 | n/a | 8.4 | n/a | 8.4 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Table 32 -Int. 52027 Traffic Condition Summary with the Development

|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2027 Traffic | n/a | 5 | 1 | 7 | 5 | n/a | 1 | n/a | 3 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| LOS | n/a | A | A | A | A | n/a | A | n/a | A | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Delay | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.5 | n/a | 8.4 | n/a | 8.4 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

## 3. Turn Lane Analysis

## a. Left Turn Lane Analysis

Based on the ITD guidelines, no new turn-lanes are warranted from the increase (including the projected traffic generated by the proposed development) in traffic from 2022 to 2027

## b. Right Turn Lane Analysis

Right turns lanes are not warranted for either intersection on Hwy 33 for the 2027 buildout.

## 4. Overall Summary for 2027

## a. 2022 Existing Conditions Review

In summary, the following was determined to be operating at an unacceptable level for the 2022 existing conditions:

1. Int. 1 Hwy 33/3000W: Southeast bound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
2. Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Eastbound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
3. Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Westbound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
(1) 2022 Mitigation Measures

It is recommended that a left turn lane be constructed on Hwy 33 for the southeast bound traffic at Int. 1 and that left turn lanes be constructed for both the eastbound and westbound traffic on Hwy 33 at Int. 2.
b. 2027 Buildout Conditions

Besides those areas noted for the 2022 existing conditions, no new LOS has been identified as operating at an unacceptable level for the 2027 buildout year.

## 5. Mitigation Measures

Since no new areas are identified to be operating at an unacceptable level, no new mitigation measures are warranted for the 2027 buildout year.

## IX. 2047 Horizon Year Traffic Analysis

## A. On-Site Development

Buildout is assumed to be complete by the year 2027. This chapter will analyze the forecasted conditions for the 20-years after buildout.

## B. Traffic Forecasting

The traffic counts from Chapter 6 were increased by the annual growth rate percentages to establish the background traffic. This chapter will analyze two (2) scenarios for each segment and intersection; 2047 background traffic (without the development) and 2047 background plus site traffic (with the development).

## C. Roadway Network

Within the area of influence there will be two (2) roadway segments, three (3) existing intersections, and two (2) future intersection studied. The segments and the intersections that will analyzed are:

1. Segment $\# 1-3000 \mathrm{~W}$
2. Segment \#2-2000W
3. Intersection \#1 - Hwy $33 / 3000$ W
4. Intersection \#2 - Hwy $33 / 2000 \mathrm{~W}$
5. Intersection $\# 3-7000 \mathrm{~N} / 1750 \mathrm{~W}$
6. Intersection $\# 4-7000 \mathrm{~N} /$ Solstice Circle East (new intersection)
7. Intersection $\# 5-7000 \mathrm{~N} /$ Solstice Circle West (new intersection)

## D. 2047 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes

## 1. Seg. 1 - 3000W 2047 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes

a. 2047 Background 3000W PM Peak Hour Flow

The traffic volumes for the 2027 Horizon Year were increased by the annual growth rate to forecast the 2047 Background Traffic. The results of this forecast 44 vph headed northeast and 25 vph headed southwest during pm peak hour.
b. 2047 Background plus Site Traffic 3000W PM Peak Hour Flow

The traffic generated by the development was added to the 2047 Background Traffic. The results of this forecast 46 vph headed northeast and 27 vph headed southwest during pm peak hour after buildout.

## 2. Seg. 2-2000W 2047 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes

c. 2047 Background 2000W PM Peak Hour Flow

The traffic volumes for the 2027 Horizon Year were increased by the annual growth rate to forecast the 2047 Background Traffic. The results of this forecast 34 vph headed northbound and 38 vph headed southbound during pm peak hour.
d. 2047 Background plus Site Traffic 2000W PM Peak Hour Flow

The traffic generated by the development was added to the 2047 Background Traffic. The results of this forecast 51 vph headed northbound and 45 vph headed southbound during pm peak hour after buildout.

## E. 2047 PM Peak Intersection Traffic Volumes

The traffic volumes for the 2027 Horizon Year were increased by the annual growth rate to forecast the 2047 Background Traffic for each intersection. The following sections show the forecasted intersection traffic volumes without and with the proposed development.

1. Int. 1 - Hwy 33/3000W 2047 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes


Figure 26: Hwy 33/3000W 2047 Traffic Volumes without and with the Development
2. Int. 2 - Hwy 33/2000W 2047 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes


Figure 27: Hwy 33/2000W 2047 Traffic Volumes without and with the Development
3. Int. 3 - 7000N/1750W 2047 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes


Figure 28: 7000N/1750W 2047 Traffic Volumes without and with the Development
4. Int. 4 - 7000N/Solstice East 2047 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes

Since this intersection only exists with the development, only traffic volumes with the development are included.


Figure 29: 7000N/Solstice Circle East 2047 Traffic Volumes with the Development

## 5. Int. 5-7000N/Solstice West 2047 PM Peak Segment Traffic Volumes

Since this intersection only exists with the development, only traffic volumes with the development are included.


Figure 30: 7000N/Solstice Circle West 2047 Traffic Volumes with the Development

## F. 2047 Segment PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The traffic counts shown previously in the chapter were used to determine the forecasted conditions without and with the proposed development. The following sections identify the projected LOS for each segment for both scenarios.

## 1. Seg. 1 - 3000W 2047 PM Peak Hr Segment Traffic Conditions

## a. Seg. 1-2047 Background 3000W PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The visual counts that were seasonally adjusted show that there were 44 vph heading northeast and 25 vph heading southwest during the pm peak hour. Dividing these volumes by 1700 vph , the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio is 0.026 for northeast bound traffic and 0.014 for southwest bound traffic. The terrain within the study area is considered level and a $0 \%$ no passing zone will be used. This results in a LOS of A for both directions.
b. Seg. 1-2047 Background plus Site Traffic 3000W PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions The traffic generated by the development was added to the 2047 Background Traffic. The results show that there are 46 vph heading northeast and 27 vph heading southwest during the pm peak hour. Dividing these volumes by 1700 vph , the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio is 0.027 for northeast bound traffic and 0.016 for southwest bound traffic. The terrain within the study area is considered level and a $0 \%$ no passing zone will be used. This results in a LOS of A for both directions.
c. Seg. 1-2047 Background plus Site Traffic 3000W PM Peak Hr Mitigation Measures Since the worst LOS is an A, no improvements are warranted for the existing segment conditions.

