To: Technical Advisory Committee, Citizen Advisory Committee
From: Amy Griffiths, Mark Heisinger, Nick Foster, AICP, and Matt Hughart, AICP; Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.

This memorandum describes future land-use and traffic growth projections and future traffic operations within the vicinity of the I-84 Exit 210 interchange. The information in this memorandum provides a basis for the development and analysis of potential project alternatives. It will inform the identification of various opportunities and constraints for meeting the goals and objectives of the interchange area management plan (IAMP).

## FUTURE LAND USE ANALYSIS

The analysis of potential future land use in the Interchange Management Study Area (IMSA) builds off the analysis of vacant and re-developable land presented in the Existing Conditions: System Inventory memorandum (Reference 1). Most vacant and re-developable land within the IMSA is located northeast and south of the Exit 210 interchange. Vacant and re-developable land northeast land is primarily zoned for residential uses (i.e., R-1 - Low Density Residential, R-2 - Medium Density Residential, or R-3 - High Density Residential), commercial uses (i.e., C-3 - Service Commercial), or farm use (i.e., EFU-CO - Farm Use). Vacant and re-developable land south of the interchange is zoned for commercial uses (i.e., C-3 - Service Commercial and C-2 - Tourist Commercial).

The project team evaluated the development potential of the vacant and re-developable lands under their current zoning designations. Table 1 summarizes the results of this analysis by zone. Note that this analysis assumes full build-out of the vacant and re-developable properties and does not necessarily reflect 20-year development projections.

## Table 1 - Estimated Development Potential

| Zoning Designation | Development Potential |
| :--- | :---: |
| Residential (R-1, 2, \& 3 \& EFU) | $250-2,100^{1}$ |
| Tourist Commercial (C-2) | $11,000^{2}$ |
| Service Commercial (C-3) | $378,000^{2}$ |

[^0]The land-use analysis is further described in Attachment "A."

## FUTURE GROWTH PROJECTIONS

The project team obtained the Pendleton Travel Demand Model for year 2015 and year 2040 from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and used it to develop future traffic volumes within the Exit 210 Operations and Access Study Area (OASA). This process included manually redistributing some volumes and then post-processing the volumes using National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 765 methodology to develop intersection turning movement and link volumes for the AM and PM peak hours.

In addition to analyzing the processed volumes from the ODOT travel demand model, the project team also conducted a sensitivity analysis assuming additional growth in the vacant properties northeast and south of the interchange.

## Modifications to Travel Demand Model Projections

An initial review of the future travel demand model revealed several roadway links within the Exit 210 OASA that experienced a decline in traffic volumes between year 2015 and year 2040. These declines were inconsistent with the projected growth in employment in the area. Further inspection revealed that the model was routing large amounts of traffic along US 30 to the Barnhart Road interchange with I-84 via a new connection along Old Airport Road (i.e., shifting demand from I-84 to this northerly route). To address this unrealistic shift in volumes, the project team redistributed some traffic volume from the US 30-Old Airport Road-Barnhart Road route to I-84 through the Exit 207 and Exit 210 interchanges. The project team also redistributed some local road traffic volumes to achieve growth commensurate with the expected increase in development in the area.

## Developing Final Projected Volumes from the Travel Demand Model

The project team post-processed the redistributed model volumes using the NCHRP Report 765 methodology, as recommended by the ODOT Analysis Procedures Manual (Reference 1). This analysis produced year 2040 intersection turning movements and I-84 link volumes for the AM and PM peak hours. These volumes were then balanced between study intersections. The resulting year 2040 traffic volumes are shown in Figures 1 and 2 for the AM and PM peak hour, respectively.

## FUTURE BASELINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM OPERATIONS

The project team analyzed year 2040 AM and PM peak hour transportation operations for all study intersections within the Exit 210 OASA and for all I-84 merge, diverge, and mainline segments within the vicinity of the Exit 210 interchange. The traffic operations analysis was performed in accordance with the same methodologies used for the existing conditions operations analysis, presented in the Existing Conditions: Transportation System Operations memorandum (Reference 2).

ODOT uses volume-to-capacity ( $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ) ratios to assess highway segment and intersection operations. The applicable mobility targets at each of the Exit 210 OASA study intersections, I-84 interchange terminals, and highway segments are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 - Study Intersection Performance Targets

| Intersection | OHP Mobility Target |
| :--- | :---: |
| OR 11/SE Isaac Avenue | 0.80 OR 11 approach / 0.90 Isaac Avenue approach |
| OR 11/SE Kirk Avenue | 0.80 OR 11 approach / 0.90 Kirk Avenue approach |
| I-84 Westbound Ramp Terminal/OR 11 | $0.85^{1}$ |
| I-84 Eastbound Ramp Terminal/OR 11 | $0.85^{1}$ |
| SE 3rd Avenue/SE Nye Avenue $^{2}$ | $0.90^{2}$ |

${ }^{1}$ The I-84 westbound and eastbound ramp terminals were evaluated with a more conservative v/c of 0.85 per Action 1F. 1 of the Oregon Highway Plan.
${ }^{2}$ The City of Pendleton does not have intersection or roadway performance targets - target $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ of 0.90 assumed.
${ }^{3}$ The highway segment mobility target for I-84 is 0.80 .

## Study Intersections

The results of the year 2040 traffic operations analysis for the study intersections are shown in Figures 1 and 2 for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. The critical movements at each intersection are forecast to operate under the applicable mobility targets outlined in Table 2. Intersection operations worksheets are shown in Attachment "B."

## I-84 Merge, Diverge, and Mainline Segments

The results of the year 2040 traffic operations analysis for I-84 merge, diverge, and mainline segments are shown in Table 3. As shown in Table 3, all segment v/c ratios are forecast to operate below the target v/c ratio of 0.80 during the AM and PM peak hours. Freeway operations worksheets are shown in Attachment "C."

