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# TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM 

DATE:<br>September 11, 2023<br>TO:<br>Brett Perkins, Perk Development<br>FROM:<br>Alex Atchison, PE, PTOE<br>SUBJECT:<br>Gravel Point Development - Traffic Assessment<br>CC: Darren Sandeno<br>PROJECT NUMBER: 217-8837-002<br>PROJECT NAME: Gravel Point Development



This technical memorandum analyzes potential traffic impacts of the proposed Gravel Point development in Bandon, Oregon. This transportation technical memo evaluates traffic volumes, estimated weekday PM peak hour trips generated by the project, and traffic operations for the existing and future conditions. As discussed with City Planning Department staff, a formal traffic impact analysis is not required for this development.

## PROJECT OVERVIEW

The proposed Gravel Point project includes a 110 -room hotel and 32 associated suites on a 24.8 -acre site along Beach Loop Road SW in the City of Bandon, Oregon. The hotel will have amenities that include a spa, meeting rooms and a 258 -seat restaurant and bar. The proposed project is anticipated to be constructed by 2026.

## STUDY AREA

## Roadways

Highway 101, also known as the Oregon Coast Highway, connects the northern border of Washington with the southern border of California. Highway 101 is under the jurisdictional responsibility of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). Except for Highway 101, streets located within the city limits of Bandon are the responsibility of the city and streets located outside the city limits are the responsibility of Coos County.

Functional classification is designed to serve the transportation needs within the community. In general, arterials serve longer trips and through traffic, have limited access points, and are less desirable for pedestrian and bicycle trips. Local streets serve shorter trips with nearby destinations, have frequent access points and are ideal for pedestrian and bicycle trips. Collectors connect the arterial system to the local street system.

Highway 101 is a two-way three-lane facility with two through lanes and one center lane. It is classified as an arterial and has a posted speed of 45 mph . Seabird Drive and Beach Loop Road SW are two-way, two-lane roadways and are both classified as collectors. Seabird Drive has a posted speed limit of 30 mph and Beach Loop Road SW has a posted speed limit of 25 mph .

## Study Intersections

This traffic assessment evaluates traffic operations at three intersections: Highway 101/Seabird Drive, Beach Loop Road SW/Seabird Drive and Beach Loop Road SW/Main Site Access. Figure 1 shows the study area and study intersections. The intersections of Highway 101/Seabird Drive and Beach Loop Road SW/ Seabird Drive are both stop-controlled on Seabird Drive only.


Figure 1. Study Area

## TRAFFIC VOLUMES

PM peak hour traffic counts at the intersection of Highway 101/Seabird Drive were collected in May 2021 as part of the Seabird Drive Multifamily Traffic Impact Analysis (2021). This count was reflective of off-season conditions. Because traffic volumes vary during different times of year, especially in areas like Bandon that experience significant volumes of recreational traffic, counts must be adjusted to represent the peak month by applying a seasonal factor, consistent with the ODOT's (2023) Analysis Procedures Manual (APM). The traffic volumes adjusted for seasonal variation are also referred to as the 30th highest annual traffic volumes and are commonly used for traffic analysis on ODOT facilities.

To account for seasonal variations, the Seabird Drive Multifamily TIA study increased traffic counts by 26\%. This adjustment was based on five years of traffic data from ODOT's Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR)at Station 06-004 (located on Highway 101, 1.02 miles south of 18th SW Street) approximately 0.3 miles south of Seabird Drive.

No existing traffic counts are currently available at the intersection of Beach Loop Road SW/Seabird Drive. However, the City of Bandon (2010) Bandon Transportation Refinement Plan includes PM Peak hour traffic counts collected in at the intersections of Highway 101/Seabird Drive and Beach Loop Road SW/Seabird Drive in January 2009. A seasonal adjustment factor was applied to the 2009 traffic counts and resulting 30th highest annual hour traffic volumes are included in Figure 5 of the Bandon Transportation Refinement Plan.