## 2. Seg. 2 - 2000W 2047 PM Peak Hr Segment Traffic Conditions

## a. Seg. 2-2047 Background 2000W PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The visual counts that were seasonally adjusted show that there are 34 vph heading northbound and 38 vph heading southbound during the pm peak hour. Dividing these volumes by 1700 vph , the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio is 0.020 for northbound and 0.022 for southbound. The terrain within the study area is considered level and a $0 \%$ no passing zone will be used. This results in a LOS of A for both directions.
b. Seg. 2 - 2047 Background plus Site Traffic 2000W PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions The traffic generated by the development was added to the 2047 Background Traffic. The results show that there are 51 vph heading northbound and 45 vph heading southbound during the pm peak hour. Dividing these volumes by 1700 vph , the v/c ratio is 0.030 for northbound and 0.026 for southbound. The terrain within the study area is considered level and a $0 \%$ no passing zone will be used. This results in a LOS of A for both directions.
c. Seg. 2-2047 Background plus Site Traffic 2000W PM Peak Hr Mitigation Measures Since the worst LOS is an A, no improvements are warranted for the existing segment conditions.

## G. 2047 Intersection PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

In order to determine how well an intersection is functioning, the intersection's Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) for the peak hour is analyzed. The MOEs include:

1. Level of Service (LOS)
2. Control Delay
3. Volume/Capacity Ratio (V/C Ratio)
4. $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queue

Using the traffic volumes and turning movements shown previously, the 2047 MOEs for the intersections, without and with the development, can be determined.

## 1. Int. 1 - Hwy 33/3000W 2047 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The traffic volumes, identified at the beginning of this chapter, were entered into the computer modeling software Synchro. The results from the model for Intersection 1, without and with the development, are shown in the following figures.

Table 33-Int. 1 - 2047 Peak Hr MOEs without the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  |  |  | $\%$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | * |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 17 | 8 | 625 | 31 | 14 | 561 |
| O Future Volume (vph) | 17 | 8 | 625 | 31 | 14 | 561 |
| - Sign Control | Stop $\checkmark$ |  | Free | - | - | Free |
| $\infty$ Median Width (ft) | 12 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 |  |
| - Follow Up Time, tF [s] | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| - Control Delay (s) | 24.7 | 24.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| - Level of Service | C | C | A | A | A | A |
| - Queue Length 95th ( ft ) | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| - Approach Delay [s] | 24.7 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.5 |

Table 34 -Int. 1 - 2047 Peak Hr MOEs with the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{SBT}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | M |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 18 | 9 | 625 | 32 | 15 | 561 |
| O Future Volume (vph) | 18 | 9 | 625 | 32 | 15 | 561 |
| $\bigcirc$ - Sign Control | Stop | - | Free | - | - | Free |
| $\infty$ Median Width (ft) | 12 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC [s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 | - |
| - Follow Up Time, F ( s ) | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| - Control Delay [s] | 25.1 | 25.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| - Level of Service | D | D | A | A | A | A |
| O Queue Length 95th ( ft ) | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| - Approach Delay (s) | 25.1 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.5 |

## 2. Int. 2 - Hwy 33/2000W 2047 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The traffic volumes, identified at the beginning of this chapter, were entered into the computer modeling software Synchro. The results from the model for Intersection 2, without and with the development, are shown in the following figures.

Table 35-Int. 2 - 2047 Peak Hr MOEs without the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & \mathrm{EBL} \end{aligned}$ |  | EBR | $\underset{W B L}{ }$ | WBT |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\mathrm{SBT}}$ | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| - Traffic Volume [vph] | 8 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 22 | 3 | 14 |
| - Future Volume (vph] | 8 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 22 | 3 | 14 |
| - Sign Control |  | Free | - | - | Free | - | - | Stop | - | - | Stop | - |
| co Median Width (ft) | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| $\bigcirc$ - Critical Gap, tC [s) | 4.1 | - | - | 4.1 | - | - | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| - Follow Up Time, IF [s] | 2.2 | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| $\bigcirc$ - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.36 |
| - Control Delay (s) | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 35.1 | 35.1 | 35.1 | 52.1 | 52.1 | 52.1 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A | E | E | E | F | F | F |
| - Queue Length 95th (it) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 36 | 36 | 36 |
| $\bigcirc$ Approach Delay (s) | - | 0.3 | - | - | 0.1 | - | - | 35.1 | - | - | 52.1 |  |

Table 36-Int. 2 - 2047 Peak Hr MOEs with the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS | EBL |  | EBR | WBL | *- |  | $4$ |  | $\underset{\text { NBR }}{p}$ |  | SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{4 B R}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) |  | \& |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 11 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 36 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 26 | 4 | 16 |
| - Future Volume (vph) | 11 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 36 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 26 | 4 | 16 |
| - Sign Control | - | Free | - | - | Free | - | - | Stop | - | - | Stop | - |
| $\infty$ Median Width (ft) | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | - |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC [s] | 4.1 | - | - | 4.1 | - | - | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| - Follow Up Time, LF (s) | 2.2 | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.43 |
| $\bigcirc$ Control Delay (s) | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 37.1 | 37.1 | 37.1 | 59.4 | 59.4 | 59.4 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A | E | E | E | F | F | F |
| - Queue Length 95th (ft) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 47 | 47 | 47 |
| - Approach Delay [s] | - | 0.4 | - | - | 0.1 | - | - | 37.1 | - | - | 59.4 |  |

## 3. Int. 3 - 7000N/1750W 2047 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions

The traffic volumes, identified at the beginning of this chapter, were entered into the computer modeling software Synchro. The results from the model for Intersection 3, without and with the development, are shown in the following figures.

Table 37-Int. 3-2047 Peak Hr MOEs without the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  | EBR | $4$ NBL |  | SBT | $\frac{\downarrow}{5 B R}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 3 |
| - Future Volume (vph) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 3 |
| $\bigcirc$ - Sign Control | Stop |  | - | Free | Free | - |
| $\infty$ Median Width ( ft ) | 12 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC [s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 | - | - | - |
| - Follow Up Time, tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 | - | - | - |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| - Control Delay [s] | 8.5 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| - Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - Approach Delay [s] | 8.5 | - | - | 2.2 | 0.0 |  |

Table 38 -Int. 3 - 2047 Peak Hr MOEs with the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS | $4$ | EBR |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{4 B R}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | M |  |  | ${ }_{\wedge}$ | F |  |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 4 | 9 | 17 | 6 | 8 | 4 |
| O Future Volume (vph) | 4 | 9 | 17 | 6 | 8 | 4 |
| - Sign Control | Stop | - | - | Free | Free | - |
| $\infty$ Median Width (ft) | 12 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC [s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 | - | - | - |
| - Follow Up Time, F (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 | - | - | - |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| - Control Delay (s) | 8.5 | 8.5 | 0.1 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| O Queue Length 95th (ft) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| - Approach Delay [s] | 8.5 | - | - | 5.3 | 0.0 | - |

## 4. Int. 4 - 7000N/Solstice Circle East 2047 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions (New Intersection)

Since this intersection only exists with the development, only traffic volumes with the development are included.