Table 3 I-84 AM and PM Peak Hour Operations

| Segment <br> $\#$ | Direction | Type |  | LOS $^{1}$ |  | V/C² |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | AM | PM | AM | PM |  |
| 1 | EB | Diverge | W of EB Off-Ramp | B | B | 0.32 | 0.36 |
| 2 | EB | Main | EB Off-Ramp to EB On-Ramp | A | B | 0.30 | 0.34 |
| 3 | EB | Merge | EB On-Ramp | B | B | 0.36 | 0.40 |
| 4 | WB | Diverge | EB of WB Off-Ramp | B | B | 0.38 | 0.39 |
| 5 | WB | Main | WB Off-Ramp to WB On-Ramp | B | B | 0.36 | 0.35 |
| 6 | WB | Merge | WB On-Ramp | C | B | 0.55 | 0.40 |

[^1]
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## Sensitivity Analysis

As noted previously, the travel demand model assumed modest growth in the study area, below the development potential of the area. Therefore, the project team conducted a sensitivity analysis to evaluate the effect that additional development might have on the Exit 210 OASA. This analysis focuses on growth that could occur in two general areas that will have a direct effect on the function of the Exit 210 interchange:

- Location 1: Vacant properties northeast of the Exit 210 interchange. They are accessed by Kirk Avenue, Isaac Avenue, and Goad Road. These properties are currently zoned for Service Commercial, Low-Density Residential, Medium-Density Residential, HighDensity Residential and Farm uses.
- Location 2: Infill development south of the Exit 210 interchange. These properties access Nye Avenue on either side of SE $3^{\text {rd }}$ Drive. These properties include the former Bi-Mart site, the vacant property east of the Super 8 Hotel, and the vacant property east of the Hampton Inn. These properties are zoned for Service Commercial

Locations 1 and 2 and their underlying zoning designations are shown in Figure 3.
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## Sensitivity Analysis - Trip Generation and Trip Distribution

The additional development assumed in the sensitivity analysis was based on the build-out of Location 1 and 2 in accordance with the current City of Pendleton zoning designations ${ }^{1}$. Tables 3 and 4 show the assumed level of development and their trip generation potential in Locations 1 and 2, respectively.

Table 4 Trip Generation Northeast of Exit 210 Interchange (Location 1)

| Land Use (unit type) | ITE Code ${ }^{1}$ | Units | Daily | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Multi-family Housing (LowRise) | 220 | 94 | 670 | 45 | 10 | 35 | 56 | 35 | 21 |
| Single-family Housing | 210 | 508 | 4638 | 365 | 91 | 274 | 484 | 305 | 179 |
| Total Residential: |  |  | 5308 | 410 | 102 | 309 | 540 | 340 | 200 |
| Gas Station (1000 sf) | 944 | 1 | 1203 | 85 | 42 | 43 | 109 | 55 | 54 |
| Shopping Center (1000 sf) | 820 | 116 | 6650 | 210 | 130 | 80 | 606 | 291 | 315 |
| Hotel (rooms) | 310 | 100 | 702 | 45 | 26 | 18 | 49 | 25 | 24 |
| Fast Food (1000 sf) | 934 | 3 | 1413 | 121 | 61 | 59 | 98 | 51 | 47 |
| Total Commercial: |  |  | 9968 | 460 | 260 | 200 | 863 | 422 | 441 |
| Internal Capture (Commercial): |  |  | -1196 | -60 | -34 | -26 | -95 | -46 | -48 |
| Total Commercial (Adjusted for Internal Capture): |  |  | 8772 | 400 | 226 | 174 | 768 | 376 | 392 |
| Total: |  |  | 14,080 | 810 | 328 | 482 | 1307 | 716 | 592 |

${ }^{1}$ In accordance with ITE Trip Generation Manual $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition (Reference 3)
Table 5 Trip Generation South of Exit 210 Interchange (Location 2)

| Land Use (unit type) | ITE Code ${ }^{1}$ | Units | Daily | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Hotel - West of 3rd Dr (rooms) | 310 | 100 | 702 | 45 | 26 | 18 | 49 | 25 | 24 |
| Hotel - East of 3rd Dr (rooms) | 310 | 100 | 702 | 45 | 26 | 18 | 49 | 25 | 24 |
| Gas Station (1000 sf) | 944 | 1.8 | 2165 | 152 | 76 | 76 | 197 | 98 | 99 |
| Fast Food (1000 sf) | 934 | 3 | 1413 | 121 | 61 | 59 | 98 | 51 | 47 |
| Total: |  |  | 4982 | 362 | 190 | 172 | 393 | 199 | 194 |

${ }^{1}$ In accordance with ITE Trip Generation Manual $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition (Reference 3)
As shown in Tables 3 and 4, there are approximately 1,200 trips generated in the AM peak hour and 1,700 trips generated in the PM peak hour by the additional development. The project team assigned the trips onto the surrounding roadway network, assuming that most of the trips are I-84-oriented, as shown in Figures 4 and 5 for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

[^2]
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## Sensitivity Analysis - Study Intersection Traffic Operations

The results of the year 2040 traffic operations analysis for the study intersections are shown in Figures 6 and 7 for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. The critical movements at each intersection operate above the applicable mobility targets outlined in Table 1, except for the SE Kirk Ave/OR 11 intersection in the AM peak hour. The critical movements of all intersections operate at level of service (LOS) F during the AM and PM peak hour, except for the SE Kirk Ave/OR 11 intersection in the AM peak hour which operates at LOS D. Intersection operations worksheets are included in Attachment "D."

## NEXT STEPS

The project team will review the findings of these analyses with the project Technical and Citizen Advisory Committees (TAC/CAC). The results of these findings will be used to create project alternatives for the Exit 210 interchange area. These alternatives may include modifications related to the Exit 210 interchange, local circulation and/or access, and/or land development requirements/guidelines.
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LAND USE PLANNING

## MEMORANDUM

## Future Land Use Analysis

Pendleton Exit 210 IAMP - Task 6.1

DATE January 28, 2019
TO Nick Foster and Matt Hughart, KAI
FROM Darci Rudzinski, and Clinton "CJ" Doxsee, APG

## OVERVIEW

This memorandum presents assumptions and analysis for future land uses in the Interchange Management Study Area (IMSA). It addresses Task 6.1 of the Pendleton Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) for Exit 207. The following land use assumptions are based on the development potential of vacant parcels in the IMSA, the development patterns demonstrated in Pendleton and other Oregon communities, and anticipated development resulting from extending City services. The assumptions will be used to inform modeling future traffic conditions in the IMSA over the course of the year 2040 planning horizon.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

## Current Uses and Zoning

As identified in Technical Memorandum \#2: Existing Conditions - Land Use and Demographics Overview, there are areas of vacant land within the IMSA. These areas represent the most significant development potential in the IMSA.

