# TREMONTON <br> CITY COUNCIL 

Tremonton City Corporation<br>City Council Meeting<br>April 4, 2023<br>Meeting to be held at 102 South Tremont Street Tremonton, Utah

## 5:00 p.m.

1. Presentation and discussion of the 2024 Fiscal Year Budget for governmental funds and enterprise funds
2. Review of the agenda items identified on 7:00 p.m. City Council Agenda
3. CLOSED SESSIONS:
a. Strategy session to discuss the purchase of real property when public discussion of the transaction would disclose the appraisal or estimated value of the property under consideration or prevent the public body from completing the transaction on the best possible terms; and/or
b. $\quad$ Strategy session to discuss the character, professional competence or physical or mental health of an individual; and/or
c. $\quad$ Strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation; and/or
d. Discussions regarding security personnel, devices or systems

CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA
7:00 p.m.

1. Opening Ceremony
2. Introduction of guests
3. Declaration of Conflict of Interest
4. Approval of agenda
5. Approval of minutes - March 21, 2023
6. Presentation
a. Tremonton City Citizenship Award to Elementary and Intermediate Students
7. Proclamation
a. Arbor Day Proclamation- April 28, 2023
8. Public comments: This is an opportunity to address the City Council regarding your concerns or ideas.
9. New Council Business:
a. Discussion and consideration of adopting Resolution No. 23-23 appointing Mike Garrett to serve on the Tremonton City Library Board and reaffirming and appointing existing Library Board Members
b. Discussion and consideration of adopting Resolution No. 23-24 approving a Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvements between Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), Tremonton City, and Rivers Edge Real Holdings, LLC for a future traffic signal at the intersection of Main Street (State Route 102) and 950 East and other improvements at the intersection of 1600 East (State Route 13) and 450 North
10. Calendar Items and Previous Assignment
a. Review of calendar
b. Unfinished Business/Action Items
c. Branding Implementation update
11. Reports \& Comments:
a. City Administration Reports and Comments
b. Development Review Committee Report and Comments
c. City Department Head Reports and Comments
d. Council Reports and Comments
12. CLOSED SESSIONS:
a. Strategy session to discuss the purchase of real property when public discussion of the transaction would disclose the appraisal or estimated value of the property under consideration or prevent the public body from completing the transaction on the best possible terms; and/or
b. Strategy session to discuss the character, professional competence or physical or mental health of an individual; and/or
c. Strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation; and/or d. Discussions regarding security personnel, devices or systems
13. Adjournment

Anchor location for Electronic Meeting by Telephone Device. With the adoption of Ordinance No. 13-04, the Council may participate per Electronic Meeting Rules. Please make arrangements in advance.

Persons with disabilities needing special assistance to participate in this meeting should contact

Linsey Nessen no later than 48 hours prior to the meeting.
Notice was posted March 31, 2023 a date not less than 24 hours prior to the date and time of the meeting and remained so posted until after said meeting. A copy of the agenda was delivered to The Leader (Newspaper) on March 31, 2023.

Linsey Nessen, CITY RECORDER

# TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION CITY COUNCIL MEETING <br> MARCH 21, 2023 

Members Present:
Connie Archibald
Wes Estep
Bret Rohde
Rick Seamons
Lyle Vance
Lyle Holmgren, Mayor
Shawn Warnke, City Manager
Marc Christensen, Assistant City Manager
Linsey Nessen, City Recorder

## CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP

Mayor Holmgren called the March 21, 2023 City Council Workshop to order at 5:00 p.m. The meeting was held in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Those in attendance were Mayor Holmgren, Councilmembers Archibald, Estep, Rohde, Seamons, and Vance, City Manager Warnke, Assistant City Manager Christensen, and City Recorder Nessen. The following Department Heads were also present: Public Works Director Paul Fulgham, Police Chief Dustin Cordova, and Treasurer Sharri Oyler. Also in attendance was Finance Director Curtis Roberts.

The following items were discussed out of order with the Closed Session held first.

1. Presentation and discussion of the 2024 Fiscal Year Budget for governmental funds

Assistant City Manager Christensen said this is a continuation of our last discussion. One of the biggest concerns was the sales tax revenue. We projected that based off a trend line and put what we think is going to occur in the budget. Director Roberts said we came at this several different ways, including population, historical trends, and the government office projections. Assistant City Manager Christensen then referred them to a chart on their actual sales tax and what has been transferred for capital projects and UTOPIA debt. I averaged that over the past 11 years and we have transferred $80 \%$ of the sales tax revenue annually. We are showing transfers into the Capital Vehicles and Equipment funds. For the Transportation Capacity Fund there is a $\$ 7$ million deficit because roads are so expensive. We want to build it up and start paying for road projects coming up in the next five years. Councilmember Vance said my main concern is we are coming up on Truth in Taxation and have to know if we need to ask for more real estate taxes or not. It would be nice to know what is essential and what is cream so we can understand how much we really need. Manager Warnke reminded the Council that property taxes do not keep up with inflation, but sales tax does, which is what is funding these capital projects. Taxes should be looked at every year and thought of in terms of inflation. Director Roberts said these are projections based on five years and the question becomes is this
really the list the City wants to see. If it is, how much do you want to contribute this year toward that? The plan could be to fund this much this year and then see what the growth is. It is not practical to approximate growth to the revenues, but we can say this is what we are going to commit to in the next year and set that aside. Every year these projects could be shifted based on priority.

Assistant City Manager Christensen then reviewed each fund and the proposed projects with the Council. He said the Food Pantry has nothing proposed and pays for itself. Recreation is also taken care of. They do not have projects for the next five years. The Parks Fund has some costs for engineering and we have parks coming online. There is the canal rail trail along Rocky Mountain Power's property. We made an agreement to develop that trail within $x$ amount of years. A Facilities Impact Study was recommended by the parks and recreation director. We need to build a recreation center in the area, but need a study first. We have earmarked $\$ 35,000$ for that. Director Roberts said in this current budget there is nothing being transferred into this fund. It has an income stream and will cover 2024. There is no ask of the General Fund.

Assistant City Manager Christensen said former Fire Chief Robert LaCroix had a fiveyear plan for the Fire and EMS funds. The biggest is replacing personal protective equipment every year. Director Roberts said the transfer ask for the Fire Fund is $\$ 358,000$. That is funding the operational needs, as well as setting money aside for capital. With this plan we are going to come close to being able to fund those by 2027. We are on track for that if this is approved. Manager Warnke said this fund is a little dynamic and one we need to watch closely. Ambulance billing has fluctuations.

Assistant City Manager Christensen said there is also the detention pond on 350 North for a walkway for children from Matheson Apartments to Alice C. Harris Intermediate (ACHI). Manager Warnke said as we continue to grow, we will need to figure out our facilities and engage an architect. Once we have more information we can make good decisions on how to fund those. Assistant City Manager Christensen said we need new carpet in the Civic Center. There is also the chip seal project that has money set aside ( $\$ 1.5$ million). We have not resurfaced the tennis court in six years and it should be done every five years. We would repaint them with pickleball lines and could bring in portable nets. There is also material storage space for sand, rock, gravel and things for the Parks Department by their building. Senior Center personnel have suggested changing the flooring in their main room that is rented out. They are cleaning constantly due to spills. They would get better flooring there and new carpet in other areas. The fence on the east side has been pushed due to snow removal. We would add a concrete strip and new fence along that side. There is also a rear entrance proposed $(\$ 5,000)$ since most of the parking is in the rear. There would be a cutout with a man door. The landscape will happen this year. We will continue to put aside money for the expansion of the cemetery.

Councilmember Archibald said our department heads suggested this to us so we need to think hard about it. It is valuable for us to show our support. We appreciate them so much and I think this is awesome they have thought it through. Director Roberts said we have some moving targets. We are asking for $\$ 400,000$ for this fund to make sure we have

## Draft Minutes

money. Our recommendation is to keep it funded so we have enough money to respond to road projects or anything that comes up. This is a critical discussion for the Council to have on what you want to fund. Assistant City Manager Christensen said we need more police department vehicles in 2024. That would be four vehicles and they would have to be equipped. Chief Cordova said those are to staff the additional officers that are inside the budget. Assistant City Manager Christensen said there is also a one-ton dump truck and one six-wheel dump truck needed.

Assistant City Manager Christensen said for the Transportation Capacity Fund in 2024 we need to acquire the rights-of-way on 1000 North. We are ready to go to bid in January of 2024 with construction in July of 2024 so we can get to work on 1000 North and a couple of these other roads. We will continue to apply for grants and other sources of revenue.
2. Review of the agenda items identified on 7:00 p.m. City Council Agenda

Motion by Councilmember Estep to move into closed session. Motion seconded by Councilmember Archibald. Vote: Councilmember Archibald - aye, Councilmember Estep - aye, Councilmember Rohde - aye, Councilmember Seamons - aye, Councilmember Vance - aye. Motion approved.

The Council moved into a closed session at 5:01 p.m.
3. CLOSED SESSIONS:
a. Strategy session to discuss the purchase of real property when public discussion of the transaction would disclose the appraisal or estimated value of the property under consideration or prevent the public body from completing the transaction on the best possible terms; and/or
b. Strategy session to discuss the character, professional competence or physical or mental health of an individual; and/or
c. Strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation; and/or
d. Discussions regarding security personnel, devices or systems

Motion by Councilmember Rohde to return to open session. Motion seconded by Councilmember Archibald. Vote: Councilmember Archibald - aye, Councilmember Estep - aye, Councilmember Rohde - aye, Councilmember Seamons - aye, Councilmember Vance - aye. Motion approved.

The Council returned to open session at 5:59 p.m. Item 1. was discussed at this time.
The meeting adjourned at 7:01 p.m. by consensus of the Council.

## CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Mayor Holmgren called the March 21, 2023 City Council Meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. The meeting was held in the Tremonton City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Those in attendance were Mayor Holmgren, Councilmembers Archibald, Estep, Rohde, Seamons, and Vance, City Manager Warnke, Assistant City Manager Christensen,
and City Recorder Nessen. The following Department Heads were also present: Public Works Director Paul Fulgham, Police Chief Dustin Cordova, and Treasurer Sharri Oyler (left at 7:48 p.m.). Also in attendance was Finance Director Curtis Roberts.

1. Opening Ceremony:

Mayor Holmgren informed the audience that he had received no written or oral request to participate in the Opening Ceremony. He asked anyone who may be offended by listening to a prayer to step out into the lobby for this portion of the meeting. The prayer was offered by Assistant City Manager Christensen and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Recorder Nessen.
2. Introduction of guests: Mayor Holmgren welcomed those in attendance.
3. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.
4. Approval of Agenda:

Motion by Councilmember Estep to approve the agenda of March 21, 2023. Motion seconded by Councilmember Archibald. Vote: Councilmember Archibald - aye, Councilmember Estep - aye, Councilmember Rohde - aye, Councilmember Seamons aye, Councilmember Vance - aye. Motion approved.
5. Approval of minutes - March 7, 2023

Motion by Councilmember Vance to approve the minutes of March 7, 2023. Motion seconded by Councilmember Rohde. Vote: Councilmember Archibald - aye, Councilmember Estep - aye, Councilmember Rohde - aye, Councilmember Seamons aye, Councilmember Vance - aye. Motion approved.
6. Presentation
a. Report from the Youth City Council - Mayor Reed Bourgeous and City Manager
Emmeline Rees

Reed Bourgeous said we are grateful to talk today and to discuss what we have been up to. Our time as a Youth City Council is coming to a close. We start in the spring and will recruit new people. We currently have 34 members that all attend Bear River High School. We have put in 490 hours of service with a one person high of 34 hours. Emmeline Rees said this year we helped with many events including the Daddy Daughter Dance, the 24th of July celebration and the Christmas season. We helped at the Holiday Extravaganza and added lights on Main Street. I loved doing that, it brightened up my night. Reed Bourgeous said we also planned some of our own events. Some were for fun and others were service oriented. One I was really proud of was when we reached out to a local business and asked them to fund us making and putting together hygiene kits. We were able to assemble 20 kits and donated those through an organization in Salt Lake City. Emmeline Rees said a couple weeks ago we went to USU for a leadership conference. It was incredible to learn what it means to be a good leader
and help those in our community. We learned good problem solving and how to help people. I loved being with other people from cities around Utah. Reed Bourgeous said we got to give a presentation in front of everybody and brag about our little town. In conclusion, we want to say thank you for this opportunity. We have all got to serve and benefit our community, but a lot of that benefit has been for us. We have gained leadership and life skills, and are excited for what lies ahead. We are thankful for this opportunity. The Council thanked them for their time and their advisors who have helped.
7. Public comments: There were no public comments.
8. New Council Business:
a. Discussion and consideration of approving the February Financial Statements

Motion by Councilmember Archibald to approve the February Financial Statements. Motion seconded by Councilmember Seamons. Vote: Councilmember Archibald - aye, Councilmember Estep - aye, Councilmember Rohde - aye, Councilmember Seamons - aye, Councilmember Vance - aye. Motion approved.
b. Discussion and consideration of approving the February Warrant Register

Motion by Councilmember Vance to approve the February Warrant Register. Motion seconded by Councilmember Estep. Vote: Councilmember Archibald - aye, Councilmember Estep - aye, Councilmember Rohde - aye, Councilmember Seamons - aye, Councilmember Vance - aye. Motion approved.
c. Discussion and consideration of approving Resolution No. 23-17 approving a land acquisition agreement between Tremonton City and DC Aston \& Company, LLC for Tremonton City's acquisition of 4.309 acres of real property for the intended use of constructing a secondary water equalization basin

Manager Warnke said this was on the last agenda, but we held off on approval so we could include the water right in the agreement (1.45-acre feet). That has been included as one of the assets the City received in that transaction. Both parties have reviewed it and everything is in order.

Motion by Councilmember Estep to approve the resolution. Motion seconded by Councilmember Archibald. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Archibald - aye, Councilmember Estep - aye, Councilmember Rohde - aye, Councilmember Seamons - aye, Councilmember Vance - aye. Motion approved.
d. Discussion and consideration of adopting Resolution No. 23-18 approving Section XXI: Financial Policies of the Tremonton Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual

Manager Warnke said this is a whole new section attributed to existing policies that we had approved, but not codified in a document. There are also some recommended policies from the State Auditors' Officer that we included.