Table 39-Int. 4-2047 Peak Hr MOEs with the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  | EBR | WBL | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 廿- } \\ & \text { WBT } \end{aligned}$ | $4$ | NBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 9 | 1 | 8 | 13 | 1 | 4 |
| O Future Volume (vph] | 9 | 1 | 8 | 13 | 1 | 4 |
| - Sign Control | Free $\checkmark$ | - | - | Free | Stop |  |
| $\infty$ Median Width (ft) | 0 | - | - | 0 | 12 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ | - | - | $\square$ | $\square$ | - |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC [s] | - | - | 4.1 | - | 6.4 | 6.2 |
| - Follow Up Time, F (s) | - | - | 2.2 | - | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| - Control Delay [s] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 8.5 | 8.5 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| - Queue Length 95th ( ft ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\bigcirc$ Approach Delay [s] | 0.0 | - | - | 2.9 | 8.5 | - |

## 5. Int. 5 - 7000N/Solstice Circle West 2047 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions (New Intersection)

Since this intersection only exists with the development, only traffic volumes with the development are included.

Table 40 -Int. 5 - 2047 Peak Hr MOEs with the Development

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | $\underset{\text { WBL }}{ }$ | *- | NBL | $\underset{\text { NBR }}{P}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing (\#RL) | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | \% |  |
| - Traffic Volume (vph) | 7 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 1 | 3 |
| - Future Volume (vph) | 7 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 1 | 3 |
| - Sign Control | Free $\checkmark$ | - | - | Free | Stop | - |
| $\infty$ Median Width ( ft ) | 0 | - | - | 0 | 12 | - |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | $\square$ |  | - | $\square$ | $\square$ | - |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| - Critical Gap, tC (s) | - | - | 4.1 | - | 6.4 | 6.2 |
| - Follow Up Time, tF (s) | - | - | 2.2 | - | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| - Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| - Control Delay [s] | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 8.5 | 8.5 |
| - Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| O Queue Length 95th ( t () | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - Approach Delay [s] | 0.0 | - | - | 2.5 | 8.5 | - |

## H. Turn Lane Warrants Based on Safety Analysis of Intersections

## 1. 2047 Left Turn Lane Analysis

Intersection \#1 and \#2 were evaluated for safety using ITD guidelines which recommend using the National Cooperative Highway Research Report 745 -Left-Turn Accommodations at Unsignalized Intersections (NCHRP 745) to evaluate left-hand turns and National Cooperative Highway Research Report 457: Evaluating Intersection Improvements: An Engineering Study Guide (NCHRP 457) to evaluate right-turn movements to determine if turning movements are consistent with national standards for safety based on traffic volumes. These guidelines show that if a three-leg intersection has traffic higher than 200 vph per lane on the major roadway and more than 150 vph per lane on a four-leg intersection, a left turn is warranted (see left-turn lane warrant chart in Chapter 4).

It was found in the 2022 Existing Conditions Chapter that left turn lanes are warranted at Intersection 1 for eastbound traffic and at Intersection 2 for both eastbound and westbound traffic. Based on the ITD guidelines, no new turn-lanes are warranted from the increase (including the projected traffic generated by the proposed development) in traffic from 2027 to 2047 (see Appendix K for the left-turn worksheet).

## 2. 2047 Right Turn Lane Analysis

The Right-hand turn warrant analysis follows the guidance found in ITD's Traffic Manual: Idaho's Supplementary Guide to the MUTCD (reference the right-turn lane warrant chart in Chapter 4).

Based on these guidelines, it has been determined that the forecasted traffic for 2047 warrant right turn lanes for the westbound traffic at Intersection 1 and for the westbound traffic at Intersection 2. (see Appendix K for the right-turn worksheet).

## I. 2047 PM Peak Hr Traffic Conditions Summary without and with the Development

This chapter has identified the following:

## 1. Segments

a. Seg. 1: 3000W without the Development

The segment/link v/c ratio results in a LOS of A. Therefore, in accordance with ITD guidelines, no improvements are warranted for the existing conditions.
b. Seg. 1: 3000W with the Development

The segment/link v/c ratio results in a LOS of A. Therefore, in accordance with ITD guidelines, no improvements are warranted for the existing conditions.
c. Seg. 2: 2000W without the Development

The segment/link v/c ratio results in a LOS of A. Therefore, in accordance with ITD guidelines, no improvements are warranted for the existing conditions.
d. Seg. 2: 2000W with the Development

The segment/link v/c ratio results in a LOS of A. Therefore, in accordance with ITD guidelines, no improvements are warranted for the existing conditions.

## e. Segment Summary

The following tables are a summary of each segment's v/c ratio and LOS for each direction without and with the development.

## Table 41 -Seg. 1 3000W 2047 Segments Traffic Condition Summary

| 3000W | 2022 |  | 2027 |  | 2047 |  | 3000W | 2022 |  | 2027 |  | 2047 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direction | v/c | LOS | v/c | LOS | v/c | LOS | Direction | v/c | LOS | v/c | LOS | v/c | LOS |
| Northeast | 0.014 | A | 0.015 | A | 0.026 | A | Northeast | 0.014 | A | 0.016 | A | 0.027 | A |
| Southwest | 0.008 | A | 0.009 | A | 0.014 | A | Southwest | 0.008 | A | 0.010 | A | 0.016 | A |
| Without the Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | With | he D | evelop | ment |  |  |

Table 42 -Seg. 2 2000W 2047 Segments Traffic Condition Summary

| 2000 W | 2022 |  | 2027 | 2047 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direction | v/c | LOS | v/c | LOS | v/c | LOS |
| Northbound | 0.011 | A | 0.012 | A | 0.020 | A |
| Southbound | 0.012 | A | 0.013 | A | 0.022 | A |
| Without the Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 2000 W | 2022 |  | 2027 |  | 2047 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direction | v/c | LOS | v/c | LOS | v/c | LOS |
| Northbound | 0.011 | A | 0.022 | A | 0.030 | A |
| Southbound | 0.012 | A | 0.018 | A | 0.026 | A |
| With the Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 2. Intersections

a. Int. 1: Hwy 33/3000W without the Development

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of C during the PM peak hour of the day.
b. Int. 1: Hwy 33/3000W with the Development

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of D during the PM peak hour of the day.
c. Int. 2: Hwy 33/2000W without the Development

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of F during the PM peak hour of the day.