As shown on Figure 1, parcels within the IMSA all have City of Pendleton zoning applied to them. The City of Pendleton Unified Development Code implements the policy established in the Comprehensive Plan and regulates development through zoning designations and provisions that apply generally to all development and specifically to land divisions. The following zones are found within the IMSA and within the UGB.

- C-2 - Tourist Commercial
- C-3 - Service Commercial
- EFU-CO - Farm Use
- R-1 - Low-density Residential
- R-2 - Medium-density Residential
- R-3 - High-density Residential

Figure 1: Zoning


## North of the Interchange

Land north of the interchange is predominantly zoned R-1 (Low-density Residential) or EFU-CO (Farm Use). There are also areas zoned R-3 (High-density Residential) and C-3 (Service Commercial) located adjacent to or near OR-11 and the interchange exit. Most of the area located northeast of the interchange exit is vacant and has the East Side Mixed Use Opportunity Area (MOA) Subdistrict applied to it. The MOA allows for a mixed used area that has the potential to accommodate commercial uses, as well as a range of housing types and densities through a master planning process.

A significant majority of the area is vacant.

## South of the Interchange

Land south of the interchange is predominantly zoned C-3 (Service Commercial) or C-2 (Tourist Commercial). There is a small portion of the area zoned EFU-CO (Farm Use). Unlike the EFU-CO area north of the interchange, this area does not have the MOA applied. A fairly large portion of the land zoned C-3 is either vacant or redevelopable.

## Land Use Designations and Development Standards

All development in the vicinity of the interchange will have some impact on the facility, so it is important to review the zoning for surrounding parcels and connecting roads. Permitted land uses and the applicable standards associated with the zone designations are an indicator of the potential growth in the area. Recommendations for restricting uses or modifying development standards (e.g. restricting uses with high traffic generation rates or limiting building size) are possible outcomes of the IAMP process.

## Residential Uses

Most of the residential land within the IMSA is zoned for low-density residential ( $\mathrm{R}-1$ ). The R-1 zoned land is primarily located northeast of the interchange. The purpose of the R-1 zone is to provide for transition of large, sparsely settled areas to urban one-family residential uses. It also stated within a designated Opportunity Area - the MOA - the purpose is to provide land that is suitable for the range of urban land uses authorized by a Master Development Plan approved by the City. Permitted uses within the R-1 zone include single-family dwellings, duplexes or similar, manufactured homes with limitations, townhouses, and uses approved through a Master Development Plan. Conditional uses in the zone include agricultural services, churches or similar, multi-family dwellings, hospitals, light industrial uses, manufactured homes, schools, and transportation facilities. Residential densities for R-1 zone land require a minimum of one dwelling per acre and a maximum of 9 dwellings per acre. The minimum lot size for a typical single-family home is 6,000 square feet. The minimum lot size varies between 3,000 and 9,000 square feet depending on the design (i.e. duplex) or slope.

High-density residentially zoned land (R-3) is also located near the interchange. The purpose of the R-3 zone is to provide for residential development at increased densities, offering varying forms of urban living in close proximity to jobs, goods, and services. It also states that within a designated Opportunity Area - the MOA - the purpose is to provide suitable urban land uses authorized by a Master Development Plan approved by the City. Permitted uses within the zone include duplexes or similar, multi-family dwellings, residential care facilities, and uses approved through a Master Development Plan. Conditional uses in the zone include churches, government buildings, health services, neighborhood commercial uses, office spaces, schools, and transportation facilities. Residential densities for R-3 zoned land requires a minimum of 10 dwellings per acre and a maximum of 35 dwellings per acre. There is no minimum lot size for multi-family dwellings.

## Commercial Uses

Land zoned C-2 is primarily located south of the interchange. The stated purpose of the zone is to provide areas suitable for motels, restaurants, service stations, and other similar uses for the accommodation of tourists or travelers. The list of permitted uses is consistent the purpose statement and include eating and drinking establishments, hotels/motels/similar lodging, service stations, and information centers. Conditional uses in the zone include transit facilities, transportation and utility services, and health care services. There are no minimum lot size or maximum lot coverage requirements in the C-2 zone.

Land zoned C-3 is located on both sides of the interchange, but is more prominently found on the south side. The stated purpose of the zone is to provide areas for retail and services uses, and housing opportunities which are accessible to the entire community. Permitted uses within the zone include
vehicles sales/service/fueling, auto-oriented uses, retail businesses, office space, restaurants, hotels, light manufacturing, museums, and commercial amusement businesses. Conditional uses in the zone include any permitted use with more than 25,000 square feet of gross floor area, warehousing, animal clinics, and transportation facilities. There are no minimum lot size or maximum lot coverage requirements in the C-3 zone.

## Industrial Uses

There are not industrially zoned areas within the IMSA.

## Agricultural Uses

Some areas within the IMSA are located within the city's UGB and have the EFU-CO zone applied to them. The purpose of the EFU-CO zone is to preserve agricultural lands and scenic resources. However, for the purposes of this analysis, the area is assumed to develop within the planning horizon and within the range of development allowed by the MOA. The MOA allows for a mixed used area that incorporates a range of commercial and housing types and densities through a master planning process. For the purpose of this analysis, the area is assumed to develop with low-density residential development.

## FUTURE LAND USES AND ASSUMPTIONS

The IMSA includes a variety of land uses, including commercial, residential, and exclusive farm use. For the purpose of forecasting future development potential, the study area was divided into nine subareas, as illustrated in Figure 2. Each sub-area corresponds to a transportation analysis zone (TAZ) from the Oregon Department of Transportation's travel demand model.

Figure 2: Study Sub-areas


Figure 3: Vacant \& Redevelopable Land


The analysis of future land uses within the IMSA focused on parcels that are vacant or expected to have redevelopment potential that would generate traffic (see Figure 3). The analysis factored the following assumptions to determine buildout potential growth:

- The net vacant and redevelopable acres were calculated assuming a 20\% reduction to account for utilities and right-of-way dedications.
- The floor-area-ratio (FAR) for commercial zones (C-2) is assumed to be 0.20 . A FAR of 0.20 reflects a range of typical auto-oriented commercial development types.
- Residential dwellings were calculated based on the minimum and maximum range of units per acre allowed by code.
- Areas zoned EFU-CO and have the MOA overlay applied are assumed to develop as low-density residential development.
- Standard employee per square foot ratios were used to estimate the number of employees associated with the amount of new development. The ratio assumed 400 square feet per employee for commercial development.
- The R-3 zoned area in Sub-area 250 is assumed to develop at a factor of one-third due to topographical constraints. The R-3 zoned land in Sub-area is assumed to be undevelopable to due to topographical constraints.