Motion by Councilmember Vance to adopt the resolution. Motion seconded by Councilmember Rohde. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Archibald - aye, Councilmember Estep - aye, Councilmember Rohde - aye, Councilmember Seamons - aye, Councilmember Vance - aye. Motion approved.
e. Discussion and consideration of adopting Resolution No. 23-19 awarding the 2023 Street Maintenance Project to Staker Parsons

Director Fulgham said we went out to bid. We do have some money set aside from fees-in-lieu that has been on our books for chip seals ( $\$ 165,000$ ). Our engineer's estimate was $\$ 1,550,640$. We bid out for two schedules, but when I looked at the price difference (about $\$ 200,000$ ) I was happy with what we have done in the past. In order to conserve money for other projects I would recommend we go with schedule A. The high bidder was CKC from Vernal at $\$ 1,845,080$. The next was Intermountain Slurry at $\$ 1,422,840$, Advance Paving at $\$ 1,278,000$, and Consolidated Paving at $\$ 1,214,100$. The low bidder was Staker Parsons who has done the majority of the work for the City over the past 25 years. Their bid was $\$ 1,099,080$, which is the bid I suggest we go with.

Director Fulgham said I know we are having issues with 1000 West and there is an option for the north end. If you are interested, I will have our engineer look at it and get an estimate. We would take that road and grind down two inches to get through that layer that keeps flaking off. We could get some good prices with the contractors that will already be working here. The south end needs a whole bunch of work, but that will be a multimillion-dollar project. If you are interested, we would put a package together. Councilmember Vance said let us look at it.

Motion by Councilmember Archibald to adopt the resolution and award the bid to Staker Parsons. Motion seconded by Councilmember Seamons. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Archibald - aye, Councilmember Estep - aye, Councilmember Rohde - aye, Councilmember Seamons - aye, Councilmember Vance - aye. Motion approved.
f. Discussion and consideration of adopting Resolution No. 23-20 reaffirming, amending, and enacting new fees and fines in a schedule entitled Tremonton City Consolidated Fees and Fines schedule for fees including, but not limited to, building fees and subdivision street sign fees

Manager Warnke said with bringing on a contractor to do work we thought it would be a good idea to review the fee schedule. We have a table of what building evaluations were as a common practice. Instead of including that we are just referencing the International Code Councils Building Evaluation, which is updated on a regular basis and tied to the cost of construction. We felt this was easier to leave everything we have and show it as new. The other thing we looked at was subdivision street signs. We take a fee-in-lieu with the development and the City installs those. Director Fulgham brought us up to what the current costs are there. We also looked at the fee-in-lieu for storm drain, chip seal, sidewalks, and curb and gutter, which are the common infrastructure we take as a fee-in-lieu. The City engineer will look at those things, which are subject to change. We will
see an increase in revenue, but there are some boundaries we have to stay in. We are also working on purchasing software to facilitate the plan reviews, inspections and payments. This will help with all the development applications.

Motion by Councilmember Archibald to adopt the resolution. Motion seconded by Councilmember Vance. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Archibald aye, Councilmember Estep - aye, Councilmember Rohde - aye, Councilmember Seamons - aye, Councilmember Vance - aye. Motion approved.
g. Discussion and consideration of adopting Resolution No. 23-21 approving a Professional Services Agreement with B2 Land Services, LLC as the lead acquisition agent for the 1000 North Widening Project from 2300 West to 2650 West

Manager Warnke said at the last Council meeting you selected this person to be the lead. There are easements the City needs to obtain with this expansion. This shows the interfaces with these adjoining properties and their driveways and how they will tie into the expanded right-of-way. This individual will communicate with the 12 property owners that this road affects. She will coordinate and negotiate the easements that are needed for us to construct. This construction season we will acquire the rights-of-way that will put us in a position to go out to bid. It would be ready for construction the summer of 2024.

Manager Warnke said I would like to enter into another contract with this person to do the acquisition for the expanded right-of-way at the intersection of 1000 North and 1000 West. We are trying to position ourselves to have that secured and will submit for CMAC funding. I have been working with BRAG to get funds, too. We need 1000 square feet on each approach for the right turn lanes so all the movements will be separated. This will help with congestion as the City grows. We have to follow the federal process for the acquisition so it would be helpful to have her expertise. Councilmember Vance clarified that there are four owners so the cost would be $\$ 8,000$. That is a lot of money for a sliver of land and the amount of work that happens there. Manager Warnke said we can do this inhouse, but there are a lot of small projects that add up. We are going after more grant funds, which requires a lot of work. There are other things we can do inhouse. She knows the federal process for procurement better than I would. We will be using federal dollars for construction so there is value added there. This is just a recommendation separate from the resolution that I am looking for direction on.

Motion by Councilmember Rohde to adopt the resolution. Motion seconded by Councilmember Archibald. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Archibald - aye, Councilmember Estep - aye, Councilmember Rohde - aye, Councilmember Seamons - aye, Councilmember Vance - aye. Motion approved.
h. Discussion and consideration of adopting Resolution No. 23-22 appointing Raulon Van Tassell to serve on the Tremonton City Planning Commission and reaffirming and appointing existing Planning Commission members

Mayor Holmgren said Commission Member Paul Fowler sent me a message
asking to resign from the Planning Commission since he is moving. We have talked to Raulon Van Tassell and feel he has a lot to offer our Planning Commission. Councilmember Archibald read through the City's mission and vision, which she said speaks positivity. Working on the Planning Commission I was thinking about a community member who would be able to display this and be someone who would add to our Planning Commission. I reached out to Raulon Van Tassell who is someone I felt would do a good job at bringing that to our community-that safe and welcoming type of environment. She then read through his bio. The Council made a motion and thanked him for his willingness to serve.

Motion by Councilmember Archibald to adopt this resolution. Motion seconded by Councilmember Estep. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Archibald aye, Councilmember Estep - aye, Councilmember Rohde - aye, Councilmember Seamons - aye, Councilmember Vance - aye. Motion approved.
9. Calendar Items and Previous Assignment
a. Review of calendar

The Utah League of Cities and Towns Mid-Year Conference is approaching
b. Unfinished Business/Action Items: None.
c. Branding Implementation update

Assistant City Manager Christensen said the biggest thing is the addition of the sign in here. Councilmember Estep said the flags came in, too. They are going on Main Street. We have an American flag and a City flag that will attach to the light poles. They are $3 \times 5$ so they will stand out a bit more than previous ones.
10. Reports \& Comments:
a. City Administration Reports and Comments: None.
b. Development Review Committee Report and Comments: None.
c. City Department Head Reports and Comments

Director Fulgham said neighborhoods that butted against any field had issues with flooding because water came off in a hurry. There are 240 acres behind Buttars Tractors and there was a foot of water that came south. That is about 78 million gallons of water. We had this same type of event six years ago and that took us a week to deal with. For this one, because of the new system down Main Street, it was gone in 24 hours. You cannot plan for that much water. It is not a storm event it is a seasonal build up. There is not much we can do for that. We do the best we can, but I think the City Council was wise in putting that 36 -inch line there. We provided more than 2,000 sand bags, plus five loads of sand. We have done things to help people prepare. Mayor Holmgren said I have to tell Director Fulgham and his crew what a great job they did. I heard tons of compliments. We really appreciate all your efforts. Director Fulgham said we appreciate your support. There are still a couple issues with the Tremonton Garland Drainage District, but they have been working on it. We have helped them remove tree roots from years of neglect. We have to stay on top of that so they do not get in the sewer.

Chief Cordova said Brigham City recently notified us that they do not want to be in an agreement with SWAT with both us and the County. That poses many challenges, but we are working through it. I am getting bids from other cities. The issue we will run into is the response time. The national standard is 45 minutes to an hour, but here it could be up to an hour and a half. We will have to create an emergency response team and could do that in-house. This came out of the blue and we did not have a written agreement. We had called them for an incident and they did not come out anyway so this allows us to put something in place where we are guaranteed a response. We will work something out that makes sense for our City and our capabilities. I will keep you posted when we have the solution. Councilmember Archibald is helping me apply for a grant. Other than that, it is business as usual.

Social Media Manager Sara Mohrman said the Farmer's Market is coming up in six weeks. We had a good meeting with the Chamber of Commerce and local individuals to discuss how we can do more for our businesses here. We have a good plan going forward.

Mayor Holmgren said we appreciate what everyone is doing. You all are making a significant contribution to the City. We appreciate you so much.
d. Council Reports and Comments

Councilmember Estep said thank you to everyone for all they are doing, you sure make us look good.

Councilmember Vance said Assistant City Manager Christensen and Manager Warnke, the numbers you are putting together really helps us to know what is going on so thank you.

Councilmember Rohde said I just want to thank Assistant City Manager Christensen and Director Roberts. Thank you for entertaining us with what we need. I wondered if we could put some language in our public comment that restricts it to only citizens of Tremonton. When it is an annexation or people from other communities are affected, they can talk, but when it is just Tremonton, I would like to keep it to just those citizens. They agreed to look into that.

Councilmember Seamons said thank you to the Public Works for helping with the flooding. Thank you for all you are doing.

## 11. CLOSED SESSIONS: No Closed Session held at this time.

a. Strategy session to discuss the purchase of real property when public discussion of the transaction would disclose the appraisal or estimated value of the property under consideration or prevent the public body from completing the transaction on the best possible terms; and/or
b. Strategy session to discuss the character, professional competence or physical or mental health of an individual; and/or
c. Strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation; and/or
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## d. Discussions regarding security personnel, devices or systems

12. Adjournment.

Motion by Councilmember Seamons to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by Councilmember Rohde. Vote: Councilmember Archibald - aye, Councilmember Estep aye, Councilmember Rohde - aye, Councilmember Seamons - aye, Councilmember Vance - aye. Motion approved.

The meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m.
The undersigned duly acting and appointed Recorder for Tremonton City Corporation hereby certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes for the City Council Meeting held on the above referenced date. Minutes were prepared by Jessica Tanner.

Dated this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2023.

## Linsey Nessen, City Recorder

## Follow-up items for the Council and City Staff

Director Fulgham would have the City Engineer put together a bid for work to be done on the north end of 1000 West.

Chief Cordova is looking into options for SWAT. They will do some in-house options, as well as look at contracts with outside help.

Staff will look into wording and the legality of having only Tremonton residents talk during public comment when dealing with issues that only involve those residents.

# Proclamation 

## ENCOURAGING THE OBSERVANCE OF ARBOR DAY

WHEREAS, in 1872, J. Sterling Morton proposed to the Nebraska Board of Agriculture that a special day be set aside for the planting of trees, and

WHEREAS, this holiday, called Arbor Day, was first observed with the planting of more than a million trees in Nebraska, and

WHEREAS, Arbor Day is now observed throughout the nation and the world, and
WHEREAS, trees can reduce the erosion of our precious topsoil by wind and water, cut heating and cooling costs, moderate the temperature, clean the air, produce oxygen and provide habitat for wildlife, and

WHEREAS, trees are a renewable resource giving us paper, wood for our homes, fuel for our fires and countless other wood products, and

WHEREAS, trees in our City increase property values, enhance the economic vitality of business areas, and beautify our community, and

WHEREAS, trees, wherever they are planted, are a source of joy and spiritual renewal.

NOW THEREFORE, I, Lyle N. Holmgren, Mayor of the City of Tremonton, Utah, do hereby proclaim April 28, 2023, as ARBOR DAY. In the City of Tremonton, I urge all citizens to support efforts to protect our trees and woodlands and to support our City's Urban Forestry Program, and

FURTHER, I urge all citizens to plant trees to gladden hearts and promote the wellbeing of present and future generations.

DATED this $4^{\text {th }}$ day of April, 2023.
TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION

Lyle N. Holmgren, Mayor

## ATTEST:

[^0]| Tremonton City City Council MeEting April 4, 2023 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Title: | Discussion and consideration of adopting Resolution No. 23-23 appointing Mike Garrett to serve on the Tremonton City Library Board and reaffirming and appointing existing Library Board Members |
| FISCAL IMPACT: | Not applicable |
| Presenter: | Kim Griffiths, Library Director |

Prepared By:
Kim Griffiths

## RECOMMENDATION:

I move that the City Council adopt a resolution to appoint Mike Garrett as a Tremonton City Library Board member.

## BACKGROUND:

Mike will be replacing Mercedes Stacey, who has moved. Mike volunteered to serve on the Board and was introduced to the existing Board on March 17, 2023.

As stated in the Tremonton City Library ordinance Section 3 article 3.4: In the event of a vacancy on the Library Board, replacement candidates will be recommended by the Library Board and approved by the Tremonton City Council.

## RESOLUTION NO. 23-23

## A RESOLUTION OF TREMONTON CITY COUNCIL APPOINTING MIKE GARRETT TO SERVE ON THE TREMONTON CITY LIBRARY BOARD AND REAFFIRMING AND APPOINTING EXISTING LIBRARY BOARD MEMBERS

WHEREAS, Tremonton City believes that public libraries promote literacy and quality of life in a community and provide many other ancillary services; and

WHEREAS, following Utah Code 9-7-402, Tremonton City has established and maintains a public library; and

WHEREAS, Utah Code 9-7-402 requires that when a city's governing body decides to establish and maintain a city public library, it shall appoint a Library Board of not less than five members and not more than nine members, chosen from the citizens of the city and based upon their fitness for the office; and

WHEREAS, Tremonton City has established a Library Board as required by Utah Code 9-7-402, codified in Title 3. City Government, Part 3-840 Library Board of the Revised Ordinances of Tremonton City Corporation; and

WHEREAS, per Tremonton City Code 3-841 (1), the Library Board consists of seven (7) to nine (9) persons chosen from the citizens at large of Tremonton, Utah, with one member of the board being a member of the Tremonton City Council; and

WHEREAS, per Tremonton City Code 3-841 (2), the Library Board member is appointed for a three (3) year term, or until their successors are appointed, with Board members not serving more than two (2) consecutive full terms; and

WHEREAS, Library Board Member Mercedes Stacey is moving and has resigned from the Library Board, creating a vacant position on the Tremonton City Library Board; and

WHEREAS, Mike Garrett, a Tremonton City resident, has expressed interest in participating in the Tremonton City Library Board and possesses skills and interests that will complement the Library Board as detailed in Exhibit "A."