## d. Int. 2: Hwy 33/2000W with the Development

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of F during the PM peak hour of the day.
e. Int. 3: 7000N/1750W without the Development

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of A during the PM peak hour of the day.

## f. Int. 3: 7000N/1750W with the Development

The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of A during the PM peak hour of the day.
g. Int. 4-7000N/Solstice Circle East (New Intersection) with the Development The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of A during the PM peak hour of the day.
h. Int. 5-7000N/Solstice Circle West (New Intersection) with the Development The delay times, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio, and LOS indicate that the intersection's worst turning movement is operating at a LOS of A during the PM peak hour of the day.

## i. Intersection Summary

Intersection 1 is forecasted to operate in an acceptable range but is near unacceptable with a max LOS of D. Intersection 2 is forecasted to operate in an unacceptable range in the 2047 horizon year with a max LOS of F. The remaining intersections are forecasted to operate within an acceptable range for the 2047 horizon year. The following tables are a summary of each intersection's LOS and delay time for each turning movement.

Table 43 -Int. 12047 Traffic Condition Summary without and with the Development

|  | Northeastbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2047 Traffic | n/a | n/a | n/a | 14 | 561 | n/a | n/a | 625 | 31 | 17 | n/a | 8 |
| LOS | n/a | n/a | n/a | A | A | n/a | n/a | A | A | C | n/a | C |
| Delay | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.2 | 0.5 | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 24.7 | n/a | 24.7 |


| Int 1 - Hwy 33/3000W - Build LOS and Delay Times with the Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Northeastbound |  |  | Southeastbound |  |  | Northwestbound |  |  | Southwestbound |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2047 Traffic | n/a | n/a | n/a | 15 | 561 | n/a | n/a | 625 | 32 | 18 | n/a | 9 |
| LOS | n/a | n/a | n/a | A | A | n/a | n/a | A | A | D | n/a | D |
| Delay | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.3 | 0.5 | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 25.1 | n/a | 25.1 |

Table 44-Int. 22047 Traffic Condition Summary without and with the Development

|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2047 Traffic | 8 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 22 | 3 | 14 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | E | E | E | F | F | F |
| Delay | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 35.1 | 35.1 | 35.1 | 52.1 | 52.1 | 52.1 |


| Int 2 - Hwy 33/2000W - Build LOS and Delay Times with the Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2047 Traffic | 11 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 36 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 26 | 4 | 16 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | E | E | E | F | F | F |
| Delay | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 37.1 | 37.1 | 37.1 | 59.4 | 59.4 | 59.4 |

Table 45 -Int. 32047 Traffic Condition Summary without and with the Development

|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2047 Traffic | 3 | n/a | 3 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 3 | 6 | n/a | n/a | 8 | 3 |
| LOS | A | n/a | A | n/a | n/a | n/a | A | A | n/a | n/a | A | A |
| Delay | 8.5 | n/a | 8.5 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 2.2 | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 |


| Int 3-7000N/1750W - Build LOS and Delay Times with the Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2047 Traffic | 4 | n/a | 9 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 17 | 6 | n/a | n/a | 8 | 4 |
| LOS | A | n/a | A | n/a | n/a | n/a | A | A | n/a | n/a | A | A |
| Delay | 8.5 | n/a | 8.5 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.1 | 5.3 | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 |

Table 46 -Int. 42047 Traffic Condition Summary with the Development

|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2047 Traffic | n/a | 9 | 1 | 8 | 13 | n/a | 1 | n/a | 4 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| LOS | n/a | A | A | A | A | n/a | A | n/a | A | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Delay | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.9 | n/a | 8.5 | n/a | 8.5 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Table 47 -Int. 52047 Traffic Condition Summary with the Development

|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| 2047 Traffic | n/a | 7 | 1 | 7 | 14 | n/a | 1 | n/a | 3 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| LOS | n/a | A | A | A | A | n/a | A | n/a | A | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Delay | n/a | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0 | 2.5 | n/a | 8.5 | n/a | 8.5 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

## 3. Turn Lane Analysis

## a. Left Turn Lane Analysis

Based on the ITD guidelines, no new turn-lanes are warranted from the increase (including the projected traffic generated by the proposed development) in traffic from 2022 to 2027

## b. Right Turn Lane Analysis

Right turns lanes are not warranted for either intersection on Hwy 33 for the 2027 buildout.

## 4. Overall Summary for 2047

a. 2022 Existing Conditions Review

In summary, the following was determined to be operating at an unacceptable level for the 2022 existing conditions:

1. Int. 1 Hwy 33/3000W: Southeast bound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
2. Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Eastbound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
3. Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Westbound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
(1) 2022 Mitigation Measures

It is recommended that a left turn lane be constructed on Hwy 33 for the southeast bound traffic at Int. 1 and that left turn lanes be constructed for both the eastbound and westbound traffic on Hwy 33 at Int. 2.

## b. 2027 Buildout Conditions Review

Besides those areas noted for the 2022 existing conditions, no new LOS has been identified as operating at an unacceptable level for the 2027 buildout year.
(1) 2022 Mitigation Measures

Since no new areas are identified to be operating at an unacceptable level, no new mitigation measures are warranted for the 2027 buildout year.

## c. 2047 Horizon Conditions Review

In summary, the following was determined to be operating at an unacceptable level for the 2047 conditions:

1. Int 1 Hwy $33 / 3000 \mathrm{~W}$ : Northwest bound, right turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
2. Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Northbound traffic left, thru, and right turning movement's LOS is E, without or with the development
3. Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Southbound traffic left, thru, and right turning movement's LOS is F, without or with the development
4. Int 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Westbound, right turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels

## 5. Mitigation Measures for the $\mathbf{2 0 4 7}$ Horizon Year Traffic

a. Int. 1: Hwy 33/3000W

It has been determined that the northwest bound traffic at Int. 1 Hwy 33/3000W warrants a right turn lane. It is recommended that a right turn lane be constructed before the 2047 Horizon Year to meet the minimum recommended guidelines.
b. Int. 2: Hwy 33/2000W

It has been determined that in 2047 the projected westbound traffic will require a right turn lane. It is recommended that a right turn lane be constructed to meet this minimum recommended guideline. Also, the northbound and southbound traffic is forecasted to be failed. It is recommended that right and left turn lanes be added to the north and south leg of the intersection.
(1) 2047 Mitigation Measures Traffic Analysis

The following figure shows the projected layout and traffic volumes for the 2047 mitigation measures; this includes the addition of left turn lanes for both the eastbound and westbound traffic (warranted for the 2022 Existing Conditions), a westbound right turn lane (warranted for the 2047 Horizon Year), a northbound right and left turn lane (warranted for the 2047 Horizon Year), a southbound right and left turn lane (warranted for the 2047 Horizon Year).