Table 1: Residential \& Commercial/Industrial Full Buildout Forecast

| SUB-AREA \& ZONE | Gross Vacant/ Redevelopable Acres | Net Vacant/ <br> Redevelopable Acres | Size (1,000 <br> Sq. Ft. GLA) | Employees | Dwellings at Min. Density | Dwellings at Max Density |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 249 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| R-2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 250 | 40 | 32 | 98 | 243 | 39 | 235 |
| C-3 | 14 | 11 | 98 | 243 | 0 | 0 |
| EFU-CO | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 |
| R-1 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 91 |
| R-2 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 90 |
| R-3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 40 |
| 251 | 51 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 363 |
| C-3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EFU-CO | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 34 |
| R-1 | 46 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 329 |
| R-2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 252 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| R-2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 253 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 120 |
| R-1 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 52 |
| R-2 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 68 |
| 254 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 118 |
| R-1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| R-2 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 106 |
| 255 | 129 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 926 |
| EFU-CO | 48 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 348 |
| R-1 | 80 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 574 |
| R-2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 263 | 43 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 310 |
| EFU-CO | 43 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 310 |
| 278 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| C-3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 279 | 43 | 34 | 289 | 716 | 0 | 14 |
| C-2 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| C-3 | 40 | 32 | 278 | 690 | 0 | 0 |
| EFU-CO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| R-2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 281 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C-3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| R-2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 328 | 262 | 388 | 960 | 252 | 2,091 |

As summarized in Table 1, the full buildout of vacant/redevelopable commercial, residential, and farmland within the IMSA would generate just under a 400,000 square feet of gross lease area (GLA) and slightly under 960 employees. The bulk of the GLA growth (just under 300,000 square feet) and new employees (716) would occur in Sub-area 279, located south of the interchange on Nye Avenue. Other
sub-areas that would see large increases in the amount of commercial GLA would include Sub-area 250 with approximately 250,000 square feet of development and close to 100 new employees.

There is a wide range of potential new housing allowed under Pendleton's zoning code. Assuming the EFU-CO zones develop as low-density residential, there could be between 300 and 2,200 new houses within the IMSA. The 300 new housing estimate assumes new development is built at the minimum required density, while the 2,200 estimate assumes all housing will be built at the maximum allowed density. Most of the new housing would potentially be built in Sub-areas 250 and 255. This is where most of the EFU-CO and MOA overlay land is located.

A partial buildout scenario was also generated that used the same assumptions as those listed above. The partial buildout scenario assumes that $65 \%$ of the vacant and redevelopable area will be built out over the planning horizon. This scenario assumes a modest pace of growth. The partial buildout scenario is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Residential \& Commercial/Industrial Partial (65\%) Buildout Forecast

| SUB-AREA \& ZONE | Gross Vacant/ Redevelopable Acres | Net Vacant/ Redevelopable Acres | Size (1,000 <br> Sq. Ft. GLA) | Employees | Dwellings at Min. Density | Dwellings at Max Density |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 249 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| R-2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 250 | 40 | 21 | 64 | 158 | 23 | 154 |
| C-3 | 14 | 7 | 64 | 158 | 0 | 0 |
| EFU-CO | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| R-1 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 60 |
| R-2 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 59 |
| R-3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 26 |
| 251 | 51 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 236 |
| C-3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EFU-CO | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| R-1 | 46 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 214 |
| R-2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 252 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| R-2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 253 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 77 |
| R-1 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33 |
| R-2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 44 |
| 254 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 76 |
| R-1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| R-2 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 68 |
| 255 | 129 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 601 |
| EFU-CO | 48 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 226 |
| R-1 | 80 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 373 |
| R-2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 263 | 43 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 201 |
| EFU-CO | 43 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 201 |
| 278 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C-3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| SUB-AREA \& ZONE | Gross Vacant/ <br> Redevelopable <br> Acres | Net Vacant/ Redevelopable Acres | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Size (1,000 } \\ & \text { Sq. Ft. GLA) } \end{aligned}$ | Employees | Dwellings at Min. Density | Dwellings at Max Density |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 279 | 43 | 22 | 188 | 463 | 0 | 10 |
| C-2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| C-3 | 40 | 21 | 180 | 446 | 0 | 0 |
| EFU-CO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| R-2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 281 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C-3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| R-2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 328 | 170 | 252 | 621 | 157 | 1,357 |

## East Side Mixed Use Opportunity Area (MOA): Development Scenario

A large portion of the East Side Mixed Use Opportunity Area (MOA) is under common ownership and is currently in the early design stages of development. Recent conceptual site plans show a mix of single-family, multi-family, and commercial development across Sub-areas 250, 251, and 255. See Figure 4. According to the conceptual site plan, approximately 50 acres of the MOA overlay area would be developed with commercial uses. After factoring for right-of-way and utility deductions, this would result in an approximate increase of 12 acres of commercial land and a corresponding reduction to the amount of low-density residential land, as compared to the full buildout assumptions.

