Paul Coffelt
City of Lynnwood
20816 44th Ave. W, STE 230
Lynnwood, WA 98046-5008

## RE: Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Update for the Lynnwood Automotive Dealerships

Dear Paul:
This document includes an update to a previously prepared TIA (dated April 23, 2021) for two automotive dealerships proposed on one site along SR 99 in Lynnwood, Washington. The site is located between $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW and $188^{\text {th }}$ Street SW, is bounded by single-family homes to the north and west, and is bounded by an existing Harley Davidson motorcycle dealership to the south. The site is being expanded in two phases to repurpose the existing Harley Davidson dealership and demolish one of two existing buildings in use by Harley Davidson. Figure 1 displays the site vicinity map, and Figure 2 displays the proposed site plan for the project. The northern part of the site will be occupied by a Porsche dealership which is currently under construction and is scheduled for occupancy in 2023. Build-out and occupancy of the southern part of the site, which will include a BMW dealership, is anticipated in 2024.

The April 2021 TIA was approved by City of Lynnwood and included both the Porsche and BMW dealerships, albeit assuming they would be constructed only using the site north of Harley Davidson. This document compares the estimated revised trip generation for both dealerships and compares it with the approved trip generation in the April 2021 TIA. As documented herein, the proposed change in site plan will result in a reduction in net new trips on the surrounding roadway system compared to the findings in the April 2021 TIA. As such, the findings and recommendations of the April 2021 remain valid, and no additional mitigation measures are recommended.

The remainder of this document includes a revised trip assignment (including the approved Porsche dealership, the BMW dealership, and removal of the Harley Davidson trips), updated total traffic conditions assessment after build-out, updated access configuration, and findings and recommendations. Appendix "A" contains the April 2021 TIA.

## BACKGROUND

The original site plan included a phased development of two automotive dealerships located between the existing Harley Davidson dealership and $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW, with two site accesses: one full access driveway along the $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW frontage approximately 350 feet west of SR 99, and the other driveway along the SR 99 frontage approximately 325 feet south of $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW, to be restricted to right-in/right-out/left-out through the use of a raised separator and revised lane striping within the existing center two-way left-turn lane of SR 99. No internal access through the Harley Davidson dealership to the south was assumed. The April 2021 TIA assumed up to 91,578 square feet of gross floor area for the two dealerships combined.

The scope of work in the April 2021 TIA included the following study intersections:

1. SR 99/188 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street SW
2. $\operatorname{SR} 99 /$ Site Access (future)
3. SR 99/186 th Place SW
4. $186^{\text {th }}$ Place $\mathrm{SW} /$ Site Access (future)
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In addition to these four study intersections, the following existing Harley Davidson site accesses have been added to the study for trip tracking purposes only (no additional traffic analysis as a result of a net reduction in trips):
5. East Harley Davidson site access $/ 188^{\text {th }}$ Street SW
6. West Harley Davidson site access/188 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street SW

## TRIP GENERATION

## APRIL 2021 SITE PLAN

Trip generation rates for the proposed dealerships were based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition (Reference 1). Table 1 displays the approved trip generation for the two dealerships, including a reduction for pass-by trips.

Table 1. Trip Generation (April 2021 TIA)

| Building | Land Use | ITE Code | Size ( $\mathrm{f}^{2}$ ) | Weekday Trips | Weekday PM Peak Hour Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out |
| North dealership | Auto Sales (New) | 840 | 34,076 | 948 | 83 | 33 | 50 |
| South dealership | Auto Sales (New) | 840 | 57,502 | 1,600 | 140 | 56 | 84 |
| Total |  |  | 91,578 | 2,548 | 223 | 89 | 134 |
| Less Pass-By (20\%)* |  |  |  | 510 | 44 | 22 | 22 |
| Total Net Trips |  |  |  | 2,038 | 179 | 67 | 112 |

*A localized pass-by rate was identified based on conversations with City staff. The Cities of Burien, WA and Kent, WA both apply a $25 \%$ pass-by trip reduction to auto sales land use. Due to the anticipated upscale nature of the proposed dealerships, a lower pass-by trip reduction of $20 \%$ was agreed-upon by City staff and applied to the analysis.