Figure 31： 2047 Horizon Year Mitigation Measures Improvements Layout and Volumes
The following shows the results of the mitigated measures traffic model．
Table 48－Int．2－2047 Peak Hr MOEs with the Development Mitigation Measures

| HCM 2000 SIGNING SETTINGS |  |  | EBR |  | WBT |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{4 B R}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ Lanes and Sharing（\＃RL） | 11 | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | \％ | 4 | 「 | \％ | 4 | 「 |
| －Traffic Volume（vph） | 8 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 22 | 3 | 14 |
| －Future Volume（vph） | 8 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 22 | 3 | 14 |
| －Sign Control | － | Free | － | － | Free | － | － | Stop | － | － | Stop | － |
| $\infty$ Median Width（ft） | － | 12 | － | － | 12 | － | － | 12 | － | － | 12 | － |
| $\infty$ TWLTL Median | － | $\checkmark$ | － | － | $\checkmark$ | － | － | $\square$ | － | － | $\square$ | － |
| $\infty$ Right Turn Channelized | － | － | None | － | － | None | － | － | None | － | － | None |
| －Critical Gap，tC［s］ | 4.1 | － | － | 4.1 | － | － | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| －Follow Up Time， F （s） | 2.2 | － | － | 2.2 | － | － | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| $\bigcirc$－Volume to Capacity Ratio | 0.01 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.47 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
| －Control Delay［s］ | 9.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.1 | 17.6 | 13.8 | 19.5 | 17.3 | 14.8 |
| －Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A | A | C | C | B | C | C | B |
| －Queue Length 95th（ft） | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 3 |
| －Approach Delay［s］ | － | 0.1 | － | － | 0.0 | － | － | 16.2 | － | － | 17.7 | － |

It can be seen from this table that by improving the intersection as outline，the projected traffic is forecasted to operate at an acceptable level in the 2047 Horizon Year．

## X. Conclusions.

After evaluating the proposed development within the context of zoning; projected land use; existing transportation system; background traffic counts for the principal roadways within the study impact area; projected traffic for horizon years corresponding with project opening, project buildout, and a 20 -year horizon year; the findings of the Traffic Impact Study are summarized below. In order to simplify the forecasted traffic conditions as they have progressed through this study, the following three (3) tables were produced. The first table shows the forecasted progression of the roadway segments, the second table shows the intersections, and the third shows the left or right turn.

Table 49- Segment Traffic Conditions Progression Each Horizon Year

| Segment 1: 3000w | Northeast <br> V/C Ratio | LOS | Southwest <br> V/C Ratio | LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | 0.014 | A | 0.008 | A |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | 0.016 | A | 0.010 | A |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | 0.027 | A | 0.016 | A |


| Segment 2: 2000W | Northbound <br> V/C Ratio | LOS | Southbound <br> V/C Ratio | LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | 0.011 | A | 0.012 | A |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | 0.022 | A | 0.018 | A |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | 0.030 | A | 0.026 | A |

Table 50- Intersection Traffic Conditions Progression Each Horizon Year

| Int 1: Hwy 33/3000W | Northeast <br> Max Los | Southeast <br> Max LOS | Northwest <br> Max LOS | Southwest <br> Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A | B |
| 2027 Background Traffic | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A | B |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A | B |
| 2047 Background Traffic | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A | C |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A | D |


| Int 2: Hwy 33/2000w | Eastbound <br> Max LOS | Westbound <br> Max LOS | Northbound <br> Max LOS | Southbound <br> Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | A | A | B | C |
| 2027 Background Traffic | A | A | C | C |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | A | A | C | C |
| 2047 Background Traffic | A | A | E | F |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | A | A | E | F |


| Int 3: 7000N/1750W | Eastbound <br> Max LOS | Westbound <br> Max LOS | Northbound <br> Max LOS | Southbound <br> Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | A | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A |
| 2027 Background Traffic | A | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | A | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A |
| 2047 Background Traffic | A | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | A | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | A | A |


$\left.$| Int 4: 7000N/Solstice East |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (New) | | Eastbound |
| :---: |
| Max LOS | | Westbound |
| :---: |
| Max LOS | | Northbound |
| :---: |
| Max LOS | | Southbound |
| :---: |
| Max LOS | \right\rvert\,


| Int 5: 7000N/Solstice West <br> (New) | Eastbound <br> Max LOS | Westbound <br> Max LOS | Northbound <br> Max LOS | Southbound <br> Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 2027 Background Traffic | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | A | A | A | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 2047 Background Traffic | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | A | A | A | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |

Table 51- Left and Right Turn Lane Progression Each Horizon Year

| Int 1: Hwy 33/3000W | Left Turn Lane |  | Right Turn Lane |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Southeast | Northwest | Southeast | Northwest |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | Warranted | n/a | n/a | Not Warranted |
| 2027 Background Traffic | Warranted | n/a | n/a | Not Warranted |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | Warranted | n/a | n/a | Not Warranted |
| 2047 Background Traffic | Warranted | n/a | n/a | Warranted |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | Warranted | n/a | n/a | Warranted |


| Int 2: Hwy 33/2000W |  | Left Turn Lane |  | Right Turn Lane |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Eastbound | Westbound |  |
| 2022 Existing Traffic | Warranted | Warranted | Not Warranted | Not Warranted |  |
| 2027 Background Traffic | Warranted | Warranted | Not Warranted | Not Warranted |  |
| 2027 Background plus Site Traffic | Warranted | Warranted | Not Warranted | Not Warranted |  |
| 2047 Background Traffic | Warranted | Warranted | Not Warranted | Warranted |  |
| 2047 Background plus Site Traffic | Warranted | Warranted | Not Warranted | Warranted |  |

## A. Existing Traffic Conditions (2022)

The existing traffic conditions were analyzed with the existing intersection control and lane configurations, all the road segments and intersections are operating within minimum operational thresholds except:

* Int. 1 Hwy 33/3000W: Southeast bound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
* Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Eastbound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
* Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Westbound, left turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels


## 1. Mitigating Measures

It is recommended that a left turn lane be constructed on Hwy 33 for the southeast bound traffic at Int. 1 and that left turn lanes be constructed for both the eastbound and westbound traffic on Hwy 33 at Int. 2.