Figure 4: MOA Conceptual Site Plan


Attachment B Year 2040 Intersection Operations Worksheets

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | \& |  |  | * $\uparrow$ |  |  | + $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 15 | 7 | 87 | 32 | 26 | 4 | 104 | 322 | 27 | 3 | 226 | 36 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 15 | 7 | 87 | 32 | 26 | 4 | 104 | 322 | 27 | 3 | 226 | 36 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 5 | - | - | -4 | - | - | 4 | - | - | -4 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 50 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 100 | 15 | 18 |
| Mvmt Flow | 20 | 9 | 114 | 42 | 34 | 5 | 137 | 424 | 36 | 4 | 297 | 47 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 12.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  |  |  |  | 个 |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 215 | 1 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 273 | 51 | 31 | 163 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 215 | 1 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 273 | 51 | 31 | 163 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Yield | Yield | Yield | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 150 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - |  | 16979 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | -2 | - | - | -2 | - | - | -4 | - | - | 4 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 10 | 100 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 9 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 291 | 1 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 369 | 69 | 42 | 220 | 0 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement E | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | * |  |  | * ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  |  | * $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 19 | 10 | 124 | 20 | 16 | 4 | 158 | 282 | 27 | 6 | 277 | 42 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 19 | 10 | 124 | 20 | 16 | 4 | 158 | 282 | 27 | 6 | 277 | 42 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 5 | - | - | -4 | - | - | 4 | - | - | -4 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 25 | 7 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 20 | 11 | 132 | 21 | 17 | 4 | 168 | 300 | 29 | 6 | 295 | 45 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | * |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 |  |  | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 1 | 64 | 37 | 403 | 0 | 0 | 235 | 186 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 1 | 64 | 37 | 403 | 0 | 0 | 235 | 186 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Y | Yield | Yield | Yield | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 150 | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | -2 | - | - | -2 | - | - | 4 | - | - | -4 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 1 | 69 | 40 | 433 | 0 | 0 | 253 | 200 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | * |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 205 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 44 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 64 | 2 | 230 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 205 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 44 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 64 | 2 | 230 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 4 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 230 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 49 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 72 | 2 | 258 |



Attachment C Year 2040 Freeway Operations Worksheets

## HCS7 Freeway Diverge Report

## Project Information

| Analyst | KAI | Date | $1 / 21 / 2020$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency |  | Analysis Year | 2040 |
| Jurisdiction | City of Pendleton | Time Period Analyzed | Future AM |
| Project Description | Exit 210 IAMP - Segment 1 (EB <br> Off-Ramp) | Unit | United States Customary |
| Geometric Data | Freeway | Ramp |  |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 70.0 | 45.0 |  |
| Segment Length (L) / Deceleration Length (LA),ft | 1500 | 200 |  |
| Terrain Type | Specific Grade | Rolling |  |
| Percent Grade, \% | -3.40 | - |  |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side | Freeway | Right |  |
| Adjustment Factors |  |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | All Familiar |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weather Type | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |
| Incident Type | No Incident | - |
| Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 0.968 | 0.950 |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Demand and Capacity | 1002 | 263 |
| Demand Volume (Vi) | 0.88 | 0.74 |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) | 32.00 | 12.00 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 30 | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | 70 | - |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | 0.763 | 0.806 |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1492 | 441 |
| Flow Rate (vi),pc/h | 4646 | 1995 |
| Capacity (c), pc/h | 0.32 | 0.22 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) |  |  |
| Speed and Density |  |  |

## Speed and Density

| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Number of Outer Lanes on Freeway (No) | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (DS) | 0.338 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Flow Outer Lanes (vOA), pc/h/ln | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | Off-Ramp Influence Area Speed (SR), mi/h | 60.5 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PFD) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (So), mi/h | 76.8 |
| Flow in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 1492 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h | 60.5 |
| Flow Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | - | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 12.3 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | Density in Ramp Influence Area (DR), pc/mi/ln | 15.3 |

## HCS7 Freeway Diverge Report

## Project Information

| Analyst | KAI | Date | 1/21/2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency |  | Analysis Year | 2040 |
| Jurisdiction | City of Pendleton | Time Period Analyzed | Future PM |
| Project Description | Exit 210 IAMP - Segment 1 (EB Off-Ramp) | Unit | United States Customary |
| Geometric Data |  |  |  |
|  |  | Freeway | Ramp |
| Number of Lanes (N), In |  | 2 | 1 |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  | 70.0 | 45.0 |
| Segment Length (L) / Deceleration | Length (LA), ft | 1500 | 200 |
| Terrain Type |  | Specific Grade | Rolling |
| Percent Grade, \% |  | -3.40 | - |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side |  | Freeway | Right |
| Adjustment Factors |  |  |  |
| Driver Population |  | All Familiar | All Familiar |
| Weather Type |  | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |
| Incident Type |  | No Incident | - |
| Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CA | (AF) | 0.968 | 0.950 |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Demand and Capacity |  |  |  |
| Demand Volume (Vi) |  | 1136 | 203 |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) |  | 0.88 | 0.92 |
| Total Trucks, \% |  | 32.00 | 11.00 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% |  | 30 | - |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% |  | 70 | - |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) |  | 0.763 | 0.820 |
| Flow Rate (vi),pc/h |  | 1692 | 269 |
| Capacity (c), pc/h |  | 4646 | 1995 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) |  | 0.36 | 0.13 |

## Speed and Density

| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Number of Outer Lanes on Freeway (No) | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (DS) | 0.322 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Flow Outer Lanes (vOA), pc/h/ln | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | Off-Ramp Influence Area Speed (SR), mi/h | 61.0 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PFD) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (So), mi/h | 76.8 |
| Flow in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 1692 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h | 61.0 |
| Flow Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | - | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 13.9 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | Density in Ramp Influence Area (DR), pc/mi/ln | 17.0 |

## HCS7 Basic Freeway Report

## Project Information

| Analyst | KAI | Date | $1 / 21 / 2020$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency |  | Analysis Year | 2040 |
| Jurisdiction | City of Pendleton | Time Period Analyzed | Future AM |
| Project Description | Exit 210 IAMP - Segment 2 <br> (EB Between On and Off <br> Ramps) | Unit | United States Customary |

## Geometric Data

| Number of Lanes, In | 2 | Terrain Type | Rolling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 70.0 | Total Ramp Density (TRD), ramps/mi | 0.83 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 67.2 |
| Right-Side Lateral Clearance, ft | 10 |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weather Type | Non-Severe Weather | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 0.968 |
| Incident Type | No Incident | Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) | 1.000 |

## Demand and Capacity

| Demand Volume veh/h | 739 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 0.610 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 688 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 32.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2372 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2296 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | - | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.30 |
| Passenger Car Equivalent (ET) | 3.000 |  |  |

## Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 67.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right-Side Lateral Clearance Adj. (fRLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 10.2 |
| Total Ramp Density Adjustment | 2.8 | Level of Service (LOS) | A |
| Adjusted Free-Flow Speed (FFSadj), mi/h | 67.2 |  |  |