NOW BE IT RESOLVED that the Tremonton City Council hereby appoints Mike Garrett to serve on the Tremonton City Library Board and reaffirms and appoints the following individuals as members of the Tremonton City Library Board for the following duration:

| Board Member | Term | Can Serve Thru (Two-Term Limits) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mike Garrett | June 2024 | June 2030 |
| Moroni Aguilar | June 2024 | June 2024 |
| Lisa Unsworth | June 2024 | June 2024 |
| Alysia Chapman | June 2024 | June 2027 |
| Annette Macfarlane | June 2024 | June 2027 |


| Becca Ashby | June 2025 | June 2028 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rick Jeppesen | June 2025 | June 2028 |
| Julie Beagley | June 2025 | June 2028 |
| Connie Archibald | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |

Adopted and passed by the City Council this $4^{\text {th }}$ day of April 2023. Resolution to become effective upon adoption.

TREMONTON CITY
A Utah Municipal Corporation
By $\quad$ Lyle Holmgren, Mayor

## ATTEST:

Linsey Nessen, City Recorder

## EXHIBIT "A"

A little background about me:
Mike Garrett
\#\#\# Tremont Street
Tremonton Ut. 84337
My wife is Sheri Lott Garrett, we've been married for 42 years. We have 4 boys and two girls.The youngest two are twin boys. (Everyone in life should experience raising twins... just saying.)
-I was born here in Tremonton, attended part of 1st Grade here at the old McKinley. Grew up in Soda Springs Idaho. Attended Ricks College (BYU-Idaho) and Utah State University in Logan. My education background is in Automotive, Aerospace, and Environmental Protection.
-I'm a licensed Power Plant Operator (Industrial Steam Eng) at the North Plant for Northrop Grumman, Promontory. I work rotating shifts, text me anytime. (I'm probably awake at 3 am.) I'm about two years away from retirement.
-I've been taking on-line and USU extension classes for Creative Nonfiction Writing for about the past 8 years. I really enjoy writing about adventure and time-travel romance. Indiana Jones and Regency Jane Austen are my favorites. (Miss Jane Austen is my home-town girl.) As a writer, I have developed pretty thick skin. I'm a pretty easy going type of guy, it's hard to offend me. (Typo's kill me...)
-I love to volunteer, I was involved in Cub and Boy Scouts for 39 years. One of my most enjoyable positions was being WEBELOS leader. One year we took the boys flying with Wayne Larsen after they "graduated" from a 5 hour flight school. I'm a S.T.E.M. advocate for a fun way to learn. (S.T.E.M stands for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics)


| Tremonton City City Council MeEting April 4, 2023 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Title: | Discussion and consideration of adopting Resolution No. 23-24 approving a Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvements between Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), Tremonton City, and Rivers Edge Real Holdings, LLC for a future traffic signal at the intersection of Main Street (State Route 102) and 950 East and other improvements at the intersection of 1600 East (State Route <br> 13) and 450 North |
| FISCAL IMPACT: | Not applicable. |
| Presenter: | Shawn Warnke, City Manager |

## BACKGROUND:

The Rivers Edge - Phase 1 is being proposed as the first phase of the Rivers Edge Development, and the construction of this phase requires access onto State Route 102 (Main Street), which is owned and controlled by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). Accessing State Routes requires access permits from UDOT, and as part of the access permitting process, UDOT requires that Developers submit a traffic impact study.

The Developers of the Rivers Edge Development completed a traffic impact study which identified several site-related traffic mitigation improvements required during the construction of this Development. More specifically, the traffic impact study identifies that a traffic signal at the intersection of Main Street (State Route 102) and 950 East is needed as a site-related improvement when $35 \%$ of the Rivers Edge Development is complete. The traffic impact study identified right and left turn lanes that need to be constructed on 1600 East (State Route 13) when the 450 North Collector Road connects to State Route 13.

The proposed River Edge - Phase 1 plat is less than 35\% of the total Rivers Edge Development, and the construction of the 450 North Collector Road will be constructed in a future phase of the Rivers Edge Development. UDOT is willing to grant Rivers Edge - Phase 1 an access permit for the intersection of 950 East and Main Street (State Route 102) if the Utah Department of Transportation, Tremonton City, and Rivers Edge Holdings, LLC enter into Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvement.

This Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvements requires that the City not issue any future development approval for future phases of the Rivers Edge Development without requiring the Developer to submit an amended traffic impact study (TIS) to UDOT to verify if the proposed phase meets the warrant for a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 102 (Main Street) and 950 East. If the TIS finds that the proposed phase meets UDOT's warrants for a traffic signal, the Developer shall provide construction plans of the traffic signal and any other mitigation improvements for review and approval by UDOT. Thereafter the Developer shall construct a traffic signal and any other mitigation improvement required by UDOT concurrent with constructing the subdivision improvements for the proposed phase; and

This Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvements requires that the City not issue any future development approval for future phases, which includes the construction of the city street that connects to State Route 13 unless the Developer shall be required to construct mitigation improvements which include but are not limited to right and left turn lanes on State Route 13. The Developer shall provide construction plans of the mitigation improvements for connecting a city street to State Route 13 for review and approval by UDOT. Thereafter the Developer shall construct right and left turn lanes on State Route 13 and any other mitigation improvement required by UDOT concurrent with constructing the subdivision
improvements for the proposed phase.
City Staff is proposing that this Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvements be recorded in the office of the Box Elder County Recorder so that any successor of interest in the Rivers Edge Development is notified of this future obligation to construct the required traffic mitigation measures and other improvements.

Attachment: Resolution No. 23-24

## RESOLUTION NO. 23-24

## A RESOLUTION OF TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION APPROVING A COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT FOR PHASED DEVELOPMENT IMPROVEMENTS BETWEEN UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (UDOT), TREMONTON CITY, AND RIVERS EDGE REAL HOLDINGS, LLC FOR A FUTURE TRAFFIC SIGNAL AT THE INTERSECTION OF MAIN STREET (STATE ROUTE 102) AND 950 EAST AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS AT THE INTERSECTION OF 1600 EAST (STATE ROUTE 13) AND 450 NORTH

WHEREAS, Tremonton City adopted Resolution No. 18-40, approving the Tremonton Transportation Master Plan, which identifies the 950 East Collector Road and the 450 North Collector Road as needed transportation corridors as shown in Exhibit "A"; and

WHEREAS, the Tremonton Transportation Master Plan also identified the intersection of 950 East to be a signalized location, as shown in Exhibit "A"; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Tremonton Transportation Master Plan, the Rivers Edge Development, as legally described in Exhibit "B" has incorporated the 950 East Collector Road and the 450 North Collector Road into their development plans as shown in Exhibit "C"; and

WHEREAS, the 950 East Collector Road and the 450 North Collector Road intersect with State Route 102 (Main Street) and State Route 13 (1600 East), respectively, as shown in Exhibit "C"; and

WHEREAS, the Developers of Rivers Edge Development are proposing that the project be developed in phases, as shown in Exhibit " $C$ "; and

WHEREAS, Rivers Edge - Phase 1 is being proposed as the first phase of the Rivers Edge Development, requires access onto State Route 102 (Main Street); and

WHEREAS, State Route 102 (Main Street) is owned and controlled by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), and accessing State Routes requires access permits from UDOT; and

WHEREAS, as part of the access permitting process, UDOT requires that Developers submit a traffic impact study; and

WHEREAS, the Developers of the Rivers Edge Development completed a traffic impact study which identified several improvements as summarized in Exhibit "D" and fully detailed in Exhibit "E"; and

WHEREAS, more specifically, the traffic impact study identifies that a traffic signal at the intersection of Main Street (State Route 102) and 950 East is needed as a site-related improvement when 35\% of the Rivers Edge Development is complete; and

WHEREAS, the proposed River Edge - Phase 1 plat is less than $35 \%$ of the total Rivers Edge Development; and

WHEREAS, UDOT is willing to grant Rivers Edge - Phase 1 an access permit for the intersection of 950 East and Main Street (State Route 102) if the Utah Department of Transportation, Tremonton City, and Rivers Edge Holdings, LLC enter into Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvement; and

WHEREAS, the Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvements requires that the City not issue any future development approval for future phases of the Rivers Edge Development without requiring the Developer to submit an amended traffic impact study (TIS) to UDOT to verify if the proposed phase meets the warrant for a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 102 (Main Street) and 950 East. If the TIS finds that the proposed phase meets UDOT's warrants for a traffic signal, the Developer shall provide construction plans of the traffic signal and any other mitigation improvements for review and approval by UDOT. Thereafter the Developer shall construct a traffic signal and any other mitigation improvement required by UDOT concurrent with constructing the subdivision improvements for the proposed phase; and

WHEREAS, the Rivers Edge Development includes a future phase wherein the 450 North Collector Road will require access to State Route 13 (1600 East) as shown in Exhibit "C"; and

WHEREAS, the traffic impact study complete for the River Edge Development as summarized in Exhibit "D" and fully detailed in Exhibit "E" identified right and left turn lanes be construction on 1600 East (State Route 13); and

WHEREAS, the Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvements requires that the City not issue any future development approval for future phases, which includes the construction of the city street that connects to State Route 13, unless the Developer shall be required to construct mitigation improvements which include but are not limited to right and left turn lanes on State Route 13. The Developer shall provide construction plans of the mitigation improvements for connecting a city street to State Route 13 for review and approval by UDOT. Thereafter the Developer shall construct right and left turn lanes on State Route 13 and any other mitigation improvement required by UDOT concurrent with constructing the subdivision improvements for the proposed phase; and

WHEREAS, the complete Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvements is contained within Exhibit " $F$ "; and

WHEREAS, Tremonton City desires that this Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvements be recorded in the office of the Box Elder County Recorder so that any successor of interest in the Rivers Edge Development is notified of this future obligation to construct the required traffic mitigation measures and other improvements.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Tremonton City Council approves the Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvements between Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), Tremonton City, and Rivers Edge Real Holdings, LLC for a future traffic signal at the intersection of Main Street (State Route 102) and 950 East and other improvements at the intersection of 1600 East (State Route 13) and 450 North as contained in Exhibit "F."

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that the Tremonton City Council authorizes the City Manager to sign the Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvements as contained in Exhibit "F" on behalf of Tremonton City.

LASTLY, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council directs the City Recorder to record this Cooperative Agreement for Phased Development Improvements in the Box Elder County Recorder's Office so that any successor of interest in the Rivers Edge Development is notified of this future obligation to construct the required traffic mitigation improvements.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Tremonton City Council on this the $4^{\text {th }}$ day of April 2023. To become effective upon passage.

TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
A Utah Municipal Corporation
By
Lyle Holmgren, Mayor

## ATTEST:

Linsey Nessen, City Recorder

## NOTARY PUBLIC

State of Utah )
County of Box Elder )
On this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , in the year 2023, before me $\qquad$ a notary public, personally appeared Lyle Holmgren and proved on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) subscribed to this instrument, and acknowledge executing the same.

Notary Public

## EXHIBIT "A"

## Transportation Master Plan

Figure 10: Capital Projects Map


## EXHIBIT "B"

## LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A part of Section 2, Township 11 North, Range 3 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, U.S Survey:

Beginning at the Center of said Section 2 said point being 2639.50 feet North $01^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 04$ " West from the South Quarter corner of said Section; and running thence North $88^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 54{ }^{\prime \prime}$ East 2,004.33 feet; thence South $01^{\circ} 09^{\prime} 01^{\prime \prime}$ East 186.64 feet; thence North $89^{\circ} 58^{\prime} 32$ " East 104.95 feet; thence South $00^{\circ} 01^{\prime} 28$ " East 126.74 feet; thence North $88^{\circ} 51$ '00" East 266.41 feet; thence South $08^{\circ} 30^{\prime} 15$ " West 123.54 feet; thence South $00^{\circ} 01^{\prime} 14$ " East 206.20 feet; thence South $04^{\circ} 06^{\prime} 23^{\prime \prime}$ East 676.79 feet; thence South $88^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 19 "$ West 608.67 feet; thence South $24^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 00$ " West $1,406.61$ feet; thence South $88^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ West 35.75 feet; thence North $24^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 00$ " East 375.60 feet; thence South $88^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 43$ " West 324.94 feet; thence South $01^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 15$ " East 7.00 feet; thence South $88^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ West 180.00 feet; thence South $01^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 15$ " East 332.00 feet; thence South $88^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ West 97.88 feet; thence North $01^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 15$ " West 105.00 feet; thence South $87^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 50$ " West 107.75 feet; thence South $02^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 13^{\prime \prime}$ West 103.00 feet; thence South $88^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ West 570.25 feet; thence North $01^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 04$ " West 338.53 feet; thence South $88^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 41^{\prime \prime}$ West 357.63 feet; thence North $14^{\circ} 29^{\prime} 46^{\prime \prime}$ West 92.49 feet; thence North $14^{\circ} 32^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ West 136.57 feet; thence North $14^{\circ} 31^{\prime} 32$ " West 54.36 feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 46^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ West 145.74 feet; thence North $08^{\circ} 58^{\prime} 18^{\prime \prime}$ East 60.95 feet; thence North $01^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 46$ " West 120.00 feet; thence South $88^{\circ} 48^{\prime} 14$ " West 209.45 feet; thence North $87^{\circ} 50 ' 49 "$ West 60.08 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 13^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ West 200.00 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 13^{\prime} 28^{\prime \prime}$ West 222.96 feet; thence North $74^{\circ} 47^{\prime} 49$ " West 121.70 feet; thence North $03^{\circ} 34^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ East 157.10 feet; thence North $33^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ East 123.47 feet; thence North $77^{\circ} 10{ }^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ East 60.00 feet; thence North $89^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 18$ " East 568.51 feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 03^{\prime} 41$ " West 120.16 feet; thence North $04^{\circ} 06^{\prime} 54$ " West 60.12 feet; thence North $00^{\circ} 03^{\prime} 31^{\prime \prime}$ West 99.25 feet; thence North $58^{\circ} 18^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East 114.42 feet; thence North $16^{\circ} 07^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ East 102.16 feet; thence North $15^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime}$ East 101.96 feet; thence North $27^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 56^{\prime \prime}$ East 399.77 feet; thence North $62^{\circ} 48^{\prime} 02^{\prime \prime}$ West 120.00 feet; thence North $27^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 58$ " East 66.99 feet; thence North 62 $48^{\prime} 02^{\prime \prime}$ West 213.04 feet; thence North $29^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 26^{\prime \prime}$ East 25.27 feet; thence North $04^{\circ} 52^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East 159.87 feet; thence North $01^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 48$ " West 144.50 feet; thence North $27^{\circ} 29^{\prime} 05$ " East 72.06 feet; thence North $55^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ East 419.94 feet; thence South $01^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 01^{\prime \prime}$ East 373.07 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 135.5117 acres, more or less.