## B. Projected Traffic

The projected land use for the build-out year of the proposed development is comprised of 17 main dwelling units and 17 accessory dwelling units ( 34 units total). All other uses remain the same as the existing conditions. The build-out conditions are expected to generate approximately 325 trips for the MADT and 26 trips during PM peak hour by year 2027.

## C. 2027 Buildout Year Traffic Conditions Results

All segment capacity and intersection delay times/LOS are projected to operate within the minimum allowable operational thresholds. It was determined that for the 2022 existing conditions, left turn lanes are warranted at Intersection 1 and Intersection 2. For the 2027 buildout conditions, no new left turn lanes are warranted with or without the proposed development.

## 1. Mitigating Measures

For the 2027 buildout scenario no deficiencies were forecasted, therefore no mitigation measures are recommended.

## D. 2047 Horizon Year Traffic Conditions Results

The forecasted 2047 traffic conditions were analyzed with the existing intersection control and lane configurations, all the road segments and intersections are within minimum operational thresholds except:

* Int 1 Hwy 33/3000W: Northwest bound, right turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels
* Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Northbound traffic left, thru, and right turning movement's LOS is E, without or with the development
* Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Southbound traffic left, thru, and right turning movement's LOS is F, without or with the development
* Int 2 Hwy 33/2000W: Westbound, right turning traffic, exceeds the minimum levels


## 1. Mitigating Measures

Analysis shows that the addition of left turn lanes for both the eastbound and westbound traffic (warranted for the 2022 Existing Conditions), a westbound right turn lane (warranted for the 2047 Horizon Year), a northbound right and left turn lane (warranted for the 2047 Horizon Year), a southbound right and left turn lane (warranted for the 2047 Horizon Year) will create a road network that will operate within the minimum allowable thresholds.

## E. Overall Study Summary

As can be seen from the tables in this chapter, the development is forecasted to have minimal impact to the traffic network within the study area. All segments and intersections are forecasted to operate below the allowable operation thresholds throughout the study time period. As can be seen in the tables presented in this chapter, the LOS at each intersection for each turning movement without or with the development are the same except for the southwest traffic in the 2047 Horizon Year (reference the red highlighted cell in Table 47). Even though the southwest traffic without and with the development is difference, they are still forecasted to operate at an acceptable level through the 2047 Horizon Year.

This study also determined that all the intersections, each direction, within the study area on Hwy 33 warrant a left turn lane for the current/existing conditions. Additionally, right turn lanes are warranted within the next 25 years for the northwest bound traffic at Int. 1 Hwy $33 / 3000 \mathrm{~W}$ and for the westbound traffic at Int. 2 Hwy 33/2000W without or with the development.

## XI. Appendix A: Site Master Plan



Civilize, PLLC

## XII. Appendix B: Traffic Counts





## \#059-Newdale -ATR Averag Automatic Counter Volumes

## Report Types
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## Civilize, PLLC

[^0]


## XIII. Appendix C: 2022 Existing Conditions Traffic Model Results





## XIV. Appendix D: 2027 Buildout Traffic Model Results

## Without the Development



With the Development

| Northern Lights With the Development - 2027 Buildout - Intersection 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| Lane Confgurations | \% |  | b |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 11 | 6 | 375 | 19 | 9 | 336 |  |
| Future Volume (Vehh) | 11 | 6 | 375 | 19 | 9 | 336 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly fow rate (vph) | 12 | 7 | 408 | 21 | 10 | 365 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Wioth (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (t/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right tum fare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Usosteam sional (it) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, plation unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC, conficing volume | 804 | 418 |  |  | 429 |  |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 804 | 418 |  |  | 429 |  |  |
| C. C , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| C.C, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queve free \% | 97 | 99 |  |  | 99 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 349 | 635 |  |  | 1130 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB1 | NB1 | SB1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 19 | 429 | 375 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Lef | 12 | 0 | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 7 | 21 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| CSH | 419 | 1700 | 1130 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.05 | 0.25 | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| Queve Lengh 95 m ( t ) | 4 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Cortol Delay (s) | 14.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 14.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Ufitization |  |  | 34.9\% |  | ICU Level | Service | A |
| Andysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

## Without the Development

Northern Lights Without the Development - 2027 Buildout - Intersection 2

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | + |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configuratons |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 5 | 399 | 7 | 2 | 444 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 2 | 8 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 5 | 399 | 7 | 2 | 444 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 2 | 8 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 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 |
| Hourly fow rate (vph) | 5 | 434 | 8 | 2 | 483 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 14 | , | 9 |
| Pedestrins |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Wioth (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Naking Speed (t/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right tum fare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Usstream sional (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| bX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC, conficing volume | 499 |  |  | 442 |  |  | 953 | 951 | 438 | 952 | 947 | 491 |
| VC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 499 |  |  | 442 |  |  | 953 | 951 | 438 | 952 | 947 | 491 |
| C. single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| C, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| po queve free \% | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 98 | 99 | 99 | 94 | 99 | 98 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1065 |  |  | 1118 |  |  | 233 | 258 | 619 | 234 | 259 | 578 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 447 | 501 | 15 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Let | 5 | 2 | 5 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 8 | 16 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSH | 1065 | 1118 | 356 | 300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queve Lengh 95\% (t) | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cortol Delay (s) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 15.6 | 18.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A | A | C | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 15.6 | 18.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | c | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Ufitzation |  |  | 35.4\% |  | U Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

With the Development

| Northern Lights With the Development - 2027 Buildout - Intersection 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\geqslant$ |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configuratons |  | \$ |  |  | \& |  |  | \$ |  |  | + |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 8 | 399 | 7 | 2 | 444 | 26 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 17 | 3 | 10 |
| Fuutre Volume (Vehh) | 8 | 399 | 7 | 2 | 444 | 26 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 17 | 3 | 10 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 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 |
| Hourly fow rate (vph) | 9 | 434 | 8 | 2 | 483 | 28 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 3 | 11 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Widh (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nalking Speed (t/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right wm fare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uostream sional (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platioon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC, conficing volume | 511 |  |  | 442 |  |  | 970 | 971 | 438 | 966 | 961 | 497 |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 511 |  |  | 442 |  |  | 970 | 971 | 438 | 966 | 961 | 497 |
| C, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| C, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| po queve free \% | 99 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 98 | 99 | 99 | 92 | 99 | 98 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1054 |  |  | 1118 |  |  | 224 | 250 | 619 | 227 | 254 | 573 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB1 | WB1 | NB1 | SB1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 451 | 513 | 16 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Lef | 9 | 2 | 5 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 8 | 28 | 8 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSH | 1054 | 1118 | 339 | 290 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queve Lengt 95m (t) | 1 | 0 | 4 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.3 | 0.1 | 16.1 | 18.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A | A | C | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.3 | 0.1 | 16.1 | 18.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | c | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Ufifzation |  |  | 37.1\% |  | CU Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Without the Development