[^3]
## HCS7 Basic Freeway Report

## Project Information

| Analyst | KAI | Date | $1 / 21 / 2020$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency |  | Analysis Year | 2040 |
| Jurisdiction | City of Pendleton | Time Period Analyzed | Future PM |
| Project Description | Exit 210 IAMP - Segment 2 <br> (EB Between On and Off <br> Ramps) | Unit | United States Customary |

## Geometric Data

| Number of Lanes, In | 2 | Terrain Type | Rolling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 70.0 | Total Ramp Density (TRD), ramps/mi | 0.83 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 67.2 |
| Right-Side Lateral Clearance, ft | 10 |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weather Type | Non-Severe Weather | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 0.968 |
| Incident Type | No Incident | Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) | 1.000 |

## Demand and Capacity

| Demand Volume veh/h | 833 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 0.610 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 776 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 32.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2372 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2296 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | - | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.34 |
| Passenger Car Equivalent (ET) | 3.000 |  |  |

## Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 67.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right-Side Lateral Clearance Adj. (fRLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 11.5 |
| Total Ramp Density Adjustment | 2.8 | Level of Service (LOS) | B |
| Adjusted Free-Flow Speed (FFSadj), mi/h | 67.2 |  |  |

[^4]
## Project Information

| Analyst | KAI | Date | 1/21/2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency |  | Analysis Year | 2040 |
| Jurisdiction | City of Pendleton | Time Period Analyzed | Future AM |
| Project Description | Exit 210 IAMP - Segment 3 (EB On-Ramp) | Unit | United States Customary |
| Geometric Data |  |  |  |
|  |  | Freeway | Ramp |
| Number of Lanes ( N ), In |  | 2 | 1 |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  | 70.0 | 45.0 |
| Segment Length (L) / Acceleration L | Length (LA),ft | 1500 | 725 |
| Terrain Type |  | Rolling | Rolling |
| Percent Grade, \% |  | - | - |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side |  | Freeway | Right |
| Adjustment Factors |  |  |  |
| Driver Population |  | All Familiar | All Familiar |
| Weather Type |  | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |
| Incident Type |  | No Incident | - |
| Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (C | CAF) | 0.968 | 0.950 |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Demand and Capacity |  |  |  |
| Demand Volume (Vi) |  | 822 | 83 |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) |  | 0.88 | 0.74 |
| Total Trucks, \% |  | 32.00 | 7.00 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% |  | - | - |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% |  | - | - |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) |  | 0.610 | 0.877 |
| Flow Rate (vi),pc/h |  | 1531 | 128 |
| Capacity (c), pc/h |  | 4646 | 1995 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) |  | 0.36 | 0.06 |

## Speed and Density

| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Number of Outer Lanes on Freeway (No) | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (Ms) | 0.276 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Flow Outer Lanes (vOA), pc/h/ln | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | On-Ramp Influence Area Speed (SR), mi/h | 62.3 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PFM) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (So), mi/h | 70.0 |
| Flow in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 1531 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h | 62.3 |
| Flow Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | 1659 | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 13.3 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | Density in Ramp Influence Area (DR), pc/mi/ln | 13.9 |

## Project Information

| Analyst | KAI | Date | $1 / 21 / 2020$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency |  | Analysis Year | 2040 |
| Jurisdiction | City of Pendleton | Time Period Analyzed | Future PM |
| Project Description | Exit 210 IAMP - Segment 3 (EB <br> On-Ramp) | Unit | United States Customary |
| Geometric Data | Freeway | Ramp |  |
|  | 2 | 1 |  |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 70.0 | 45.0 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 1500 | 725 |  |
| Segment Length (L) / Acceleration Length (LA),ft | Rolling | Rolling |  |
| Terrain Type | - | - |  |
| Percent Grade, \% | Freeway | Right |  |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side |  |  |  |
| Adjustment Factors |  |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | All Familiar |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weather Type | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |
| Incident Type | No Incident | - |
| Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 0.968 | 0.950 |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Demand and Capacity | 926 | 93 |
| Demand Volume (Vi) | 0.88 | 0.97 |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) | 32.00 | 8.00 |
| Total Trucks, \% | - | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | - |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | 0.610 | 0.862 |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1725 | 111 |
| Flow Rate (vi),pc/h | 4646 | 1995 |
| Capacity (c), pc/h | 0.40 | 0.06 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) |  |  |
| Speed and Density |  |  |

## Speed and Density

| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Number of Outer Lanes on Freeway (No) | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (Ms) | 0.280 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Flow Outer Lanes (vOA), pc/h/ln | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | On-Ramp Influence Area Speed (SR), mi/h | 62.2 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PFM) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (So), mi/h | 70.0 |
| Flow in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 1725 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h | 62.2 |
| Flow Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | 1836 | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 14.8 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | Density in Ramp Influence Area (DR), pc/mi/ln | 15.3 |

## 3_EB_Merge_PM - Future.xuf

## HCS7 Freeway Diverge Report

## Project Information

| Analyst | KAI | Date | 1/21/2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency |  | Analysis Year | 2040 |
| Jurisdiction | City of Pendleton | Time Period Analyzed | Future AM |
| Project Description | Exit 210 IAMP - Segment 4 (WB Off-Ramp) | Unit | United States Customary |
| Geometric Data |  |  |  |
|  |  | Freeway | Ramp |
| Number of Lanes (N), In |  | 2 | 1 |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  | 70.0 | 45.0 |
| Segment Length (L) / Deceleration | Length (LA), ft | 1500 | 290 |
| Terrain Type |  | Rolling | Specific Grade |
| Percent Grade, \% |  | - | -2.30 |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side |  | Freeway | Right |
| Adjustment Factors |  |  |  |
| Driver Population |  | All Familiar | All Familiar |
| Weather Type |  | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |
| Incident Type |  | No Incident | - |
| Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CA | (AF) | 0.968 | 0.950 |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Demand and Capacity |  |  |  |
| Demand Volume (Vi) |  | 960 | 64 |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) |  | 0.88 | 0.72 |
| Total Trucks, \% |  | 32.00 | 5.00 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% |  | - | 30 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% |  | - | 70 |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) |  | 0.610 | 0.939 |
| Flow Rate (vi),pc/h |  | 1788 | 95 |
| Capacity (c), pc/h |  | 4646 | 1995 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) |  | 0.38 | 0.05 |