The seasonally adjusted 2009 traffic count at the intersection of Highway 101/Seabird Drive was compared to the 2021 seasonally adjusted traffic count to calculate the total growth along Seabird Drive. Weekday PM peak hour, seasonally adjusted volumes on Seabird Drive grew by $58 \%$ between 2009 and 2021. This growth rate was applied to the 2009 seasonally adjusted traffic counts at the intersection of Beach Loop Road SW/Seabird Drive to estimate 2021 PM Peak hour traffic counts.

The Year 2026 No Build traffic volumes were estimated by applying a background annual growth of $2 \%$ to the 2021 traffic volumes. The annual growth rate of $2 \%$ is the average of the growth rates reported in the Coos County (2011) Transportation System Plan (TSP) and the Bandon Transportation Refinement Plan. Traffic volumes are included in Attachment A.

## TRIP GENERATION, DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

The proposed project includes a resort hotel that includes 110 room, 32 suites and a 258 -seat restaurant and bar. Trip generation estimates were prepared for the proposed hospitality development based on trip rates identified using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition (2022).

Table 1 summarizes weekday PM peak hour trip generation estimates. The net new total trips do not include project traffic that would be internal to the site (linked trips between the hotel and restaurant uses). To be conservative, trips for the restaurant were calculated as if the use was stand-alone. However, it is anticipated that hotel guests will make up a large majority of the people patronizing the restaurant and bar and the PM peak hour trips generated by the restaurant will be lower than what is shown in Table 1. See Attachment B for detailed trip generation calculations.

As shown in Table 1, the development is estimated to generate approximately 111 net new PM peak hour trips ( $75 \mathrm{in} / 36$ out). Trip distribution patterns are consistent with trip distribution estimates shown in Figure 7 of the Bandon Transportation Refinement Plan, with 55\% coming to/from the north on Highway 101, 10\% coming from the south on Highway 101, 20\% coming to/from the south on Beach Loop Road SW, and the remaining 15\% coming to/from the north on Beach Loop Road SW.

Table 1: Weekday PM Peak Project Trip Generation

| Land Use ${ }^{1}$ | Unit | Size | Gross Trips Total <br> (in/out) $)^{2}$ | Internal Trips Total <br> (in/out) $)^{3}$ | Net New Trips <br> Total (in/out) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Resort Hotel (LU 330) | Room | 110 | $35(25 / 10)$ | $4(2 / 2)$ | $31(23 / 8)$ |
| Suite Hotel (LU 311) | Room | 32 | $12(6 / 6)$ | 0 | $12(6 / 6)$ |
| Restaurant (LU 931) | Seats | 258 | $72(48 / 24)$ | $4(2 / 2)$ | $683(46 / 22)$ |
| Total |  |  | $119(79 / 40)$ | $8(4 / 4)$ | $111(75 / 36)$ |

1) Land use from ITE Trip Generation Manual ( $11^{\text {th }}$ edition)
2) Total vehicle trips based on rates/equations from ITE Trip Generation Manual (11th edition)
3) Trips that would remain internal to the project site and would not use external roads, based on rates from Trip Generation Handbook and NCHRP report 685.
4) Overall new trips that would travel externally to/from the proposed project.

## TRAFFIC OPERATIONS

Traffic operations are often measured by an approach called intersection level of service (LOS). LOS is a scale ranging from A to F in which rankings are based on the delay at a given intersection. LOS A represents the best conditions with minimal amount of delay, and LOS F represents the worst conditions with severe congestion and delay. Table 2 lists the intersection LOS delay thresholds for signalized intersections and unsignalized intersections.

At signalized and all-way stop-control intersections, LOS is calculated based on the delay of all vehicles entering the intersection. At two-way or one-way stop-control intersections, LOS is calculated and reported based on the worst movement at the intersection.