Northern Lights Without the Development - 2027 Buildout - Intersection 3


With the Development

| Northern Lights With the Development - 2027 Buildout - Intersection 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Confguratons | \% |  |  | * | b |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 3 | 8 | 16 | 3 | 5 | 3 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 3 | 8 | 16 | 3 | 5 | 3 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly fow rate (vph) | 3 | 9 | 17 | 3 | 5 | 3 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Wioth (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (t/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right tum fare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  | None | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Usstream sional (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| eX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC, conficing volume | 44 | 6 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 44 | 6 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| C. single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| C, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| poqueve free \% | 100 | 99 | 99 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 957 | 1076 | 1612 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB1 | NB1 | SB1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume TotalVolume Left | 12 | 20 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 17 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 9 | 0 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| CSH | 1044 | 1612 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Queve Lengh 95 m ( t ) | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Contol Delay (s) | 8.5 | 6.2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.5 | 6.2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Ufitization |  |  | 17.7\% |  | CU Level of | Service | A |
| Andysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

With the Development


With the Development


## XV. Appendix E: 2047 Horizon Year Traffic Analysis

Without the Development


With the Development

| Northern Lights with the Development - 2047 Horizon Year - Intersection 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 9 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| ane Confyuratons | \% |  | 1 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Iraffic Volume (veh/h) | 18 | 9 | 625 | 32 | 15 | 561 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 18 | 9 | 625 | 32 | 15 | 561 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly fow rate (vah) | 20 | 10 | 679 | 35 | 16 | 610 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Wioth (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nalking Speed (t/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right tum fare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jostream sional (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| px, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| dC, conficing volume | 1338 | 696 |  |  | 714 |  |  |
| VC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c/2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clu , unblocked val | 1338 | 696 |  |  | 714 |  |  |
| C, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| C, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| D0 queve free \% | 88 | 98 |  |  | 98 |  |  |
| EM capacity (veh/h) | 166 | 441 |  |  | 886 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB1 | SB1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 30 | 714 | 626 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Lef | 20 | 0 | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| /olume Right | 10 | 35 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| SSH | 209 | 1700 | 886 |  |  |  |  |
| /olume to Capacity | 0.14 | 0.42 | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |
| Queve Lengh 95m (t) | 12 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Cortol Delay (s)Lane LOS | 25.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | D |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| ane LOS <br> Approach Delay (s) | 25.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |
| ntersection Capacity Utilizaton |  |  | 51.6\% |  | CU Level of | Service | A |
| Andysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

## Without the Development

| Northern Lights without the Development - 2047 Horizon Year - Intersection 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\geqslant$ |  |  | 4 |  | $\dagger$ |  | - |  | 4 |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Confgurations |  | \$ |  |  | \& |  |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh $/$ ) | 8 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 22 | , | 14 |
| Futre Volume (Vehh) | 8 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 22 | 3 | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 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 |
| Hourly fow rate (voh) | 9 | 723 | 12 | 3 | 805 | 27 | 9 | 3 | 12 | 24 | 3 | 15 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Widh (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Waking Speed (t/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right tum fare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uostream sional (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC, conficing volume | 832 |  |  | 735 |  |  | 1588 | 1585 | 729 | 1585 | 1578 | 818 |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vCu}^{\text {a }}$, unblocked vol | 832 |  |  | 735 |  |  | 1588 | 1585 | 729 | 1585 | 1578 | 818 |
| ${ }^{\text {t }}$ C, s. single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| po queve free \% | 99 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 89 | 97 | 97 | 71 | 97 | 96 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 801 |  |  | 870 |  |  | 81 | 107 | 423 | 82 | 108 | 376 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB1 | WB1 | NB1 | SB1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 744 | 835 | 24 | 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Lef | 9 | , | 9 | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 12 | 27 | 12 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSH | 801 | 870 | 143 | 117 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queve Lengh 95\% ( $t$ ) | 1 | 0 | 15 | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cortol Delay (s) | 0.3 | 0.1 | 35.1 | 52.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A | A | E | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.3 | 0.1 | 35.1 | 52.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | E | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utization |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 52.5\% |  | Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

With the Development
Northern Lights with the Development - 2047 Horizon Year - Intersection 2

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ane Configuratons |  | * |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| Trafic Volume (veh/h) | 11 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 36 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 26 | 4 | 16 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 11 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 36 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 26 | 4 | 16 |
| Sign Cortrol |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 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 |
| Hourly fow rate (vph) | 12 | 723 | 12 | 3 | 805 | 39 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 28 | 4 | 17 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ane Widh (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nalking Speed (t/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right um fare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jostream signal (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DX, plation unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC, conficing volume | 844 |  |  | 735 |  |  | 1602 | 1603 | 729 | 1598 | 1590 | 824 |
| $\mathrm{VC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 844 |  |  | 735 |  |  | 1602 | 1603 | 729 | 1598 | 1590 | 824 |
| C. single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| C, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F(s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queve free \% | 98 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 88 | 96 | 97 | 65 | 96 | 95 |
| EM capacity (veh/h) | 792 |  |  | 870 |  |  | 78 | 104 | 423 | 80 | 106 | 373 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB1 | WB1 | NB1 | SB1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 747 | 847 | 25 | 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Lef | 12 | 3 | 9 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| /olume Right | 12 | 39 | 12 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SSH | 792 | 870 | 137 | 113 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| /olume to Capacity | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queve Lengh 95\% (t) | 1 | 0 | 16 | 47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cortrol Delay (s) | 0.4 | 0.1 | 37.1 | 59.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ane LOS | A | A | E | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.4 | 0.1 | 37.1 | 59.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | E | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ntersection Summary

| Average Delay | 2.5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| ntersection Capacity Utilzation | $54.6 \%$ |