ITE has released an updated version of Trip Generation ( $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition) since preparation of the April 2021 TIA. However, the weekday daily peak hour trip generation rate for a new automobile dealership did not change between the $10^{\text {th }}$ and $11^{\text {th }}$ editions. The weekday PM peak hour trip generation rate decreased by less than one percent from the $10^{\text {th }}$ to the $11^{\text {th }}$ edition as a result of one additional study being added to the dataset. Given this small change, the net decrease in estimated trip generation, and a desire for consistency between analyses, the $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition rates are used in this analysis.

## PORSCHE DEALERSHIP (ACTUAL BUILT)

While the original 2021 TIA assumed up to 91,578 square feet of new automotive dealership, the actual build-out area for the Porsche dealership will be 41,352 square feet. Table 2 displays the estimated trip generation for the Porsche dealership as planned.

Table 2. Trip Generation (Porsche Dealership - Actual Built)

| Building | Land Use | ITE Code | Size ( $\mathrm{f}^{2}$ ) | Weekday Trips | Weekday PM Peak Hour Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out |
| Porsche dealership | Auto Sales (New) | 840 | 41,352 | 1,152 | 100 | 40 | 60 |
| Less Pass-By (20\%) |  |  |  | 230 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Total Net Trips |  |  |  | 922 | 80 | 30 | 50 |

By comparing the results of Tables 1 and 2 , the as-built size of the Porsche dealership is projected to result in 1,116 fewer weekday trips than the approved trip generation in the April 2021 TIA. Likewise, 99 fewer weekday PM peak hour trips are projected. These are treated as vested trips for the purposes of this analysis.

## PROPOSED BMW DEALERSHIP

The gross floor area of the proposed BMW dealership will be up to 88,452 square feet. Table 3 displays the estimated trip generation associated with the BMW dealership.

Table 3. Trip Generation (BMW Dealership)

| Building | Land Use | ITE Code | Size ( $\mathrm{fi}^{2}$ ) | Weekday Trips | Weekday PM Peak Hour Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out |
| BMW dealership | Auto Sales (New) | 840 | 88,452 | 2,462 | 215 | 86 | 129 |
| Less Pass-By (20\%) |  |  |  | 492 | 44 | 22 | 22 |
| Total Net Trips |  |  |  | 1,970 | 171 | 64 | 107 |

As part of initial construction of the BMW dealership, the east Harley Davidson building (currently 13,583 square feet) will be demolished, and the west Harley Davidson building (currently 31,450 square feet) will remain (continuing to operate as a Harley Davidson Dealership). As part of Phase 2 of the BMW dealership, all of the existing Harley Davidson dealership in the west building will be repurposed to service the BMW dealership. Table 4 displays the estimated trip generation associated with the existing Harley Davidson dealership, which will be credited against the net new BMW trips summarized in Table 3. For simplicity, all of the Harley Davidson trips are combined, even though the west building may not be repurposed as BMW (Phase 2) until several years after construction of the new BMW site. Note that no driveway counts at the Harley Davidson accesses were performed, so the number of trips shown in Table 3 is an estimate based on industry standard references (ITE Trip Generation).

Table 4. Trip Generation (Harley Davidson - to be Removed/Repurposed)

| Building | Land Use | ITE Code | Size ( $\mathrm{f}^{2}$ ) | Weekday Trips | Weekday PM Peak Hour Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out |
| West building | Auto Sales (New) | 840 | 31,450 | 876 | 76 | 30 | 46 |
| East building | Auto Sales (New) | 840 | 13,583 | 378 | 33 | 13 | 20 |
| Total |  |  | 45,033 | 1,254 | 109 | 43 | 66 |
| Less Pass-By (20\%) |  |  |  | 250 | 22 | 11 | 11 |
| Total Net Trips |  |  |  | 1,004 | 87 | 32 | 55 |

## SUMMARY

Table 5 calculates the net impact of the BMW dealership by subtracting the Harley-Davidson trips and the vested trips from the approved April 2021 TIA from the BMW dealership trips. As shown, build-out of the proposed BMW dealership is projected to result in fewer weekday trips and fewer weekday PM peak hour trips added to the surrounding transportation system than what was approved in the April 2021 TIA, when accounting for the actual build-out area of the Porsche dealership and the removed trips from Harley Davidson.