## END OF DESCRIPTION.

## EXHIBIT "C"



## EXHIBIT "D"

Edited Excerpts from Traffic Impact Study for the River, the complete Traffic Impact Study for the Rivers Edge Development is contained in Exhibit "E"

- 950 East Collector Road \& Main Street (State Route 102)- Signalize intersection when 35\% of the site is complete. Signal should be constructed with left and right tum storage lanes for all approaches. This is a future master planned signalized location. Site traffic increases traffic at this intersection by $40 \%$. This is a site-related improvement.
- The 1150 East Access \& Main Street (State Route 102) access requires an eastbound lane (50foot minimum) and westbound right ( 50 -foot minimum) deceleration lanes, and a southbound right acceleration lane. This is a site-related improvement.
- 450 North Collector Road \& 1600 East (State Route 13) requires a northbound lane (50-foot minimum) and southbound right (50-foot minimum) deceleration lanes. This is a site-related improvement.


## EXHIBIT "E"

## EXHIBIT "F"

# Rivers Edge 5600 West / Main Street Traffic Impact Study 

Tremonton, Utah

March 2021


TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING

A-Trans Engineering P.O. Box 521651

Salt Lake City, Utah 84152 (801) 949-0348 telephone (801) 582-6252 fax


# Rivers Edge 5600 West / Main Street Traffic Impact Analysis 

Tremonton, Utah

## Category II

March 2021

Prepared by:
A-Trans Engineering Joseph Perrin, PhD, PE, PTOE
P.O. Box City, 521651

Salt Lake City, Utah 84152
(801) 949-0348
atrans@comcast.net
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## I. Introduction and Summary

This traffic impact analysis is for the proposed Rivers Edge residential development located to the north of Main Street ( 11200 North) and west of 1600 East in Tremonton, Utah. The site is planned to include 210 townhomes, 264 apartments, 369 single family residences and 70,000 sf of retail. It is projected to generate 557 AM, 898 PM peak hour trips and 9,596 daily trips. The site is planning 3 accesses to the site. One access along 1600 East and two accesses along Main Street that align will the existing streets of 5600 West and 1150 East.

1600 East / Main Street operates with overall LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. In 2026 without the site in LOS increases to LOS B in the AM and LOS D in the PM peak period. With the site in 2021 the intersection operates with LOS B in the AM and LOS E in the PM peak period with the NB direction at LOS F. In 2026 with the site the intersection operates with LOS C in the AM and LOS F in the PM peak period with the NB direction at LOS F. With growth in the area plus the addition of site traffic the intersection is operating near capacity and an improvement is recommended by 2026. The intersection was analyzed as an allway stop with additional lanes in each direction or as a signal. Both of these options allow the intersection to operate at acceptable LOS. It is recommended that UDOT consider the options available at this location and plan this as a future improvement location.

1150 East / Main Street operates with a critical NBLTR at LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. Without the site in 2026 the intersection operates with critical NBLTR at LOS C in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. With the addition of site traffic the NBLTR lane will operate at LOS E and the PM peak period and the site SBL traffic will operate at LOS C. 5600 West / Main Street operates with critical NBLTR at LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. This is maintained in 2026 without the site. With the site traffic at this location the delay for the NBL and SBL declines to LOS F. A signal is recommended at this location when the site is $35 \%$ complete. With a signal at this location the intersection operates with overall LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. Access Z / 1600 North is projected to operate with critical EBL at LOS B in 2021 and 2026 in the AM and PM peak periods.

Recommendations:

- Main Street / 1600 East (2026) - Improve intersection geometry to an all-way stop with separate left and through right turn lanes or signalize. Signal should be constructed with left and right turn storage lanes for all approaches. This is a future master planned signalized location. Site traffic increases traffic at this intersection by $18 \%$. This is a site related and non-site related improvement. It is recommended that UDOT investigate potential improvement options for this intersection.
- 5600 West / Main Street - Signalize intersection when $35 \%$ of the site is complete. Signal should be constructed with left and right turn storage lanes for all approaches. This is a future master planned signalized location. Site traffic increases traffic at this intersection by $40 \%$. This is a site related improvement.
- The 1150 East / Main Street access requires EBL (50 foot minimum) and WBR (50 foot minimum) deceleration lanes and a SBR acceleration lane. This is a site related improvement.
- Access Z / 1600 East requires NBL (50 foot minimum) and SBR (50 foot minimum) deceleration lanes. This is a site related improvement.


## II. Proposed Project

The proposed single and multi-family residential community is planned to the north of Main Street ( 11200 North) and west of 1600 East in Tremonton, Utah. The site is planned to include 210 townhomes, 264 apartments, 369 single family residences and 70,000 sf of retail. It is projected to generate 557 AM, 898 PM peak hour trips and 9,596 daily trips.

The site is proposing 3 accesses; one access (Access Z) is located along SR 13 approximately 580 feet south of 11600 North. There are several residential driveways within 500 feet of the access. Due to the location of the residential driveways and 11600 North along SR 13 the accesses must be approved through the variance process. The two accesses along SR 102 are planned to align with 1150 East and 5600 West. 1150 East is approximately 1780 feet west of 1600 East. 5600 West is located approximately 650 feet west of 1150 East. There are several residential driveways within 500 feet of the proposed roadways. Due to the location of the residential driveways along SR 102 the accesses must be approved through the variance process. The site plan and access location and spacing is shown in Figure 1.


## III. Study Area Conditions

The study area includes the following intersection.

- 1600 East / Main Street
- Main Street / 1150 East
- Main Street / 5600 West
- 1600 East / Access Z

Figure 2 shows the location of the site. Figure 3 shows existing intersection geometry.

## Main Street

Main Street or 11200 North (SR 102) is currently a 3 lane facility with one lane in each direction and a center turn lane. The 2019 AADT is 8,600 vehicles per day with a posted speed limit is 55 MPH. The Tremonton City Master Transportation Plan classifies Main Street as a Major Arterial.

1600 East
1600 East (SR 13) is currently a 2 lane facility with one lane in each direction. The 2019 AADT is 5,100 vehicles per day with a posted speed limit of 55 MPH. The Tremonton City Master Transportation Plan classifies Main Street as a Major Arterial.

- 5600 West is planned as a collector.
- 1600 East / Main Street is planned as a future signalized location.
- Main Street / 5600 West is planned as a future signalized location.




## IV. Analysis of Existing Condition

The existing traffic counts were performed March 2-4, 2021 during the AM and PM peak periods. The 2021 Existing Traffic volumes used in the study are shown in Figure 4.

The $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition Highway Capacity Manual defines the Level of Service (LOS) for both signalized and unsignalized intersections as a range of average experienced delay. LOS is a qualitative rating of traveler satisfaction from A to F whereby LOS A is good and LOS F poor. Table 1 shows the LOS range by delay for unsignalized and signalized intersections and accesses.

Table 1: Intersection LOS-Delay Relationship

|  | Unsignalized | Signalized |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level of <br> Service | Total Delay per Vehicle <br> $(\mathrm{sec})$ | Total Delay per Vehicle <br> $(\mathrm{sec})$ |
| A | $\leq 10.0$ | $\leq 10.0$ |
| B | $>10.0$ and $\leq 15.0$ | $>10.0$ and $\leq 20.0$ |
| C | $>15.0$ and $\leq 25.0$ | $>20.0$ and $\leq 35.0$ |
| D | $>25.0$ and $\leq 35.0$ | $>35.0$ and $\leq 55.0$ |
| E | $>35.0$ and $\leq 50.0$ | $>55.0$ and $\leq 80.0$ |
| F | $>50.0$ | $>80.0$ |

1600 East / Main Street operates with an overall LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. 1150 East / Main Street operates with a critical NBLTR at LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. 5600 West / Main Street operates with a critical NBLTR at LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. Table 2 shows the Existing LOS.

Table 2: Existing Level of Service

| Intersection | Delay (sec/veh) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1600 East / Main Street (Overall) | 11.9 | B |
|  | 21.0 | C |
| Main Street / 1150 East <br> (NBLTR) | 14.2 | B |
|  | 18.3 | C |
| Main Street / 5600 West (NBLTR) | 14.3 | B |
|  | 20.9 | C |



## V. Projected Traffic

## A. Trip Generation

Trip generation for the site was done using The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation ( $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition) handbook. The site is planned to include 210 townhomes, 264 apartments, 369 single family residences and 70,000 sf of retail. It is projected to generate 557 AM, 898 PM peak hour trips and 9,596 daily trips. The trip generation for the site is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Trip Generation for Site

| Land Use Type | Density | Land Use \# | Trip Rate | Trips | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { \% } \\ & \text { In } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Out } \end{gathered}$ | Trips <br> In | Trips Out |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family | 369 | 210 | 0.74 | 273 | 25\% | 75\% | 68 | 205 |
| Town Homes | 210 | 220 | 0.46 | 97 | 23\% | 77\% | 22 | 75 |
| Apartments | 264 | 220 | 0.46 | 121 | 23\% | 77\% | 28 | 93 |
| Retail | 70,000 | 820 | 0.94 | 66 | 62\% | 38\% | 41 | 25 |
| Total |  |  |  | 557 |  |  | 159 | 398 |
| PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family | 369 | 210 | 0.99 | 365 | 63\% | 37\% | 230 | 135 |
| Town Homes | 210 | 220 | 0.56 | 118 | 63\% | 37\% | 74 | 44 |
| Apartments | 264 | 220 | 0.56 | 148 | 63\% | 37\% | 93 | 55 |
| Retail | 70,000 | 820 | 3.81 | 267 | 48\% | 52\% | 128 | 139 |
| Total |  |  |  | 898 |  |  | 525 | 373 |
| Daily |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family | 369 | 210 | 9.44 | 3483 |  |  |  |  |
| Town Homes | 210 | 220 | 7.32 | 1537 |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | 264 | 220 | 7.32 | 1932 |  |  |  |  |
| Retail | 70,000 | 820 | 37.75 | 2644 |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 9596 |  |  |  |  |

## B. Trip Distribution

Project site traffic was applied to the origin-destination (O-D) for the site. Origin-destination was determined from evaluating the existing traffic patterns and hourly traffic volumes on each leg of the included intersections as well as the location of retail centers and freeways relative to this site. This was used as a baseline for origin destination and engineering judgment was applied to this to determine the following OD for the site.

- $70 \%$ to/from west on Main Street
- $10 \%$ to/from east on Main Street
- $5 \%$ to/from north on 1600 East
- $15 \%$ to/from south on 1600 East

Origin Destination is shown in Figure 5. Site trip distribution is shown in Figure 6.



## VI. Growth

Growth in the area was determined from the 2019 Traffic on Utah Highways counts. The 2040 projections were taken from Wasatch Front Regional Council. The volumes and utilized to determine growth in the area is shown in Table 4. Based on this data an average growth of $1.4 \%$ is assumed for the 2026 analysis ( 1.07 growth factor).

Table 4: Growth Projections

|  | Main Street | 1600 East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 8,600 | 5,100 |
| 2040 | 10,500 | 7,500 |
| Growth | $0.96 \%$ | $1.85 \%$ |

Background traffic is determined by multiplying the existing traffic by the growth factor for 2026. 2026 Background Traffic is shown in Figure 7. Total traffic in the area for the future projection years is derived by adding the non-site volume forecasts to the site trip distribution. 2021 Total Traffic is shown in Figure 8. 2026 Total Traffic is shown in Figure 9.




## VII. Traffic Analysis

## A. Level of Service Analysis

The intersection and access analysis evaluates the performance of each intersection and access using the measure of performance of delay and level of service (LOS). Tables 5-8 show the intersection and access analysis.

## Analysis Results

- 1600 East / Main Street operates with an overall LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. In 2026 without the site in LOS increases to LOS B in the AM and LOS D in the PM peak period. With the site in 2021 the intersection operates with LOS B in the AM and LOS E in the PM peak period with the NB direction at LOS F. In 2026 with the site the intersection operates with LOS C in the AM and LOS F in the PM peak period with the NB direction at LOS F. With growth in the area plus the addition of site traffic the intersection is operating near capacity and an improvement is recommended by 2026. The intersection was analyzed as an all-way stop with additional lanes in each direction or as a signal. Both of these options allow the intersection to operate at acceptable LOS. It is recommended that UDOT consider the options available at this location and plan this as a future improvement location.
- 1150 East / Main Street operates with critical NBLTR at LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. Without the site in 2026 the intersection operates with critical NBLTR at LOS C in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. With the addition of site traffic the NBLTR lane will operate at LOS E and the PM peak period and the site SBL traffic will operate at LOS C.
- 5600 West / Main Street operates with critical NBLTR at LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. This is maintained in 2026 without the site. With the site traffic at this location the delay for the NBL and SBL declines to LOS F. A signal is recommended at this location when the site is $35 \%$ complete. With a signal at this location the intersection operates with overall LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period.
- Access Z / 1600 North is projected to operate with critical EBL at LOS B in 2021 and 2026 in the AM and PM peak periods.