## Speed and Density

| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Number of Outer Lanes on Freeway (No) | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (DS) | 0.307 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Flow Outer Lanes (vOA), pc/h/ln | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | Off-Ramp Influence Area Speed (SR), mi/h | 61.4 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PFD) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (So), mi/h | 76.8 |
| Flow in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 1788 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h | 61.4 |
| Flow Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | - | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 14.6 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | Density in Ramp Influence Area (DR), pc/mi/ln | 17.0 |

## HCS7 Freeway Diverge Report

## Project Information

| Analyst | KAI | Date | $1 / 21 / 2020$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency |  | Analysis Year | 2040 |
| Jurisdiction | City of Pendleton | Time Period Analyzed | Future PM |
| Project Description | Exit 210 IAMP - Segment 4 (WB <br> Off-Ramp) | Unit | United States Customary |
| Geometric Data | Freeway | Ramp |  |
|  | 2 | 1 |  |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 70.0 | 45.0 |  |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 1500 | 290 |  |
| Segment Length (L) / Deceleration Length (LA),ft | Rolling | Specific Grade |  |
| Terrain Type | - | -2.30 |  |
| Percent Grade, \% | Freeway | Right |  |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side |  |  |  |
| Adjustment Factors |  |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | All Familiar |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weather Type | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |
| Incident Type | No Incident | - |
| Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 0.968 | 0.950 |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Demand and Capacity | 966 | 106 |
| Demand Volume (Vi) | 0.88 | 0.93 |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) | 32.00 | 4.00 |
| Total Trucks, \% | - | 30 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | 70 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | 0.610 | 0.948 |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 1800 | 120 |
| Flow Rate (vi),pc/h | 4646 | 1995 |
| Capacity (c), pc/h | 0.39 | 0.06 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) |  |  |
| Speedand Density |  |  |

## Speed and Density

| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Number of Outer Lanes on Freeway (No) | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (DS) | 0.309 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Flow Outer Lanes (vOA), pc/h/ln | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | Off-Ramp Influence Area Speed (SR), mi/h | 61.3 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PFD) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (So), mi/h | 76.8 |
| Flow in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 1800 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h | 61.3 |
| Flow Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | - | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 14.7 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | Density in Ramp Influence Area (DR), pc/mi/ln | 17.1 |

## HCS7 Basic Freeway Report

## Project Information

| Analyst | KAI | Date | $1 / 21 / 2020$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency |  | Analysis Year | 2040 |
| Jurisdiction | City of Pendleton | Time Period Analyzed | Future AM |
| Project Description | Exit 210 IAMP - Segment 5 <br> (WB Between On and Off <br> Ramps) | Unit | United States Customary |

## Geometric Data

| Number of Lanes, In | 2 | Terrain Type | Rolling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 70.0 | Total Ramp Density (TRD), ramps/mi | 0.83 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 67.2 |
| Right-Side Lateral Clearance, ft | 10 |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weather Type | Non-Severe Weather | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 0.968 |
| Incident Type | No Incident | Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) | 1.000 |

## Demand and Capacity

| Demand Volume veh/h | 896 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 0.610 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 834 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 32.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2372 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2296 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | - | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.36 |
| Passenger Car Equivalent (ET) | 3.000 |  |  |

## Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 67.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right-Side Lateral Clearance Adj. (fRLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 12.4 |
| Total Ramp Density Adjustment | 2.8 | Level of Service (LOS) | B |
| Adjusted Free-Flow Speed (FFSadj), mi/h | 67.2 |  |  |
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## HCS7 Basic Freeway Report

## Project Information

| Analyst | KAI | Date | $1 / 21 / 2020$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency |  | Analysis Year | 2040 |
| Jurisdiction | City of Pendleton | Time Period Analyzed | Future PM |
| Project Description | Exit 210 IAMP - Segment 5 <br> (WB Between On and Off <br> Ramps) | Unit | United States Customary |

## Geometric Data

| Number of Lanes, In | 2 | Terrain Type | Rolling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Segment Length (L), ft | - | Percent Grade, \% | - |
| Measured or Base Free-Flow Speed | Base | Grade Length, mi | - |
| Base Free-Flow Speed (BFFS), mi/h | 70.0 | Total Ramp Density (TRD), ramps/mi | 0.83 |
| Lane Width, ft | 12 | Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 67.2 |
| Right-Side Lateral Clearance, ft | 10 |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weather Type | Non-Severe Weather | Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 0.968 |
| Incident Type | No Incident | Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) | 1.000 |

## Demand and Capacity

| Demand Volume veh/h | 860 | Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 0.610 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | Flow Rate (Vp), pc/h/ln | 801 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 32.00 | Capacity (c), pc/h/ln | 2372 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | Adjusted Capacity (cadj), pc/h/ln | 2296 |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | - | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.35 |
| Passenger Car Equivalent (ET) | 3.000 |  |  |

## Speed and Density

| Lane Width Adjustment (fLW) | 0.0 | Average Speed (S), mi/h | 67.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right-Side Lateral Clearance Adj. (fRLC) | 0.0 | Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 11.9 |
| Total Ramp Density Adjustment | 2.8 | Level of Service (LOS) | B |
| Adjusted Free-Flow Speed (FFSadj), mi/h | 67.2 |  |  |
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## Project Information

| Analyst | KAI | Date | 1/21/2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency |  | Analysis Year | 2040 |
| Jurisdiction | City of Pendleton | Time Period Analyzed | Future AM |
| Project Description | Exit 210 IAMP - Segment 6 (WB On-Ramp) | Unit | United States Customary |
| Geometric Data |  |  |  |
|  |  | Freeway | Ramp |
| Number of Lanes ( N ), In |  | 2 | 1 |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h |  | 70.0 | 45.0 |
| Segment Length (L) / Acceleration L | Length (LA),ft | 1500 | 725 |
| Terrain Type |  | Rolling | Rolling |
| Percent Grade, \% |  | - | - |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side |  | Freeway | Right |
| Adjustment Factors |  |  |  |
| Driver Population |  | All Familiar | All Familiar |
| Weather Type |  | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |
| Incident Type |  | No Incident | - |
| Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (C | CAF) | 0.968 | 0.950 |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Demand and Capacity |  |  |  |
| Demand Volume (Vi) |  | 1142 | 246 |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) |  | 0.88 | 0.72 |
| Total Trucks, \% |  | 32.00 | 11.00 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% |  | - | - |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% |  | - | - |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) |  | 0.610 | 0.820 |
| Flow Rate (vi), pc/h |  | 2127 | 417 |
| Capacity (c), pc/h |  | 4646 | 1995 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) |  | 0.55 | 0.21 |