Table 5. Net New Trip Impact of BMW Dealership

| Trip Description | Weekday Trips | Weekday PM Peak Hour Trips |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | In | Out |
| BMW Dealership - Proposed | 1,970 | 171 | 64 | 107 |
| Harley Davidson - to be Removed | $-1,004$ | -87 | -32 | -55 |
| Remaining Vested Trips - from April 2021 TIA | $-1,116$ | -99 | -37 | -62 |
| Net New Trip Impact | -150 | -15 | -5 | -10 |

## TRIP ASSIGNMENT

While the BMW dealership is not projected to result in an impact to the transportation system beyond what was shown in the April 2021 TIA, it will shift some of the proposed building area closer to the existing Harley Davidson accesses on $188^{\text {th }}$ St SW. Furthermore, internal connectivity will be provided between the Porsche and BMW dealerships, therefore potentially distributing trips to the site driveways more evenly. The following figures document the net driveway trip assignment (net new plus pass-by) for the combined BMW and Porsche site:

- Figure 3 - Revised Porsche Trip Assignment
- Figure 4 - BMW Trip Assignment
- Figure 5 - Harley Davidson Trips to be Removed
- Figure 6 - Net Driveway Trips (summation of Figures 3 and 4, less Figure 5)

Note that the assumed trip distribution from the April 2021 TIA was used for consistency.
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## TOTAL BUILD-OUT TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Figure 7 displays the year 2022 background traffic volumes (prior to build-out of either dealership) from the April 2021 TIA. The net new driveway trips shown in Figure 6 were added to the weekday PM peak hour background traffic volumes in Figure 7 to arrive at the revised build-out year total traffic volumes, shown in Figure 8. The original 2021 TIA assumed a build-out year of 2022. For purposes of consistency, the build-out year has been kept at 2022 (no additional background traffic growth has been added).

Figure 7 also displays the corresponding traffic operations at the original study intersections from the April 2021 TIA. As shown, each of the study intersections are projected to continue meeting applicable operating standards after full build-out of the BMW dealership. Appendix "B" contains the revised year 2022 total traffic analysis worksheets.

## 95TH-PERCENTLINE QUEUING ANALYSIS

Table 6 displays the revised $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queues at the study intersections under total traffic conditions after full build-out of the BMW dealership. As shown, all queues are projected to be accommodated within the existing turn lane storage lengths, with the following exceptions:

Table 6. Summary of 95th-percentile Queues

| Intersection | Movement | Queue Storage (ft) | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$-percentile Queue (ft), 2022 Total Traffic | Adequate Storage Provided? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 1: SR 99/ } \\ 188^{\text {th }} \text { Street SW } \end{gathered}$ | EB L | 140 | 375 | No |
|  | EB T/R | - | 300 | Yes |
|  | WB L | 160 | 300 | No |
|  | WB T/R | - | 500 | Yes |
|  | NB L | 220 | 175 | Yes |
|  | NB T | - | 925 | Yes |
|  | NB R | - | 25 | Yes |
|  | SB L | 140 | 100 | Yes |
|  | SB T | - | 550 | Yes |
|  | SB R | - | 25 | Yes |
| 2: SR 99/Site Access | EB L | 25* | 25 | Yes |
|  | EB R | 25* | 25 | Yes |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 3: SR 99/ } \\ 186^{\text {th }} \text { Place SW } \end{gathered}$ | EB L/T/R | - | 25 | Yes |
|  | WB L/T/R | - | 25 | Yes |
|  | NB L | 100 | 25 | Yes |
|  | SB L | 100 | <25 | Yes |
| 4: 186th Place SW/ <br> Site Access | WB L/T | - | 25 | Yes |
|  | NB L/R | 25* | 25 | Yes |
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As shown, all queues are projected to continue to be accommodated within the existing turn lane storage lengths during the weekday PM peak hour after full build-out of the proposed BMW dealership. Note the following queves may extend into the two-way center turn lane:

- The eastbound left-turn queve on $188^{\text {th }}$ Street $S W$ at SR 99 is projected to exceed the painted storage length; however, the estimated queve of 375 feet can be accommodated within the existing twoway left-turn lane.
- The westbound left-turn queue on $188^{\text {th }}$ Street $S W$ at SR 99 is projected to exceed the painted storage length; however, the estimated queve of 300 feet can be accommodated within the existing twoway left-turn lane.