Table 5: 1600 East / Main Street Intersection Analysis

| Existing Geometry |  | EBLT |  |  | EBR |  | WBLT |  | WBR |  | NBLT |  | NBR |  | SBLT |  | SBR |  | INT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021 Existing | AM | 11.9 | B |  | 9.8 | A | 12.1 | B | 8.8 | A | 14.6 | B | 8.5 | A | 11.2 | B | 9.7 | A | 11.9 | B |
|  | PM | 22.9 | C |  | 13.4 | B | 14.7 | B | 10.4 | B | 33.5 | D | 10.1 | B | 13.9 | B | 11.6 | B | 21.0 | C |
| $2026$ <br> Background | AM | 12.5 | B |  | 10.2 | B | 12.8 | B | 9.0 | A | 16.0 | C | 8.7 | A | 11.7 | B | 10.1 | B | 12.6 | B |
|  | PM | 27.8 | D |  | 14.8 | B | 15.9 | C | 10.8 | B | 44.9 | E | 10.5 | B | 15.0 | C | 12.3 | B | 25.8 | D |
| 2021 Total | AM | 14.0 | B |  | 11.5 | B | 13.7 | B | 9.3 | A | 18.2 | C | 9.0 | A | 12.5 | B | 10.6 | B | 13.9 | B |
|  | PM | 34.9 | D |  | 18.1 | C | 19.7 | C | 11.3 | B | 89.8 | F | 10.9 | B | 16.2 | C | 13.1 | B | 41.8 | E |
| 2026 Total | AM | 15.0 | C |  | 12.2 | B | 14.7 | B | 9.6 | A | 20.4 | C | 9.2 | A | 13.2 | B | 11.1 | B | 15.0 | C |
|  | PM | 43.3 | E |  | 20.1 | C | 21.4 | C | 11.7 | B | 118.2 | F | 11.2 | B | 17.3 | C | 13.8 | B | 52.4 | F |
| Improvements |  | EBL |  | EBT | EBR |  | WBL |  | WBTR |  | NBL |  | NBTR |  | SBL |  | SBTR |  | INT |  |
| 2021 Total (All-Way Stop) | AM | 11.8 | B | 13.2 B | 12.8 | B | 11.4 | B | 15.2 | C | 15.3 | C | 12.7 | B | 10.9 | B | 17.5 | C | 14.6 | B |
|  | PM | 18.3 | C | 19.2 C | 22.2 | C | 14.0 | B | 23.3 | C | 33.0 | D | 23.2 | C | 13.6 | B | 25.1 | D | 23.8 | C |
| $\begin{gathered} 2026 \text { Total } \\ \text { (All-Way Stop) } \end{gathered}$ | AM | 12.2 | B | 13.9 B | 13.6 | B | 11.7 | B | 16.5 | C | 16.3 | C | 13.4 | B | 11.2 | B | 19.7 | C | 15.7 | C |
|  | PM | 20.5 | C | 21.8 C | 27.1 | D | 14.8 | B | 27.1 | D | 42.2 | E | 28.5 | D | 14.3 | B | 31.0 | D | 28.8 | D |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2026 \text { Total } \\ & \text { (Signal) } \end{aligned}$ | AM | 15.2 | B | 16.0 B | 4.1 | A | 23.4 | C | 26.4 | C | 11.1 | B | 9.1 | A | 20.2 | C | 22.6 | C | 15.9 | B |
|  | PM | 18.9 | B | 17.2 B | 3.8 | A | 27.9 | C | 34.9 | C | 16.1 | B | 11.4 | B | 26.2 | C | 31.1 | C | 18.5 | B |

2021 and 2026 Total (All Way Stop) Geometry assumed: EBL, EBT, EBR, WBL, WBTR, NBL, NBTR, SBL and SBTR

2026 Total (Signal) Geometry assumed: EBL, EBT, EBR, WBL, WBTR, NBL, NBTR, SBL and SBTR

Table 6: 5600 West / Main Street Intersection Analysis

| Unsignalized |  | EBL |  |  |  | WBL |  |  |  |  |  | NBL |  |  |  | SBL |  |  |  | INT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021 Existing | AM |  |  |  |  | 7.8 | A |  |  |  |  | 14.3 | B |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4 | A |
|  | PM |  |  |  |  | 8.5 | A |  |  |  |  | 20.9 | C |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4 | A |
| 2026 <br> Background | AM |  |  |  |  | 7.8 | A |  |  |  |  | 15.0 | C |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4 | A |
|  | PM |  |  |  |  | 8.6 | A |  |  |  |  | 22.9 | C |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4 | A |
| 2021 Total | AM | 8.8 | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  | 42.8 | E |  |  | 34.2 | D | 15.7 | C | 6.6 | A |
|  | PM | 10.3 | B |  |  | 8.8 | A |  |  |  |  | >150 | F |  |  | >150 | F | 15.0 | C | 19.7 | C |
| 2026 Total | AM | 8.9 | A |  |  | 7.9 | A |  |  |  |  | 48.9 | E |  |  | 38.2 | E | 16.5 | C | 6.9 | A |
|  | PM | 10.5 | B |  |  | 8.9 | A |  |  |  |  | >150 | F |  |  | >150 | F | 15.7 | C | 23.2 | C |
| Signal |  | EBL |  | EBTR |  | WBL |  | WBT |  | WBR |  | NBL |  | NBTR |  | SBL |  | SBTR |  | INT |  |
| 2021 Total | AM | 15.9 | B | 16.3 | B | 15.8 | B | 34.3 | C | 0.4 | A | 19.2 | B | 0.0 | A | 19.2 | B | 0.7 | A | 19.8 | B |
|  | PM | 22.4 | C | 15.1 | B | 16.0 | B | 35.5 | D | 7.0 | A | 25.6 | C | 0.0 | A | 25.8 | C | 0.7 | A | 20.2 | C |
| 2026 Total | AM | 15.0 | B | 15.5 | B | 14.8 | B | 33.3 | C | 0.4 | A | 20.5 | C | 0.0 | A | 20.4 | C | 0.7 | A | 19.5 | B |
|  | PM | 24.0 | C | 15.1 | B | 15.7 | B | 35.8 | D | 6.8 | A | 26.1 | C | 0.0 | A | 26.5 | C | 0.7 | A | 20.7 | C |

Table 7: 1150 East / Main Street Intersection Analysis

|  |  | EBL | WBL | NBL | SBL | INT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021 Existing | AM |  | 7.8 A | 14.2 B |  | 0.3 | A |
|  | PM |  | 8.5 A | 18.3 C |  | 0.3 | A |
| 2026 | AM |  | 7.9 A | 15.0 C |  | 0.3 | A |
| Background | PM |  | 8.6 A | 19.7 C |  | 0.4 | A |
| 2021 Total | AM | 8.3 A | 8.0 A | 20.3 C | 15.0 C | 2.4 | A |
| 2021 Total | PM | 8.9 A | 8.7 A | 36.3 E | 22.4 C | 2.7 | A |
| 2026 Total | AM | 8.4 A | 8.1 A | 22.1 C | 15.7 C | 2.4 | A |
| 2026 Total | PM | 9.0 A | 8.8 A | 41.8 E | 24.7 C | 2.7 | A |

Table 8: 1600 East / Access Z Intersection Analysis

|  |  | EBL |  | NBL |  | INT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021 Total | AM | 11.1 | B | 7.8 | A | 0.9 | A |
|  | PM | 12.4 | B | 7.8 | A | 0.7 | A |
| 2026 Total | AM | 11.4 | B | 7.8 | A | 0.8 | A |
|  | PM | 12.8 | B | 7.9 | A | 0.7 | A |

## B. Queue Analysis

Based on the projected traffic, queue storage length requirements can be evaluated to determine if sufficient storage space exists to accommodate the projected demand. The intersection and accesses included in this traffic study are analyzed for queue storage capacity utilizing the HCM analysis and are done through Synchro. Table 9 shows the projected queue at the study intersections in 2026.

Table 9: 2026 Queue Analysis

|  |  | EBL | EBR | WBL | WBR | NBL | SBL | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1600 East / <br> Main Street | Signal | 125 | 100 | 100 |  | 150 | 100 |  |
| All-Way Stop* <br> Main Street | 100 | 125 | 100 |  | 175 | 100 |  |  |
| 5600 West / <br> Main Street | Projected <br> Signal | 150 |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |
| 1600 East / <br> Access Z | Projected <br> Two Way Stop |  |  |  |  | 50 |  |  |

*Geometry assumed: EBL, EBT, EBR, WBL, WBTR, NBL, NBTR, SBL and SBTR

## C. Signal Warrant

Per the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) peak hour warrant on Page 441 Figure 4C-3, a Peak Hour Signal Warrant was performed for the existing intersection of Main Street / 1600 East and the proposed site access of 5600 West / Main Street. The sum of the approaches along Main Street was compared against the highest of northbound or southbound approaches. These volumes are shown in Table 10. The analysis was done for the 2021 existing condition, the 2021 with site opening and the 2026 future condition.

Table 10: Signal Warrant Volumes

|  | Existing | 2021 Site <br> Opening | 2026 <br> Future |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Main Street / 1600 East |  |  |  |
| Major Direction | E/W | E/W | E/W |
| Major | 631 | 769 | 813 |
| Minor | 401 | 480 | 508 |
| Warranted | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Major Direction | E/W | E/W | E/W |
| Major | 894 | 1416 | 1479 |
| Minor | 15 | 260 | 260 |
| Warranted | No | Yes | Yes |

The signal warrant is shown in Graph 1 and Graph 2. The signal at Main Street / 1600 East is currently warranted with the existing traffic. The signal at Main Street / 5600 West will be warranted with the addition of site traffic.

## Graph 1: Signal Warrant Main Street / 1600 East

Figure 4C-3. Warrant 3, Peak Hour


Graph 2: Signal Warrant Main Street / 5600 West

Figure 4C-3. Warrant 3, Peak Hour


## D. Access and Roadway Category

According to the UDOT, SR 13 (1600 East) and SR 102 (Main Street) are categorized as a Category 4 roadway. As per UDOT Administrative Rule R930-6, signal spacing is required at 2,640 feet, street spacing is required at 660 feet and access spacing is required at 500 feet or by variance. The distance between access points/intersections is measured from end of radius to end of adjacent radius. The site is proposing 3 accesses, one access (Access $Z$ ) is located along SR 13 approximately 580 feet south of 11600 North. There are several residential driveways within 500 feet of the access. Due to the location of the residential driveways and 11600 North along SR 13 the accesses must be approved through the variance process. The two accesses along SR 102 are planned to align with 1150 East and 5600 West. 1150 East is approximately 1780 feet west of 1600 East. 5600 West is located approximately 650 feet west of 1150 East. There are several residential driveways within 500 feet of the proposed roadways. Due to the location of the residential driveways along SR 102 the accesses must be approved through the variance process.

According to UDOT Administrative Rule R930-6 a Category 4 roadway requires:

- A left turn deceleration lane with taper and storage length is required for any access with a projected peak hour left ingress turning volume greater than 10 vehicles per hour. The taper length must be included in the required deceleration length.
- A right turn deceleration lane and taper length is required for any access with a projected peak hour right ingress turning volume greater than 25 vehicles per hour. The taper length must be included in the required deceleration length.
- A right turn acceleration lane and taper length is required for any access with a projected peak hour right turning volume greater than 50 vehicles per hour when the posted speed on the highway is greater than 40 mph . The taper length must be included in the required acceleration length. A right turn acceleration lane may also be required at a signalized intersection if a free-right turn is needed to maintain an appropriate level of service for the intersection.
- Right turn deceleration and acceleration lanes are generally not required on roadways with three or more travel lanes in the direction of the right turn.
- A left turn acceleration lane may be required if it will be a benefit to the safety and operation of the roadway.
- A left turn acceleration lane is generally not required where the posted speed is less than 45 mph , the intersection is signalized, or the acceleration lane would interfere with the left turn ingress movements to any other access.

The 5600 West / Main Street access requires EBL (150 foot minimum) and WBR (100 foot minimum) deceleration lanes.

The 1150 East / Main Street access requires EBL (50 foot minimum) and WBR (50 foot minimum) deceleration lanes and a SBR acceleration lane.

Access Z / 1600 East requires NBL (50 foot minimum) and SBR (50 foot minimum) deceleration lanes. This is a site related improvement.

## VIII. Conclusions

This analysis is for the proposed Rivers Edge residential development located to the north of Main Street ( 11200 North) and west of 1600 East in Tremonton, Utah. The site is planned to include 210 townhomes, 264 apartments, 369 single family residences and 70,000 sf of retail. It is projected to generate 557 AM, 898 PM peak hour trips and 9,596 daily trips. The site is planning 3 accesses to the site. One along 1600 East and two along Main Street that align with the existing streets of 5600 West and 1150 East.

The following comments are made about the project:

- 1600 East / Main Street operates with an overall LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. In 2026 without the site in LOS increases to LOS B in the AM and LOS D in the PM peak period. With the site in 2021 the intersection operates with LOS B in the AM and LOS E in the PM peak period with the NB direction at LOS F. In 2026 with the site the intersection operates with LOS C in the AM and LOS F in the PM peak period with the NB direction at LOS F. With growth in the area plus the addition of site traffic the intersection is operating near capacity and an improvement is recommended by 2026.
- 1600 East / Main Street was analyzed as an all-way stop with additional lanes in each direction or as a signal. Both of these options allow the intersection to operate at acceptable LOS. It is recommended that UDOT consider the options available at this location and plan this as a future (2026) improvement location.
- 1150 East / Main Street operates with critical NBLTR at LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. Without the site in 2026 the intersection operates with critical NBLTR at LOS C in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. With the addition of site traffic the NBLTR lane will operate at LOS E and the PM peak period and the site SBL traffic will operate at LOS C.
- 5600 West / Main Street operates with critical NBLTR at LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period. This is maintained in 2026 without the site. With the site traffic at this location the delay for the NBL and SBL declines to LOS F. A signal is recommended at this location when the site is $35 \%$ complete. With a signal at this location the intersection operates with overall LOS B in the AM and LOS C in the PM peak period.
- Access Z / 1600 North is projected to operate with critical EBL at LOS B in 2021 and 2026 in the AM and PM peak periods.
- Per UDOT standard, the 5600 West / Main Street access requires EBL (150 foot minimum) and WBR (100 foot minimum) deceleration lanes.
- Per UDOT standard, the 1150 East / Main Street access requires EBL ( 50 foot minimum) and WBR ( 50 foot minimum) deceleration lanes and a SBR acceleration lane.
- Per UDOT standard, Access Z / 1600 East requires NBL (50 foot minimum) and SBR (50 foot minimum) deceleration lanes. This is a site related improvement.
- All 3 site accesses must be approved through the UDOT variance process.