Table 2. Highway Capacity Manual LOS Ratings

| Level of Service (LOS) | Average Delay (seconds/vehicle) <br> Signalized Intersections | Average Delay (seconds/vehicle) <br> Unsignalized Intersections |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | $\leq 10$ | $\leq 10$ |
| B | $>10$ and $\leq 20$ | $>10$ and $\leq 15$ |
| C | $>20$ and $\leq 35$ | $>15$ and $\leq 25$ |
| D | $>35$ and $\leq 55$ | $>25$ and $\leq 35$ |
| E | $>55$ and $\leq 80$ | $>35$ and $\leq 50$ |
| F | $>80$ | $>50$ |

Source: Highway Capacity Manual (6th Edition), Transportation Research Board, 2022.
Another measure of intersection operations is the volume to capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) ratio. $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ is a measure of the adequacy of an intersection geometry and capacity. The $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio is a measure of the capacity sufficiency of the overall intersection and is a good indication of whether the physical geometry design features provide sufficient capacity for the intersection. A v/c ratio of 1.0 indicates that an intersection is operating at capacity.

Traffic analysis was performed to identify intersection operations conditions for comparison to adopted mobility standards. Mobility standards for the study intersections differ, depending on the jurisdiction. The intersection of US 101/Seabird Drive is an ODOT facility, and the other two intersections are City of Bandon facilities.

The City's 2010 Bandon Transportation Refinement Plan states that the collector street network shall be maintained at LOS D during the peak hour. ODOT's mobility targets are typically based on the intersection location, its classification, and speed. The ODOT mobility standard for the US 101/Seabird Drive intersection is a V/C ratio of 0-75 for US 101 approaches and 0.80 for Seabird Drive. It should be noted that at unsignalized ODOT intersections, these standards are applicable only to minor street movements.

Study intersections, traffic control, roadway jurisdiction, and operational standards/mobility targets at the study intersections are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Study Area Intersection Operational Standards and Mobility Targets

| Intersection | Traffic Control | Jurisdiction | Performance / <br> Mobility Standard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway 101 / Seabird Drive | Minor-Street Stop-Control | ODOT | Highway $101 \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c} \leq 0.75$ <br> Seabird Dr v/c $\leq 0.80$ |
| Beach Loop Road SW / Seabird Drive | Minor-Street Stop-Control | City on Bandon | LOS D |
| Beach Loop Road SW / Site Access | Driveway Stop-Control | City of Bandon | LOS D |

## Operations Results

Analysis was performed using Synchro 11 software and implementing the Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition operations methods for stop-controlled intersections. Operational measures-including LOS, delay, and v/c ratios—of existing year 2023, future year 2026 No Build, and future year 2026 Build conditions are summarized in Table 4. Synchro reports are included in Attachment C.

As shown in Table 4, all the study intersections are forecasted to operate well within ODOT and City standards through project buildout in the year 2026.

Table 4: PM Peak Hour Intersection Operations Summary

| Intersection | LOS or Mobility Standard | 2023 Existing |  |  | 2026 No Build |  |  | 2026 Build |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS ${ }^{1}$ | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh})^{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c} \\ \text { ratio } \end{gathered}$ | LOS | Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { v/c } \\ & \text { ratio } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | Delay (sec/veh) | v/c <br> ratio |
| Highway 101 <br> / Seabird Drive | Seabird Dr $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c} \leq 0.80$ | EB = D | 31.8 | 0.44 | $E B=E$ | 44.6 | 0.58 | $E B=F$ | 61.8 | 0.73 |
| Beach Loop Rd SW / Seabird Drive | LOS D | $W B=A$ | 9.4 | 0.09 | $W B=A$ | 9.5 | 0.10 | $W B=A$ | 9.8 | 0.17 |
| Beach Loop Rd SW/ Site Access | LOS D | - | - | - | - | - | - | $E B=A$ | 9.7 | 0.05 |