## Without the Development

| Northern Lights without the Development - 2047 Horizon Year - Intersection 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | $\geqslant$ | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Confguratons | \% |  |  | $\uparrow$ | b |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 3 |  |
| Fuutre Volume (Vehh) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 3 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly fow rate (voh) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 3 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Wioth (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Naking Speed (t/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right tum fare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  | None | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Usostream sional (i) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC, conficing volume | 24 | 10 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vCu}^{\text {a }}$, unblocked vol | 24 | 10 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| C. single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { C, } 2 \text { stage (s) } & \text { c. } & \\ \text { C, }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| po queue free \% | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 991 | 1071 | 1607 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB1 | NB1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 6 | 10 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Lef | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 3 | 0 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| CSH | 1029 | 1607 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| Queve Lengh 95th ( t ) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Contol Delay (s) | 8.5 | 2.2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.5 | 2.2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 13.3\% |  | CU Level of | Service | A |
| Andysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

With the Development
Northern Lights with the Development - 2047 Horizon Year - Intersection 3


With the Development

| Northern Lights with the Development - 2047 Horizon Year - Intersection 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\geqslant$ | $t$ |  | $4$ |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Confguratons | b |  |  | $\uparrow$ | \% |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | , | 1 | 8 | 13 | 1 | 4 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 9 | 1 | 8 | 13 | 1 | 4 |  |
| Sign Cortrol | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly fow rate (vph) | 10 | 1 | 9 | 14 | 1 | 4 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Widh (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (t/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right tum fare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uostream sional (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC, conficing volume |  |  | 11 |  | 42 | 10 |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol |  |  | 11 |  | 42 | 10 |  |
| C. , single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| C.C, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| P0 queve free \% |  |  | 99 |  | 100 | 100 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 1608 |  | 963 | 1071 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB1 | WB 1 | NB1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 11 | 23 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Lef | 0 | 9 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 1 | 0 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1608 | 1047 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Queve Lengt 95m (t) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 2.9 | 8.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  | A | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 2.9 | 8.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 2.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Ufitration |  |  | 17.8\% |  | ICU Level of | Service | A |
| Andysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

With the Development

| Northern Lights with the Development - 2047 Horizon Year - Intersection 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\geqslant$ |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Confguratons | 6 |  |  | $\uparrow$ | \% |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 7 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 1 | 3 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 7 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 1 | 3 |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly fow rate (vph) | 8 | 1 | 8 | 15 | 1 | 3 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Wioth (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (t/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right tum fare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Usstream signal (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| dX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC, conficing volume |  |  | 9 |  | 40 | 8 |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol |  |  | 9 |  | 40 | 8 |  |
| C. single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| C, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| b0 queve free \% |  |  | 100 |  | 100 | 100 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 1611 |  | 967 | 1073 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB1 | WB1 | NB1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 9 | 23 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Let | 0 | 8 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 1 | 0 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| CSH | 1700 | 1611 | 1045 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Queve Lengh 95 m ( t ) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 2.5 | 8.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  | A | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 2.5 | 8.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Ufilization |  |  | 16.9\% |  | ICU Level of | Service | A |
| Analvsis Penod (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

Intersection 2-2047 Mitigation Measures

| Northern Lights - 2047 Mitigation Measures - Intersection 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\geqslant$ | $\downarrow$ |  | 4 |  | $\uparrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | 4 |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| ane Confguratons | $\dagger$ | $\dagger$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | 7 | $\dagger$ | 4 | 7 | \% | 4 | 1 |
| Iraffic Volume (veh/h) | 8 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 22 | 3 | 14 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 8 | 665 | 11 | 3 | 741 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 22 | 3 | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 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 |
| Hourly fow rate (vph) | 9 | 723 | 12 | 3 | 805 | 27 | 9 | 3 | 12 | 24 | 3 | 15 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cane Wioth (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nalking Speed (t/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vight tum fare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | TWLTL |  |  | TWLTL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jostream sional (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC, conficíing volume | 832 |  |  | 735 |  |  | 1574 | 1585 | 729 | 1566 | 1564 | 805 |
| JC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 747 | 747 |  | 811 | 811 |  |
| -C2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  | 828 | 838 |  | 754 | 753 |  |
| ${ }^{2} \mathrm{Cu}$, unblocked val | 832 |  |  | 735 |  |  | 1574 | 1585 | 729 | 1566 | 1564 | 805 |
| C, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| C, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |
| F (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| P0 queve free \% | 99 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 97 | 99 | 97 | 91 | 99 | 96 |
| EM capacity (veh/h) | 801 |  |  | 870 |  |  | 265 | 289 | 423 | 273 | 296 | 382 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB1 | EB2 | WB1 | WB2 | WB3 | NB1 | NB2 | NB3 | SB1 | SB2 | SB3 |  |
| Volume Total | 9 | 735 | 3 | 805 | 27 | 9 | 3 | 12 | 24 | 3 | 15 |  |
| Volume Lef | 9 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 15 |  |
| SSH | 801 | 1700 | 870 | 1700 | 1700 | 265 | 289 | 423 | 273 | 296 | 382 |  |
| /olume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.47 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.04 |  |
| Queve Lengh 95 m ( t ) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 3 |  |
| Cortrol Delay (s) | 9.5 | 0.0 | 9.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.1 | 17.6 | 13.8 | 19.5 | 17.3 | 14.8 |  |
| ane LOS | A |  | A |  |  | C | C | B | C | c | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.1 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 16.2 |  |  | 17.7 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  | c |  |  |  |
| ntersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ntersection Capacity Ufilization |  |  | 55.7\% |  | U Level | fervice |  |  | B |  |  |  |
| Analvsis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

XVI. Appendix F: Left Turn Lane Warrant Analyses


2 Check the plotted point(s) on the chart below against the anticpated intersection of major-road volume and peak-hour left-turn volume in the volume advancing.


Civilize, PLLC
https://civilize-my.sharepoint.com/personal/bcrowther_civilize_design/Documents/Civilize/Proj/Campbell Anne/Campbell Ranch/Campbell Design/400 Prelim/1000 Civil/TIS/TIS_Northern Lights 2023-03-06 v1-2.docx


2 Check the plotted point(s) on the chart below against the anticpated intersection of major-road volume and peak-hour left-turn volume in the volume advancing.



2 Check the plotted point(s) on the chart below against the anticpated intersection of major-road volume and peak-hour left-turn volume in the volume advancing.


## XVII. Appendix G: Right Turn Lane Warrant Analyses






[^0]:    https://civilize-my.sharepoint.com/personal/bcrowther_civilize_design/Documents/Civilize/Proj/Campbell Design/400 Prelim/1000 Civil/TIS/TIS_Northern Lights 2023-03-06 v1-2.docx