## Recommendations:

- Main Street / 1600 East (2026) - Improve intersection geometry to an all-way stop with separate left and through right turn lanes or signalize. Signal should be constructed with left and right turn storage lanes for all approaches. This is a future master planned signalized location. Site traffic increases traffic at this intersection by $18 \%$. This is a site related and non-site related improvement. It is recommended that UDOT investigate potential improvement options for this intersection.
- 5600 West / Main Street - Signalize intersection when $35 \%$ of the site is complete. Signal should be constructed with left and right turn storage lanes for all approaches. This is a future master planned signalized location. Site traffic increases traffic at this intersection by $40 \%$. This is a site related improvement.
- The 1150 East / Main Street access requires EBL (50 foot minimum) and WBR (50 foot minimum) deceleration lanes and a SBR acceleration lane. This is a site related improvement.
- Access Z / 1600 East requires NBL (50 foot minimum) and SBR (50 foot minimum) deceleration lanes. This is a site related improvement.


## APPENDICES
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## Appendix A Traffic Counts and Projections

AM PEAK HOUR VOLUMES







## TRIP GENERATION

| ITE 10th Ed | Trip Rate |  |  |  |  | Trips |  |  | In / Out \% |  |  |  | New |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Size | Land Use | AM | PM | Daily | AM | PM | Daily | AM IN | AM Out | PM IN | M OU | M | M Ou | P | M OU |
| Single Family | 369 | 210 | 0.74 | 0.99 | 9.44 | 273 | 365 | 3483 | 25\% | 75\% | 63\% | 37\% | 68 | 205 | 230 | 135 |
| Town Homes | 210 | 220 | 0.46 | 0.56 | 7.32 | 97 | 118 | 1537 | 23\% | 77\% | 63\% | 37\% | 22 | 75 | 74 | 44 |
| Apartments | 264 | 220 | 0.46 | 0.56 | 7.32 | 121 | 148 | 1932 | 23\% | 77\% | 63\% | 37\% | 28 | 93 | 93 | 55 |
| Retail | 70.000 | 820 | 0.94 | 3.81 | 37.75 | 66 | 267 | 2643 | 62\% | 38\% | 48\% | 52\% | 41 | 25 | 128 | 139 |
|  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 557 | 897 | 9596 |  |  |  |  | 159 | 398 | 525 | 373 |

## Long Term Growth

| $\mathbf{1 . 4 0 \%}$ | Growth Factor | Years | Analysis Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.00 | 0 | 2021 |  |
| 1.07 | 5 | 2026 |  |
|  | 1.30 | 19 | 2040 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Straight line growth assumed between 2016 and 2040 |  |  |  |

Straight line growth assumed between 2016 and 2040


| 2040 | 8,600 | UDOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| growth | 10,500 | WFR |
|  | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6 \%}$ |  |


| 2019 | 90.48 | 8600 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2020 | 90.48 | 8690 | $1.05 \%$ |
| 2021 | 90.48 | 8781 | $1.04 \%$ |
| 2022 | 90.48 | 8871 | $1.03 \%$ |
| 2023 | 90.48 | 8962 | $1.02 \%$ |
| 2024 | 90.48 | 9052 | $1.01 \%$ |
| 2025 | 90.48 | 9143 | $1.00 \%$ |
| 2026 | 90.48 | 9233 | $0.99 \%$ |
| 2027 | 90.48 | 9324 | $0.98 \%$ |
| 2028 | 90.48 | 9414 | $0.97 \%$ |
| 2029 | 90.48 | 9505 | $0.96 \%$ |
| 2030 | 90.48 | 9595 | $0.95 \%$ |
| 2031 | 90.48 | 9686 | $0.94 \%$ |
| 2032 | 90.48 | 9776 | $0.93 \%$ |
| 2033 | 90.48 | 9867 | $0.93 \%$ |
| 2034 | 90.48 | 9957 | $0.92 \%$ |
| 2035 | 90.48 | 10048 | $0.91 \%$ |
| 2036 | 90.48 | 10138 | $0.90 \%$ |
| 2037 | 90.48 | 10229 | $0.89 \%$ |
| 2038 | 90.48 | 10319 | $0.88 \%$ |
| 2039 | 90.48 | 10410 | $0.88 \%$ |
| 2040 | 90.48 | 10500 | $0.87 \%$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6 \%}$ |
|  |  |  |  |



| 11200 North / 5600 West |  |  |  | 1.07 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2021 | Site | 2021 | 2026 | 2026 |
| AM | Existing | Traffic | Total | Growth | Total |
| EBL |  | 83 | 83 | 0 | 83 |
| EBT | 226 | 28 | 254 | 242 | 270 |
| EBR | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| WBL | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| WBT | 332 | 70 | 402 | 355 | 425 |
| WBR |  | 26 | 26 | 0 | 26 |
| NBL | 12 |  | 12 | 13 | 13 |
| NBT |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NBR | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| SBL |  | 68 | 68 | 0 | 68 |
| SBT |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SBR |  | 208 | 208 | 0 | 208 |
| East | 565 | 192 | 757 | 605 | 797 |
| West | 571 | 389 | 960 | 611 | 1000 |
| North | 0 | 385 | 385 | 0 | 385 |
| South | 20 | 0 | 20 | 21 | 21 |
|  | 2021 | Site | 2021 | 2026 | 2026 |
| PM | Existing | Traffic | Total | Growth | Total |
| EBL |  | 275 | 275 | 0 | 275 |
| EBT | 484 | 92 | 576 | 518 | 610 |
| EBR | 12 |  | 12 | 13 | 13 |
| WBL | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| WBT | 395 | 65 | 460 | 423 | 488 |
| WBR |  | 90 | 90 | 0 | 90 |
| NBL | 14 |  | 14 | 15 | 15 |
| NBT |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NBR | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| SBL |  | 64 | 64 | 0 | 64 |
| SBT |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SBR |  | 196 | 196 | 0 | 196 |
| East | 883 | 311 | 1194 | 945 | 1256 |
| West | 905 | 628 | 1533 | 968 | 1596 |
| North | 0 | 625 | 625 | 0 | 625 |
| South | 30 | 0 | 30 | 32 | 32 |


|  |  | Access Z / 1600 East |  | 1.07 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2021 | Site | 2021 | 2026 | 2026 |  |
|  | AM | Existing | Traffic | Total | Growth | Total |  |
|  | EBL |  | 20 | 20 | 0 | 20 |  |
|  | EBT |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | EBR |  | 9 | 9 | 0 | 9 |  |
|  | WBL |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | WBT |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | WBR |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | NBL |  | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 |  |
|  | NBT | 152 |  | 152 | 163 | 163 |  |
|  | NBR |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | SBL |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | SBT | 210 |  | 210 | 225 | 225 |  |
|  | SBR |  | 8 | 8 | 0 | 8 |  |
| 83.56\% | East | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11.33\% |
|  | West | 0 | 41 | 41 | 0 | 41 |  |
|  | North | 362 | 28 | 390 | 387 | 415 |  |
|  | South | 362 | 13 | 375 | 387 | 400 |  |
|  |  | 2021 | Site | 2021 | 2026 | 2026 |  |
|  | PM | Existing | Traffic | Total | Growth | Total |  |
|  | EBL |  | 19 | 19 | 0 | 19 |  |
|  | EBT |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | EBR |  | 8 | 8 | 0 | 8 |  |
|  | WBL |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | WBT |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | WBR |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | NBL |  | 12 | 12 | 0 | 12 |  |
|  | NBT | 324 |  | 324 | 347 | 347 |  |
|  | NBR |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | SBL |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | SBT | 222 |  | 222 | 238 | 238 |  |
|  | SBR |  | 26 | 26 | 0 | 26 | 11.90\% |
| 86.03\% | East | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | West | 0 | 65 | 65 | 0 | 65 |  |
|  | North | 546 | 45 | 591 | 584 | 629 |  |
|  | South | 546 | 20 | 566 | 584 | 604 |  |

ArcGIS $\nabla$ UDOT Access Category Identification Map



Traffic Impact Study
Appendix B Without Site Intersection Analyses

| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay，s／veh | 11.9 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\hat{*}$ | 「＇ |  | $\uparrow$ | 「＇ |  | $\uparrow$ | 「＇ |  | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 48 | 79 | 102 | 14 | 118 | 15 | 116 | 89 | 12 | 5 | 108 | 97 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 48 | 79 | 102 | 14 | 118 | 15 | 116 | 89 | 12 | 5 | 108 | 97 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 58 | 95 | 123 | 17 | 142 | 18 | 140 | 107 | 14 | 6 | 130 | 117 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 11 |  |  | 11.8 |  |  | 14.3 |  |  | 10.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left，\％ | $57 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru，$\%$ | $43 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right，\％ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 205 | 12 | 127 | 102 | 132 | 15 | 113 | 97 |
| LT Vol | 116 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 89 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 118 | 0 | 108 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 12 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 97 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 247 | 14 | 153 | 123 | 159 | 18 | 136 | 117 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util（X） | 0.45 | 0.022 | 0.28 | 0.194 | 0.291 | 0.029 | 0.241 | 0.183 |
| Departure Headway（Hd） | 6.562 | 5.565 | 6.576 | 5.673 | 6.585 | 5.819 | 6.363 | 5.629 |
| Convergence，Y／N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 548 | 640 | 545 | 629 | 544 | 612 | 562 | 635 |
| Service Time | 4.324 | 3.326 | 4.339 | 3.436 | 4.353 | 3.586 | 4.126 | 3.392 |
| HCM Lane V／C Ratio | 0.451 | 0.022 | 0.281 | 0.196 | 0.292 | 0.029 | 0.242 | 0.184 |
| HCM Control Delay | 14.6 | 8.5 | 11.9 | 9.8 | 12.1 | 8.8 | 11.2 | 9.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | A |
| HCM 95th－tile Q | 2.3 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.7 |






| Intersection |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 21 |
| Intersection LOS | C |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F' |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 143 | 139 | 196 | 25 | 107 | 21 | 188 | 160 | 53 | 19 | 107 | 96 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 143 | 139 | 196 | 25 | 107 | 21 | 188 | 160 | 53 | 19 | 107 | 96 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 155 | 151 | 213 | 27 | 116 | 23 | 204 | 174 | 58 | 21 | 116 | 104 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 19 |  |  | 14.1 |  |  | 30.4 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vol Left, \% | 54\% | 0\% | 51\% | 0\% | 19\% | 0\% | 15\% | 0\% |
| Vol Thru, \% | 46\% | 0\% | 49\% | 0\% | 81\% | 0\% | 85\% | 0\% |
| Vol Right, \% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 348 | 53 | 282 | 196 | 132 | 21 | 126 | 96 |
| LT Vol | 188 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 160 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 107 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 53 | 0 | 196 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 96 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 378 | 58 | 307 | 213 | 143 | 23 | 137 | 104 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.792 | 0.105 | 0.641 | 0.388 | 0.322 | 0.046 | 0.298 | 0.204 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.535 | 6.542 | 7.53 | 6.553 | 8.068 | 7.247 | 7.827 | 7.028 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 480 | 547 | 478 | 548 | 445 | 492 | 459 | 509 |
| Service Time | 5.289 | 4.295 | 5.287 | 4.31 | 5.838 | 5.016 | 5.593 | 4.793 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.787 | 0.106 | 0.642 | 0.389 | 0.321 | 0.047 | 0.298 | 0.204 |
| HCM Control Delay | 33.5 | 10.1 | 22.9 | 13.4 | 14.7 | 10.4 | 13.9 | 11.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | D | B | C | B | B | B | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 7.2 | 0.3 | 4.4 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.8 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | 7 | $\hat{1}$ |  | \% | $\hat{F}$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 474 | 11 | 3 | 388 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 474 | 11 | 3 | 388 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - |  | None |  |
| Storage Length | 100 | - | - | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 515 | 12 | 3 | 422 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |





| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh 12.6 |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F' |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 48 | 79 | 102 | 14 | 118 | 15 | 116 | 89 | 12 | 5 | 108 | 97 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 48 | 79 | 102 | 14 | 118 | 15 | 116 | 89 | 12 | 5 | 108 | 97 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 62 | 102 | 131 | 18 | 152 | 19 | 150 | 115 | 15 | 6 | 139 | 125 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 11.5 |  |  | 12.4 |  |  | 15.6 |  |  | 11 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $57 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $43 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 205 | 12 | 127 | 102 | 132 | 15 | 113 | 97 |
| LT Vol | 116 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 89 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 118 | 0 | 108 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 12 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 97 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 264 | 15 | 164 | 131 | 170 | 19 | 146 | 125 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.494 | 0.025 | 0.307 | 0.214 | 0.32 | 0.032 | 0.265 | 0.202 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.727 | 5.728 | 6.752 | 5.848 | 6.775 | 6.007 | 6.54 | 5.805 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 534 | 621 | 529 | 610 | 528 | 591 | 546 | 614 |
| Service Time | 4.503 | 3.503 | 4.531 | 3.625 | 4.56 | 3.792 | 4.319 | 3.583 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.494 | 0.024 | 0.31 | 0.215 | 0.322 | 0.032 | 0.267 | 0.204 |
| HCM Control Delay | 16 | 8.7 | 12.5 | 10.2 | 12.8 | 9 | 11.7 | 10.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | A | B | B | B | A | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.7 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.8 |






| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 25.8 |
| Intersection LOS | D |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 143 | 139 | 196 | 25 | 107 | 21 | 188 | 160 | 53 | 19 | 107 | 96 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 143 | 139 | 196 | 25 | 107 | 21 | 188 | 160 | 53 | 19 | 107 | 96 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 166 | 162 | 228 | 29 | 124 | 24 | 219 | 186 | 62 | 22 | 124 | 112 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 22.5 |  |  | 15.2 |  |  | 40.4 |  |  | 13.8 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $54 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Tru, \% | $46 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 348 | 53 | 282 | 196 | 132 | 21 | 126 | 96 |
| LT Vol | 188 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 160 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 107 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 53 | 0 | 196 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 96 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 405 | 62 | 328 | 228 | 154 | 24 | 147 | 112 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.876 | 0.116 | 0.712 | 0.433 | 0.359 | 0.052 | 0.332 | 0.228 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.795 | 6.8 | 7.813 | 6.834 | 8.419 | 7.595 | 8.154 | 7.352 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 465 | 525 | 462 | 524 | 425 | 469 | 440 | 486 |
| Service Time | 5.562 | 4.566 | 5.58 | 4.6 | 6.201 | 5.377 | 5.934 | 5.132 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.871 | 0.118 | 0.71 | 0.435 | 0.362 | 0.051 | 0.334 | 0.23 |
| HCM Control Delay | 44.9 | 10.5 | 27.8 | 14.8 | 15.9 | 10.8 | 15 | 12.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | E | B | D | B | C | B | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 9.2 | 0.4 | 5.5 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.9 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | 7 | $\hat{1}$ |  | \% | $\hat{F}$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 474 | 11 | , | 388 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 474 | 11 | 3 | 388 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - |  | None |  |
| Storage Length | 100 | - | - | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 551 | 13 | 3 | 451 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |





Traffic Impact Study
Appendix C With Site Intersection Analyses

| Intersection |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 13.9 |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 48 | 119 | 153 | 14 | 134 | 15 | 136 | 93 | 12 | 5 | 117 | 97 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 48 | 119 | 153 | 14 | 134 | 15 | 136 | 93 | 12 | 5 | 117 | 97 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 58 | 143 | 184 | 17 | 161 | 18 | 164 | 112 | 14 | 6 | 141 | 117 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.8 |  |  | 13.3 |  |  | 17.7 |  |  | 11.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $59 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $41 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 229 | 12 | 167 | 153 | 148 | 15 | 122 | 97 |
| LT Vol | 136 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 93 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 134 | 0 | 117 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 12 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 97 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 276 | 14 | 201 | 184 | 178 | 18 | 147 | 117 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.548 | 0.025 | 0.388 | 0.311 | 0.353 | 0.032 | 0.285 | 0.203 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.153 | 6.136 | 6.943 | 6.082 | 7.132 | 6.367 | 6.984 | 6.247 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 505 | 585 | 521 | 594 | 505 | 562 | 514 | 574 |
| Service Time | 4.872 | 3.855 | 4.661 | 3.8 | 4.877 | 4.112 | 4.726 | 3.99 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.547 | 0.024 | 0.386 | 0.31 | 0.352 | 0.032 | 0.286 | 0.204 |
| HCM Control Delay | 18.2 | 9 | 14 | 11.5 | 13.7 | 9.3 | 12.5 | 10.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | A | B | B | B | A | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 3.3 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.8 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | $\dagger$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「' |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 28 | 295 | 2 | 4 | 353 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 0 | 70 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 28 | 295 | 2 | 4 | 353 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 0 | 70 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | 100 | - | - | 100 | - | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 34 | 355 | 2 | 5 | 425 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 0 | 84 |





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



| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 41.8 |
| Intersection LOS | E |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 143 | 176 | 244 | 25 | 160 | 21 | 255 | 172 | 53 | 19 | 115 | 96 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 143 | 176 | 244 | 25 | 160 | 21 | 255 | 172 | 53 | 19 | 115 | 96 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 155 | 191 | 265 | 27 | 174 | 23 | 277 | 187 | 58 | 21 | 125 | 104 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 27.6 |  |  | 18.8 |  |  | 81.1 |  |  | 14.9 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | D |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $60 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $40 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 427 | 53 | 319 | 244 | 185 | 21 | 134 | 96 |
| LT Vol | 255 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 172 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 115 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 53 | 0 | 244 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 96 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 464 | 58 | 347 | 265 | 201 | 23 | 146 | 104 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 1.064 | 0.116 | 0.779 | 0.526 | 0.482 | 0.05 | 0.346 | 0.225 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.254 | 7.225 | 8.392 | 7.437 | 8.969 | 8.169 | 8.886 | 8.083 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 441 | 499 | 433 | 488 | 404 | 441 | 408 | 447 |
| Service Time | 5.954 | 4.925 | 6.092 | 5.137 | 6.669 | 5.869 | 6.586 | 5.783 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 1.052 | 0.116 | 0.801 | 0.543 | 0.498 | 0.052 | 0.358 | 0.233 |
| HCM Control Delay | 89.8 | 10.9 | 34.9 | 18.1 | 19.7 | 11.3 | 16.2 | 13.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | B | D | C | C | B | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 15.1 | 0.4 | 6.7 | 3 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.9 |






| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{r}$ |  | 1 | 4 | 个 | $\mathbf{F}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 19 | 8 | 12 | 324 | 222 | 26 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 19 | 8 | 12 | 324 | 222 | 26 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | 100 | - | - | 100 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 21 | 9 | 13 | 352 | 241 | 28 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | ajor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 619 | 241 | 269 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 241 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 378 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 452 | 798 | 1295 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 799 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 693 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 447 | 798 | 1295 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 447 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 791 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 693 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 12.4 |  | 0.3 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBL | NBT EBLn1 |  | SBT | SBR |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1295 | - | 514 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.01 | - | 0.057 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.8 | - | 12.4 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | - | 0.2 | - | - |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 15 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F' |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 51 | 125 | 160 | 15 | 142 | 16 | 144 | 99 | 13 | 5 | 125 | 104 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 51 | 125 | 160 | 15 | 142 | 16 | 144 | 99 | 13 | 5 | 125 | 104 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 61 | 151 | 193 | 18 | 171 | 19 | 173 | 119 | 16 | 6 | 151 | 125 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 13.7 |  |  | 14.2 |  |  | 19.8 |  |  | 12.3 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $59 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $41 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 243 | 13 | 176 | 160 | 157 | 16 | 130 | 104 |
| LT Vol | 144 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 99 | 0 | 125 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 125 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 13 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 104 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 293 | 16 | 212 | 193 | 189 | 19 | 157 | 125 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.596 | 0.027 | 0.42 | 0.336 | 0.387 | 0.035 | 0.313 | 0.225 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.328 | 6.31 | 7.133 | 6.27 | 7.36 | 6.594 | 7.195 | 6.458 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 492 | 567 | 505 | 573 | 488 | 542 | 500 | 555 |
| Service Time | 5.072 | 4.054 | 4.877 | 4.014 | 5.111 | 4.344 | 4.942 | 4.204 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.596 | 0.028 | 0.42 | 0.337 | 0.387 | 0.035 | 0.314 | 0.225 |
| HCM Control Delay | 20.4 | 9.2 | 15 | 12.2 | 14.7 | 9.6 | 13.2 | 11.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | A | B | B | B | A | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 3.8 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 0.9 |








| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay，s／veh | 52.4 |
| Intersection LOS | F |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 153 | 186 | 258 | 27 | 167 | 22 | 268 | 183 | 57 | 20 | 122 | 103 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 153 | 186 | 258 | 27 | 167 | 22 | 268 | 183 | 57 | 20 | 122 | 103 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 166 | 202 | 280 | 29 | 182 | 24 | 291 | 199 | 62 | 22 | 133 | 112 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 33.3 |  |  | 20.4 |  |  | 106.2 |  |  | 15.8 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | D |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left，\％ | $59 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thu，\％ | $41 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right，\％ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 451 | 57 | 339 | 258 | 194 | 22 | 142 | 103 |
| LT Vol | 268 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 183 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 167 | 0 | 122 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 57 | 0 | 258 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 103 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 490 | 62 | 368 | 280 | 211 | 24 | 154 | 112 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util（X） | 1.147 | 0.127 | 0.842 | 0.569 | 0.514 | 0.053 | 0.375 | 0.248 |
| Departure Headway（Hd） | 8.424 | 7.395 | 8.667 | 7.707 | 9.283 | 8.478 | 9.176 | 8.37 |
| Convergence，Y／N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 431 | 485 | 420 | 471 | 390 | 425 | 395 | 432 |
| Service Time | 6.165 | 5.135 | 6.367 | 5.407 | 6.983 | 6.178 | 6.876 | 6.07 |
| HCM Lane V／C Ratio | 1.137 | 0.128 | 0.876 | 0.594 | 0.541 | 0.056 | 0.39 | 0.259 |
| HCM Control Delay | 118.2 | 11.2 | 43.3 | 20.1 | 21.4 | 11.7 | 17.3 | 13.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | B | E | C | C | B | C | B |
| HCM 95th－tile Q | 18 | 0.4 | 8.1 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 1 |








Traffic Impact Study
Appendix D With Site and With Improvements Intersection Analyses

| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 14.6 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | * | $\uparrow$ | 「 | * | 个 |  | * | ¢ |  | \% | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 48 | 119 | 153 | 14 | 134 | 15 | 139 | 93 | 12 | 5 | 117 | 97 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 48 | 119 | 153 | 14 | 134 | 15 | 139 | 93 | 12 | 5 | 117 | 97 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 58 | 143 | 184 | 17 | 161 | 18 | 167 | 112 | 14 | 6 | 141 | 117 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.8 |  |  | 14.9 |  |  | 14.2 |  |  | 17.3 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $0 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 139 | 105 | 48 | 119 | 153 | 14 | 149 | 5 | 214 |
| LT Vol | 139 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 93 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 134 | 0 | 117 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 97 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 167 | 127 | 58 | 143 | 184 | 17 | 180 | 6 | 258 |
| Geometry Grp | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.37 | 0.259 | 0.126 | 0.293 | 0.34 | 0.039 | 0.384 | 0.013 | 0.516 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.952 | 7.362 | 7.866 | 7.356 | 6.641 | 8.294 | 7.708 | 8.039 | 7.207 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 452 | 487 | 455 | 487 | 540 | 431 | 467 | 445 | 500 |
| Service Time | 5.709 | 5.119 | 5.623 | 5.112 | 4.397 | 6.058 | 5.472 | 5.796 | 4.964 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.369 | 0.261 | 0.127 | 0.294 | 0.341 | 0.039 | 0.385 | 0.013 | 0.516 |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.3 | 12.7 | 11.8 | 13.2 | 12.8 | 11.4 | 15.2 | 10.9 | 17.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | B | B | B | B | C | B | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.7 | 1 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0 | 2.9 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh $\quad 23.8$ |  |
| Intersection LOS | C |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 4 | 「 | 7 | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 143 | 176 | 244 | 25 | 160 | 21 | 255 | 172 | 53 | 19 | 115 | 96 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 143 | 176 | 244 | 25 | 160 | 21 | 255 | 172 | 53 | 19 | 115 | 96 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 155 | 191 | 265 | 27 | 174 | 23 | 277 | 187 | 58 | 21 | 125 | 104 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 20.3 |  |  | 22.2 |  |  | 28.4 |  |  | 24.2 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $0 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 255 | 225 | 143 | 176 | 244 | 25 | 181 | 19 | 211 |
| LT Vol | 255 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 172 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 115 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 96 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 277 | 245 | 155 | 191 | 265 | 27 | 197 | 21 | 229 |
| Geometry Grp | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.721 | 0.589 | 0.403 | 0.468 | 0.596 | 0.078 | 0.534 | 0.059 | 0.596 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 9.36 | 8.676 | 9.33 | 8.813 | 8.09 | 10.372 | 9.765 | 10.205 | 9.358 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 385 | 416 | 385 | 407 | 446 | 345 | 368 | 350 | 385 |
| Service Time | 7.13 | 6.447 | 7.099 | 6.582 | 5.557 | 8.156 | 7.549 | 7.986 | 7.139 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.719 | 0.589 | 0.403 | 0.469 | 0.594 | 0.078 | 0.535 | 0.06 | 0.595 |
| HCM Control Delay | 33 | 23.2 | 18.3 | 19.2 | 22.2 | 14 | 23.3 | 13.6 | 25.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | D | $C$ | $C$ | $C$ | $C$ | $B$ | $C$ | $B$ | D |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 5.5 | 3.7 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 3.8 | 0.3 | 3 | 0.2 | 3.7 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 15.7 |
| Intersection LOS | C |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | 7 | $\hat{F}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 51 | 125 | 160 | 15 | 142 | 16 | 144 | 99 | 13 | 5 | 125 | 104 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 51 | 125 | 160 | 15 | 142 | 16 | 144 | 99 | 13 | 5 | 125 | 104 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 61 | 151 | 193 | 18 | 171 | 19 | 173 | 119 | 16 | 6 | 151 | 125 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 13.5 |  |  | 16.1 |  |  | 15 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $0 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 144 | 112 | 51 | 125 | 160 | 15 | 158 | 5 | 229 |
| LT Vol | 144 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 99 | 0 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 125 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 104 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 173 | 135 | 61 | 151 | 193 | 18 | 190 | 6 | 276 |
| Geometry Grp | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.395 | 0.285 | 0.138 | 0.318 | 0.368 | 0.043 | 0.421 | 0.014 | 0.57 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.2 | 7.608 | 8.108 | 7.596 | 6.879 | 8.556 | 7.969 | 8.268 | 7.434 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 437 | 471 | 441 | 471 | 520 | 417 | 449 | 432 | 483 |
| Service Time | 5.974 | 5.381 | 5.879 | 5.366 | 4.649 | 6.337 | 5.749 | 6.04 | 5.206 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.396 | 0.287 | 0.138 | 0.321 | 0.371 | 0.043 | 0.423 | 0.014 | 0.571 |
| HCM Control Delay | 16.3 | 13.4 | 12.2 | 13.9 | 13.6 | 11.7 | 16.5 | 11.2 | 19.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | B | $B$ | $B$ | $B$ | $C$ | B | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.9 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 0 | 3.5 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 28.8 |
| Intersection LOS | D |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | F | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | \% | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 153 | 186 | 258 | 27 | 167 | 22 | 268 | 183 | 57 | 20 | 122 | 103 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 153 | 186 | 258 | 27 | 167 | 22 | 268 | 183 | 57 | 20 | 122 | 103 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 166 | 202 | 280 | 29 | 182 | 24 | 291 | 199 | 62 | 22 | 133 | 112 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 23.8 |  |  | 25.6 |  |  | 35.7 |  |  | 29.6 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $0 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $54 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 268 | 240 | 153 | 186 | 258 | 27 | 189 | 20 | 225 |
| LT Vol | 268 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 183 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 167 | 0 | 122 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 258 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 103 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 291 | 261 | 166 | 202 | 280 | 29 | 205 | 22 | 245 |
| Geometry Grp | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.799 | 0.666 | 0.454 | 0.523 | 0.669 | 0.089 | 0.591 | 0.065 | 0.674 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 9.88 | 9.192 | 9.838 | 9.319 | 8.592 | 10.975 | 10.365 | 10.77 | 9.919 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 367 | 394 | 368 | 388 | 423 | 327 | 349 | 333 | 364 |
| Service Time | 7.6 | 6.912 | 7.557 | 7.038 | 6.311 | 8.734 | 8.124 | 8.526 | 7.674 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.793 | 0.662 | 0.451 | 0.521 | 0.662 | 0.089 | 0.587 | 0.066 | 0.673 |
| HCM Control Delay | 42.2 | 28.5 | 20.5 | 21.8 | 27.1 | 14.8 | 27.1 | 14.3 | 31 |
| HCM Lane LOS | E | D | C | C | D | B | D | B | D |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 6.8 | 4.7 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 4.8 | 0.3 | 3.6 | 0.2 | 4.7 |