1. LOS is for worst movement; $E B=$ eastbound; $W B=$ westbound
2. Sec/veh $=$ seconds per vehicle

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This technical memorandum summarizes the traffic assessment conducted for the proposed Gravel Point development in the City of Bandon, Oregon. General findings include:

- The project would construct a 110-room hotel and 32 associated suites on a 24.8 -acre site along Beach Loop Road SW in the City of Bandon, Oregon. The hotel will have amenities that include a spa, meeting rooms and a 258 -seat restaurant and bar.
- The proposed project is anticipated to be constructed by 2026.
- The development is estimated to generate approximately 111 new PM peak hour trips.
- With the addition of the project trips, the off-site study intersections are forecast to continue to meet ODOT and City LOS and mobility standards.
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ATTACHMENT A - TRAFFIC VOLUMES

## 2021 EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

 WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR

HWY 101

2023 BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR


2023 TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR


Figure 9. 2021 Existing and 2023 Forecast Traffic Volumes, Weekday PM Peak Hour.


| LEGEND | 00 -30th Highest Hour Traffic Volume |
| :---: | :---: |
| (1) - Study Intersection |  |
| $\leftarrow$ - Lane Configuration | -Study Area |
| (170) - Stop Sign | $\therefore=-1$ Urban Growth Boundary <br> Bandon City Limits |
| $\xrightarrow{H 5150} \Rightarrow$ - Average Daily Trafic | I_. $\mathrm{i}^{\text {- Bandon City Limits }}$ |

2023 No Build


Beach Loop Road / Seabird Drive


Pipeline Projects SeabirdApt TAA.pdf 2026 No Build 2026 Project Trips - Trip Distribution

Main Site Access/ Beach ier Dive
2026 Project Trips - Trip Assignment
Main Site Access / Beach Loop Drive
2026 Build
Main Site Access


|  | RT LT <br> $35 \%$ $65 \%$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LT $35 \%$ |  | 65\% | RT |
| TH | $\square$ |  | TH |
| Beach Loop Road / Seabird Drive |  |  |  |
|  | TH LT |  |  |
|  | 0 $65 \%$ |  |  |
| 1.3 |  | 65\% | ${ }^{\text {RT }}$ |
|  |  | 0 | LT |
|  | 0 0 |  |  |
|  | TH RT |  |  |




Highway 101 / Seabird Drive


Highway 101 / Seabird Drive


ATTACHMENT B - TRIP GENERATION

## PM PEAK HOUR - TRIP GENERATION

|  |  |  |  |  | Gross Trips ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | Internal Trips ${ }^{3}$ |  |  | Net New Trips ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | ITE LU | Size | Units $\quad$PM Peak <br> Trip Rate ${ }^{1}$ |  | Total Trips | \% Inbound | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resort Hotel | 330 | 110 | room | 0.32 | 35 | 72\% | 25 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 31 | 23 | 8 |
| Suite Hotel | 311 | 32 | room | 0.36 | 12 | 49\% | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 6 |
| Resturant | 931 | 258 | seats | 0.28 | 72 | 67\% | 48 | 24 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 68 | 46 | 22 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 119 |  | 79 | 40 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 111 | 75 | 36 |

1) Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual 11th Edition (2022)
2) Total vehicle trips based on rates/equations from ITE Trip Generation Manual (11th edition)
3) Trips that would remain internal to the project site and would not use external roads, based on rates from Trip Generation Handbook and NCHRP report 685
4) Trips already on the adjacent street system that make a stop at the proejct site before continuing to final destination; rate based on ITE Trip Generation Manual (2021 rates); included as turning movements at project access points
5) Overall new trips that would travel externally to the proposed project

| NCHRP 8-51 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: | Gravel Point | Organization: | Parametrix |
| Project Location: | Bandon, Oregon | Performed By: | A Atchison |
| Scenario Description: |  | Date: | 8/14/2023 |
| Analysis Year: | 2026 | Checked By: |  |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour | Date: |  |