As such, no improvements are recommended to address queuing related deficiencies at the study intersections as a result of the traffic volumes associated with the proposed BMW dealership.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this TIA update, the proposed BMW dealership can be developed while maintaining acceptable levels of service at the study intersections. No additional recommendations are proposed beyond those identified in the April 2021 Lynnwood Automotive Dealerships TIA.

We trust this document adequately addresses the transportation-related impacts of the proposed dealerships. If you have any questions, please contact us at 503-535-7462.

Sincerely,
KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.


Zachary Bugg, PhD
Associate Engineer


Diego Arguea Associate Engineer


Anthony Yi, PE Senior Principal Engineer
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## APPENDIX

A. April 2021 Lynnwood Automotive Dealerships Transportation Impact Analysis
B. Revised 2022 Total Traffic Conditions Traffic Analysis Worksheets

## Appendix A

April 2021 Lynnwood Automotive Dealerships Transportation Impact Analysis

Paul Coffelt

City of Lynnwood
20816 44 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave. W, STE 230
Lynnwood, WA 98046-5008

## RE: Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for the Lynnwood Automotive Dealerships

Dear Paul,
Two new automotive dealerships are being proposed on one site along SR 99 in Lynnwood, Washington. The site is located between $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW and $188^{\text {th }}$ Street SW, is bounded by singlefamily homes to the north and west and is bounded by an existing Harley Davidson motorcycle dealership to the south. A site vicinity map is provided in Figure 1.

The proposed dealerships will be accessed via two driveways, one on SR 99 and one on $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW. Occupancy of the dealerships is expected in 2022. Figure 2 displays the proposed site plan for the project.

This study has been prepared to analyze the impacts of the proposed dealerships, consistent with City requirements. As documented herein, the proposed dealerships can be constructed while maintaining acceptable traffic operations and safety at the study intersections, provided the following mitigation measures and recommendations.

## Mitigation Measures

- Provide a full-access driveway on $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW per the proposed site plan (see page 4, Figure 2).
- Provide a right-in, right-out, left-out driveway on SR 99 per the proposed site plan (see page 4, Figure 2). Construct a raised traffic separator and provide revised lane striping at the site driveway at SR 99 to restrict left-in movements into the site from SR 99. A concept design is provided in Exhibit 1 of this report (see page 13), and additional details are provided with the civil engineering drawings under separate cover.


## Recommendations

- At the time of building permit, refer to the localized trip generation information presented in Table 9 of this report. The resultant trip generation is estimated at 148 weekday PM peak hour trips ( 64 inbound and 84 outbound).
- Landscaping, signage, and above-ground utilities along the site frontage and near the site access should be located and maintained so that adequate sight distance can be provided at the site access driveways on SR 99 and $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW.

Additional details of the methodology, findings, and recommendations are provided herein.

## STUDY SCOPE AND ANALYSIS METHDOLOGY

This section provides an overview of the TIA scope, methodology, applicable operating standards, and report structure.

## Study Scope

This report identifies the transportation-related impacts associated with the proposed dealerships.
The study intersections and scope were developed through email correspondence with City staff. Operational analyses were performed during the weekday PM peak period at four affected intersections. For ease of review, the intersections listed below are numbered to correspond with the numbering of the report figures.

1. $\operatorname{SR} 99 / 188^{\text {th }}$ Street $S W$
2. SR 99/Site Access (future)
3. $S R 99 / 186^{\text {th }}$ Place $S W$
4. $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW/Site Access (future)

This report evaluates the following transportation issues:

- Existing intersection operations, including control delay, and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queuing analysis;
- Crash data analysis for the most recent five-year period;
- Year 2022 background conditions analysis;
- Year 2022 (anticipated buildout and occupancy) total conditions analysis, assuming construction of the dealerships; and
- Conclusions and recommendations.
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## Applicable Operating Standards and Analysis Methodology

Per the City of Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan (Reference 1), the acceptable level of service (LOS) standard during the PM peak hour is " $E$ " for arterials and " $C$ " for local streets for state highway sections identified as Highways of Statewide Significance (HSS). The section of SR 99 through Lynnwood is not classified as HSS, and the corresponding LOS standard for the critical movement is LOS "E" (Comprehensive Plan, Page 5.13). Per the WSDOT Level of Service Standard for State Routes (Reference 2), the LOS standard for SR 99 is " $E$."