Timings
1: 1600 East \& 11200 North

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ | * | $\hat{}$ | * | $\hat{\beta}$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 51 | 125 | 160 | 15 | 142 | 144 | 99 | 5 | 125 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 51 | 125 | 160 | 15 | 142 | 144 | 99 | 5 | 125 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | pm+pt | NA | Perm | NA |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  |  | 8 | 5 | 2 |  | 6 |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  | 2 |  | 6 |  |
| Detector Phase | 7 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 9.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 9.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Total Split (s) | 12.0 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 27.0 | 27.0 | 17.0 | 51.0 | 34.0 | 34.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 13.3\% | 43.3\% | 43.3\% | 30.0\% | 30.0\% | 18.9\% | 56.7\% | 37.8\% | 37.8\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  |  | Lag | Lag | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | Min | Min | Min |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 18.1 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 25.8 | 25.8 | 14.3 | 14.3 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.15 | 0.25 | 0.30 | 0.06 | 0.46 | 0.32 | 0.16 | 0.02 | 0.56 |
| Control Delay | 15.2 | 16.0 | 4.1 | 23.4 | 26.4 | 11.1 | 9.1 | 20.2 | 22.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 15.2 | 16.0 | 4.1 | 23.4 | 26.4 | 11.1 | 9.1 | 20.2 | 22.6 |
| LOS | B | B | A | C | C | B | A | C | C |
| Approach Delay |  | 10.2 |  |  | 26.1 |  | 10.3 |  | 22.6 |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  | B |  | C |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 54.7
Natural Cycle: 65
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.56
Intersection Signal Delay: 15.9
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 48.5\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 1: 1600 East \& 11200 North


Timings
1: 1600 East \& 11200 North

|  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | * | $\uparrow$ | 「 | * | F | * | F | ${ }^{7}$ | ¢ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 153 | 186 | 258 | 27 | 167 | 268 | 183 | 20 | 122 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 153 | 186 | 258 | 27 | 167 | 268 | 183 | 20 | 122 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | pm+pt | NA | Perm | NA |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  |  | 8 | 5 | 2 |  | 6 |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  | 2 |  | 6 |  |
| Detector Phase | 7 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 9.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 9.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Total Split (s) | 15.0 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 22.0 | 51.0 | 29.0 | 29.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 16.7\% | 43.3\% | 43.3\% | 26.7\% | 26.7\% | 24.4\% | 56.7\% | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  |  | Lag | Lag | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | Min | Min | Min |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 27.2 | 27.2 | 27.2 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 33.2 | 33.2 | 13.5 | 13.5 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.40 | 0.28 | 0.36 | 0.13 | 0.60 | 0.55 | 0.30 | 0.10 | 0.66 |
| Control Delay | 18.9 | 17.2 | 3.8 | 27.9 | 34.9 | 16.1 | 11.4 | 26.2 | 31.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 18.9 | 17.2 | 3.8 | 27.9 | 34.9 | 16.1 | 11.4 | 26.2 | 31.1 |
| LOS | B | B | A | C | C | B | B | C | C |
| Approach Delay |  | 11.8 |  |  | 34.1 |  | 13.9 |  | 30.7 |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  | B |  | C |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 69.7
Natural Cycle: 65
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.66
Intersection Signal Delay: 18.5
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 61.2\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 1: 1600 East \& 11200 North


|  | $\rangle$ |  | 1 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | * | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F | 7 | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 83 | 254 | 4 | 402 | 26 | 12 | 0 | 68 | 0 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 83 | 254 | 4 | 402 | 26 | 12 | 0 | 68 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | Perm | NA |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  | 6 |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 8 |  | 8 | 2 |  | 6 |  |
| Detector Phase | 7 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 9.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Total Split (s) | 12.0 | 62.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 13.3\% | 68.9\% | 55.6\% | 55.6\% | 55.6\% | 31.1\% | 31.1\% | 31.1\% | 31.1\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  | Lag | Lag | Lag |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 40.1 | 40.1 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 40.9 | 40.9 | 40.9 | 40.9 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.01 | 0.77 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.26 |
| Control Delay | 15.9 | 16.3 | 15.8 | 34.3 | 0.4 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 19.2 | 0.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 15.9 | 16.3 | 15.8 | 34.3 | 0.4 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 19.2 | 0.7 |
| LOS | B | B | B | C | A | B | A | B | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 16.2 |  | 32.1 |  |  | 15.0 |  | 5.2 |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  | C |  |  | B |  | A |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.77
Intersection Signal Delay: $19.8 \quad$ Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 49.9\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 3: 5600 West \& 11200 North



|  | 4 |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | , | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\hat{1}$ | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | * | ¢ | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 83 | 270 | , | 425 | 26 | 13 | 0 | 68 | 0 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 83 | 270 | 4 | 425 | 26 | 13 | 0 | 68 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | Perm | NA |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  | 6 |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 8 |  | 8 | 2 |  | 6 |  |
| Detector Phase | 7 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 9.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Total Split (s) | 12.0 | 62.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 13.3\% | 68.9\% | 55.6\% | 55.6\% | 55.6\% | 31.1\% | 31.1\% | 31.1\% | 31.1\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  | Lag | Lag | Lag |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 41.7 | 41.7 | 32.1 | 32.1 | 32.1 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 39.3 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.44 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.01 | 0.77 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.27 |
| Control Delay | 15.0 | 15.5 | 14.8 | 33.3 | 0.4 | 20.5 | 0.0 | 20.4 | 0.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 15.0 | 15.5 | 14.8 | 33.3 | 0.4 | 20.5 | 0.0 | 20.4 | 0.7 |
| LOS | B | B | B | C | A | C | A | C | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 15.4 |  | 31.2 |  |  | 16.4 |  | 5.6 |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  | C |  |  | B |  | A |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.77
Intersection Signal Delay: $19.5 \quad$ Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 51.1\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 3: 5600 West \& 11200 North


|  | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |  |  | 4 | 4 | , | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | * | $\hat{\beta}$ | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | * | ¢ | * | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 275 | 610 | 3 | 488 | 90 | 15 | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 275 | 610 | 3 | 488 | 90 | 15 | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | Perm | NA |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  | 6 |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 8 |  | 8 | 2 |  | 6 |  |
| Detector Phase | 7 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 9.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Total Split (s) | 21.0 | 65.0 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 23.3\% | 72.2\% | 48.9\% | 48.9\% | 48.9\% | 27.8\% | 27.8\% | 27.8\% | 27.8\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  | Lag | Lag | Lag |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 51.5 | 51.5 | 31.8 | 31.8 | 31.8 | 29.5 | 29.5 | 29.5 | 29.5 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.72 | 0.64 | 0.01 | 0.81 | 0.16 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.25 |
| Control Delay | 24.0 | 15.1 | 15.7 | 35.8 | 6.8 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 26.5 | 0.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 24.0 | 15.1 | 15.7 | 35.8 | 6.8 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 26.5 | 0.7 |
| LOS | C | B | B | D | A | C | A | C | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 17.8 |  | 31.2 |  |  | 24.5 |  | 7.1 |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  | C |  |  | C |  | A |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 65
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.81

Intersection Signal Delay: 20.7
Intersection Capacity Utilization 64.6\%
Analysis Period (min) 15

Intersection LOS: C
ICU Level of Service C

Splits and Phases: 3: 5600 West \& 11200 North


State of Utah
Department of Transportation

| Cooperative Agreement <br> Phased Development <br> Improvements | Development Name <br> Rivers Edge - Phase 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Application ID | Contract \# | Tracking \# | Date Executed |
| 115166 |  |  |  |

This AGREEMENT, made and entered into on the executed date, by and between the UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORATION, hereinafter referred to as "UDOT", Tremonton City , hereinafter referred to as "LOCAL GOVERNMENT", and __ Rivers Edge Real Holdings, LLC , hereinafter referred to as the "DEVELOPER".

## RECITALS

WHEREAS, UDOT owns state highway right-of-way for State Route $\qquad$ ; and

WHEREAS, the parties desire to enter into an agreement to establish the scope and schedule of when all improvements will be required within the state route; and

WHEREAS, UDOT is willing to permit the installation of an access within $\qquad$ SR-102 at 950 East (public street) ; and

WHEREAS, the DEVELOPER is required to construct traffic mitigation described herein; and
WHEREAS, this Agreement is made to set forth the terms and conditions for the installation of these mitigation improvements within UDOT's right-of-way.

## AGREEMENT

NOW THEREFORE, it is agreed by and between the parties as follows:
I. Access for the DEVELOPER's site in the UDOT right-of-way shall be allowed only by permit issued by UDOT in conformance with Utah Administrative Codes R-930-6.
II. Upon receipt of an encroachment permit from UDOT, the DEVELOPER will have temporary access within $\quad$ SR-102 right-of-way at 950 East (public street) for the sole purpose of the mitigation improvements and access described in "Exhibit A", which is incorporated by reference.
III. The DEVELOPER will be responsible for all construction materials and design of the traffic mitigation improvements in accordance with the plan set in "Exhibit A" and at no cost to UDOT and the LOCAL GOVERNMENT. The DEVELOPER will construct the traffic
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mitigation improvements in strict compliance with the most current UDOT standards at the time of installation. Any part of the plan set that must be re-designed to comply with the UDOT standards will be at the DEVELOPER's expense.
IV. The DEVELOPER must obtain UDOT's written approval of the traffic mitigation improvements and traffic control plan in accordance with the MUTCD and applicable rules.
V. UDOT will remain the owner of the real properties on which the traffic mitigation improvements are installed. Any changes within the UDOT right-of-way will be reviewed and approved by UDOT before work may commence.
VI. Commencement of the design and subsequent construction of the traffic mitigation improvements shall start when the following conditions are met:

1) Any future phases of the Rivers Edge development beyond Rivers Edge - Phase 1 shall require the DEVELOPER to provide an amended Traffic Impact Study (TIS) to UDOT to verify if the proposed phase meets the warrant for a traffic signal at the intersection of SR-102 (Main Street) and 950 East. If the TIS finds that the proposed phase meets UDOT's warrants for a traffic signal, the DEVELOPER shall provide construction plans of the traffic signal and any other mitigation improvements for review and approval by UDOT. Thereafter the DEVELOPER shall construct traffic signal and any other mitigation improvement required by UDOT concurrent with constructing the subdivision improvements for the proposed phase.
2) Any future phase of the Rivers Edge development which includes the construction of the city street that connects to SR-13, the DEVELOPER shall be required to construct mitigation improvements which include but are not limited to right and left turn lanes on SR-13. The DEVELOPER shall provide construction plans of the mitigation improvements for connecting a city street to SR-13 for review and approval by UDOT. Thereafter the DEVELOPER shall construct right and left turn lanes on SR-13 and any other mitigation improvement required by UDOT concurrent with constructing the subdivision improvements for the proposed phase.

The traffic signal at the intersection of 950 East and SR-102 and the right and left turn lane associated with connecting a city street to SR-13 may be phased independently or UDOT may required that these mitigation improvements be done simultaneously depending upon how the DEVELOPER proposes future phases of the Rivers Edge development.
VII. The LOCAL GOVERNMENT will not issue any permits to the DEVELOPER after the conditions included in section VI until the design and subsequent construction of the traffic mitigation improvements are commenced.
VIII. The DEVELOPER may assign this Agreement to a subsequent property owner with UDOT's prior consent. Any transfer of the property will require the DEVELOPER to provide written notice to UDOT. The obligations in this Agreement shall apply to any successors in interest to the parties. The DEVELOPER may hire a contractor to perform the installation of the traffic mitigation improvements.
IX. The DEVELOPER agrees to indemnify, defend, save harmless, and release UDOT and LOCAL GOVERNMENT from and against any and all loss, damages, injury, liability, suits, claims and proceedings arising out of the performance of this Agreement, except where the claim arises out of UDOT's and LOCAL GOVERNMENT's sole negligence. This provision shall survive the termination of this Agreement. DEVELOPER shall indemnify UDOT and LOCAL GOVERNMENT for any losses, damages, injury, liability, claims, suits and proceedings arising out of the access improvements installed by the DEVELOPER within UDOT's right-of-way.
X. This Agreement shall be governed by the laws of the State of Utah both as to interpretation and performance.
X. This Agreement in no way creates any type of agency relationship, joint venture, or partnership between the DEVELOPER and UDOT and the LOCAL GOVERNMENT.
XI. This Agreement, together with all exhibits and attachments, constitutes the entire agreement between the parties and supersedes any prior understandings, agreements, or representations, verbal or written. No subsequent modification or amendments will be valid unless in writing and signed by both parties.
XII. Each party represents that it has the authority to enter into this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed by its duly authorized officers as of the day and year of the last signature.





































Rivers Edge - Phase 1
A part of Section 2, T11N, R2W, SLB\&M, U.S. Survey
Tremonton City, Box Elder County, Utah
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| Tremonton City City Council Meeting <br> April 4, 2023 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Title: | Review of Calendar and Review of Past Assignments |
| FISCAL IMPACT: | Not applicable |
| Presenter: | Marc Christensen |

## April 10

## Fire Chief Interviews:

6 pm - John Connolly
7 pm - Christopher Wells

## April 19-21

*No City Council Meeting on April 18 due to the ULCT Midyear Conference.


Dates: Wednesday, April 19-21, 2023
Location: Dixie Convention Center, St. George

## April 26

Cathy Newman, Food Pantry Director, is retiring. We a ppreciate all she has done for the city and wish her well in retirement. There is no event scheduled for her retirement.


[^0]:    Linsey Nessen, Recorder