## Speed and Density

| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Number of Outer Lanes on Freeway (No) | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (Ms) | 0.305 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Flow Outer Lanes (vOA), pc/h/ln | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | On-Ramp Influence Area Speed (SR), mi/h | 61.5 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PFM) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (So), mi/h | 70.0 |
| Flow in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 2127 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h | 61.5 |
| Flow Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | 2544 | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 20.7 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C | Density in Ramp Influence Area (DR), pc/mi/ln | 20.7 |

## Project Information

| Analyst | KAI | Date | $1 / 21 / 2020$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency |  | Analysis Year | 2040 |
| Jurisdiction | City of Pendleton | Time Period Analyzed | Future PM |
| Project Description | Exit 210 IAMP - Segment 6 (WB On-Ramp) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


|  | Freeway | Ramp |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 2 | 1 |
| Free-Flow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 70.0 | 45.0 |
| Segment Length (L) / Acceleration Length (LA),ft | 1500 | 650 |
| Terrain Type | Rolling | Rolling |
| Percent Grade, \% | - | - |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side | Freeway | Right |
| Adjen |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | All Familiar |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weather Type | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |
| Incident Type | No Incident | - |
| Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 0.968 | 0.950 |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Demand and Capacity

| Demand Volume (Vi) | 860 | 224 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) | 0.88 | 0.93 |
| Total Trucks, \% | 32.00 | 5.00 |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | - |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | - | - |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 0.610 | 0.909 |
| Flow Rate (vi),pc/h | 1602 | 265 |
| Capacity (c), pc/h | 4646 | 1995 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) | 0.40 | 0.13 |
| Sper and Desity |  |  |

## Speed and Density

| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Density in Ramp Influence Area (DR), pc/mi/ln | 15.9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (M) | 0.288 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Flow Outer Lanes (vOA), pc/mi/ln | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | On-Ramp Influenece Area Speed (SR), mi/h | 61.9 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PM) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (So), mi/h | - |
| Flow in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 1602 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h | 61.9 |
| Flow Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | 1867 | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 15.1 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B |  |  |
| Copyright © 2020 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved. | HCS |  |  |

## Attachment D

Year 2040 Intersection Operations Worksheets - Sensitivity Analysis



| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR EBLn1WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1201 | - | - | 220 | 202 | 611 | - |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\quad \$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 7.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | 个 |  |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 170 | 30 | 508 | 221 | 39 | 511 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 170 | 30 | 508 | 221 | 39 | 511 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -4 | - | 4 | - | - | -4 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 189 | 33 | 564 | 246 | 43 | 568 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 188.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 422 | 1 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 353 | 90 | 119 | 209 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 422 | 1 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 353 | 90 | 119 | 209 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Yield | Yield | Yield | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 150 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, | \# | 0 | - |  | 16979 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | -2 | - | - | -2 | - | - | -4 | - | - | 4 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 10 | 100 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 9 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 469 | 1 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 392 | 100 | 132 | 232 | 0 |



HCM LOS F

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBR EBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 328 | 1061 |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\quad \$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 44.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | * |  |  | \$ |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 266 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 165 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 146 | 12 | 190 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 266 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 165 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 146 | 12 | 190 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 4 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Mvmt Flow | 313 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 12 | 194 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 172 | 14 | 224 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 169.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\uparrow}{*}$ |  |  | + ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 19 | 152 | 124 | 124 | 99 | 25 | 158 | 348 | 205 | 42 | 340 | 42 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 19 | 152 | 124 | 124 | 99 | 25 | 158 | 348 | 205 | 42 | 340 | 42 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 5 | - | - | -4 | - | - | 4 | - | - | -4 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 20 | 162 | 132 | 132 | 105 | 27 | 168 | 370 | 218 | 45 | 362 | 45 |



HCM LOS F $\qquad$

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR EBLn1WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1148 | - | - | 107 | - | 930 | - |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\quad \$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 52.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | \$ |  | \% | 4 |  |  | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 1 | 199 | 121 | 805 | 0 | 0 | 355 | 545 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 1 | 199 | 121 | 805 | 0 | 0 | 355 | 545 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Yield | Yield | Yield | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 150 | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | -2 | - | - | -2 | - | - | 4 | - | - | -4 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 1 | 214 | 130 | 866 | 0 | 0 | 382 | 586 |




| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | 979 | 1018 | 276 | - | 0 | 0 | 386 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 632 | 632 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 347 | 386 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.08 | 6.43 | 6.16 | - | - | - | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.08 | 5.43 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.08 | 5.43 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.572 | 4.297 | 3.444 | - | - | -2.218 | - | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | $\sim 302$ | 235 | 742 | 0 | - | - | 1172 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | $\sim 556$ | 460 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Stage 2 | 730 | 584 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | $\sim 256$ | 0 | 742 | - | - | -1172 | - | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | $\sim 256$ | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | $\sim 556$ | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | $\sim 619$ | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| HCM Control Delay, s\$ 834.9 | 0 | 3.4 |  |

HCM LOS F $\qquad$

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBR EBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 296 | 1172 |
|  | - | -2.776 | 0.152 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | $-\$ 834.9$ | 8.6 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | F | A |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | - |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | - |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\quad \$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 26.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 229 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 135 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 165 | 13 | 255 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 229 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 135 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 165 | 13 | 255 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 4 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 257 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 152 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 185 | 15 | 287 |




[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ number of units
    ${ }^{2}$ sq. ft of gross leasable area

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Level-of-service - defined in terms of vehicle density (passenger car/mile/lane).
    ${ }^{2}$ Volume-to-capacity ratio. For merge/diverge segments - the reported $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ indicates worst-case for either the ramp or mainline facilities.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ The area in Location 1, northeast of the Exit 210 interchange, is designated as a Mixed-use Opportunity Area in the City's Comprehensive Plan. This designation allows the underlying zoning of this area to change with a master plan development application.
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