| Land Use | Development Data (For Information Only) |  |  | Estimated Vehicle-Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ITE LUCs ${ }^{1}$ | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Retail |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Restaurant |  |  |  | 72 | 48 | 24 |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Hotel |  |  |  | 47 | 31 | 16 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 119 | 79 | 40 |


| Table 2-P: Mode Split and Vehicle Occupancy Estimates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Entering Trips |  |  | Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized | Veh. Occ. | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Table 3-P: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential |  |  |  |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Table 4-P: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential |  |  |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Retail | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |


| Table 5-P: Computations Summary |  |  |  | Table 6-P: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| All Person-Trips | 119 | 79 | 40 | Office | N/A | N/A |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 7\% | 5\% | 10\% | Retail | N/A | N/A |
|  |  |  |  | Restaurant | 4\% | 8\% |
| External Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{3}$ | 111 | 75 | 36 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A |
| External Transit-Trips ${ }^{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Residential | N/A | N/A |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ${ }^{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | 6\% | 13\% |

[^0]${ }^{2}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site-not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator
${ }^{3}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P
${ }^{4}$ Person-Trips
*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.
Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas Transportation Institute

| Project Name: | Gravel Point |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |
| Table 7-P: Conversion of Vehicle-Trip Ends to Person-Trip Ends |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Table 7-P (D): Entering Trips |  |  | Table 7-P (O): Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* |
| Office | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 1.00 | 48 | 48 | 1.00 | 24 | 24 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 1.00 | 31 | 31 | 1.00 | 16 | 16 |


| Table 8-P (0): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Origin) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 1 | 10 |  | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 8-P (D): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Destination) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 0 |  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |  | 4 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 9-P (D): Internal and External Trips Summary (Entering Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Destination Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 2 | 46 | 48 | 46 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 2 | 29 | 31 | 29 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 9-P (0): Internal and External Trips Summary (Exiting Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 2 | 22 | 24 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 2 | 14 | 16 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

[^1]ATTACHMENT C - SYNCHRO REPORTS



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | 1 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 45 | 25 | 30 | 25 | 25 | 15 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 45 | 25 | 30 | 25 | 25 | 15 |
| 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, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 54 | 30 | 36 | 30 | 30 | 18 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 129 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 51 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 78 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 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 | 865 | 1017 | - | - | 1536 | - |
| Stage 1 | 971 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 945 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 848 | 1017 | - | - | 1536 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 848 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 971 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 926 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.4 |  | 0 |  | 4.6 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 902 | 1536 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.094 | 0.02 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.4 | 7.4 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.3 | 0.1 | - |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 48 | 28 | 32 | 27 | 29 | 16 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 48 | 28 | 32 | 27 | 29 | 16 |
| 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, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 58 | 34 | 39 | 33 | 35 | 19 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 145 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 56 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 89 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 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 | 847 | 1011 | - | - | 1528 | - |
| Stage 1 | 967 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 934 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 828 | 1011 | - | - | 1528 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 828 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 967 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 913 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.5 |  | 0 |  | 4.8 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 887 | 1528 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.103 | 0.023 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.5 | 7.4 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.3 | 0.1 | - |





| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 201 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | 56 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 145 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 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 | 788 | 1011 | - | - | 1528 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 967 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 882 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 755 | 1011 | - | - | 1528 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 755 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 967 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 845 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.8 |  | 0 |  | 5.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvm |  | NBT | NBR1 | VBLn1 | SBL | SBT |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 894 | 1528 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.167 | 0.041 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.8 | 7.5 | - |  |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.6 | 0.1 | - |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | -1 | 1 |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 26 | 44 | 59 | 49 | 23 | 13 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 26 | 44 | 59 | 49 | 23 | 13 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 31 | 53 | 71 | 59 | 28 | 16 |




[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Land Use Codes (LUCs) from Trip Generation Informational Report, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P
    ${ }^{2}$ Person-Trips
    ${ }^{3}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site-not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator
    *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