All level-of-service analyses described in this report were performed in accordance with the procedures stated in the Highway Capacity Manual, $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition (HCM $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition, Reference 3). The analysis herein evaluates the peak 15 -minute flow rate during the peak hour analysis period ${ }^{1}$. For this reason, the analyses reflect conditions that are only likely to occur for 15-minutes out of each average peak hour and will likely operate more efficiently during the other times of day. The study intersections were analyzed using the Synchro 10 software package.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing conditions analysis identifies site conditions and the current operational and geometric characteristics of roadways within the study area. The purpose of this section is to set the stage for a basis of comparison to future conditions.

## Site Conditions and Adjacent Land Uses

The site is currently vacant and is zoned as HMU (Highway 99 Mixed Use), bordered by single-family homes to the north and west and an existing Harley Davidson motorcycle dealership to the south.

## Transportation Facilities

Table 1 summarizes the existing transportation characteristics of the key roadways located within the study area. Figure 3 illustrates the existing lane configurations and traffic control devices in place at the study intersections and the proposed lane configurations at the site driveways. Note a continuous right turn/bus/bike lane is provided in both directions in SR 99 through the study area. To reflect a conservative analysis, no through vehicles were assumed to use these lanes.

[^0]Table 1. Existing Transportation Facilities

| Roadway | Classification ${ }^{1}$ | Cross <br> Section | Speed Limit <br> (mph) | Sidewalks | Bicycle <br> Lanes | Median | On-street <br> parking |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 99 | Principal Arterial | 7 lanes | 45 | Yes | Yes | TWLTL $^{2}$ | No |
| $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW | Local Street | 2 lanes | 25 | No | No | None | No |
| $188^{\text {th }}$ Street SW | Major Collector ${ }^{3}$ | 3 lanes | 30 | Yes | Yes | TWLTL | No |

${ }^{1}$ Per Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan (Reference 1)
${ }^{2}$ TWLTL: Two-way left-turn lane
${ }^{3}$ Per WASHDOT Functional Classification Map

## Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Both SR 99 and $188^{\text {th }}$ Street SW have sidewalks on both sides of the road. $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW has sidewalks only on the north side of the road at the intersection with Highway 99, and no other sidewalks are provided along $186^{\text {th }}$ Place. Bicycle lanes are striped on either side of $188^{\text {th }}$ Street SW, and there is a shared bus/bike lane present on either side of SR 99. There are no bike lanes present on $186^{\text {th }}$ Place sW.

## Transit Facilities

Local bus service is provided by Community Transit, with two routes passing the site along SR 99. The 101 route runs 2-3 times an hour during the peak hour, and the Swift Blue runs every 10 minutes during the peak hour. The nearest northbound stop (serving the 101 bus) is located directly across the street from the site, and the nearest southbound stop (also serving the 101 bus) is provided 600 feet south of the site. (Reference 4). SR 99 is a transit signal priority corridor, but due to the heavy peak hour passenger car volume in both directions of SR 99 and long green intervals for through traffic, transit signal priority phasing was not reflected in the Synchro model.
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## Existing Traffic Volumes and Peak Hour Operations

The turning movement traffic volumes used in this analysis were conducted at the study intersections in July 2018, and the afternoon system peak hour was identified as 5:00-6:00 PM. At the time of report preparation, the State of Washington had not yet returned to traffic volumes typical of pre-COVID-19 traffic levels. As a result, it was not possible to collect more recent typical traffic count volume data at the study intersections. City of Lynnwood staff provided traffic count data at the study intersections collected in July 2018, as well as signal detector data from the SR 99/188 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street SW intersection from February 2018 and February 2020 for comparison. Note that the detector data reflect the number of detector actuations recorded during the PM peak hour, which is typically lower than the actual traffic volume. Table 2 provides a comparison of the 2018 and 2020 detector data.

Table 2. Comparison of Detector Data at SR 99/188th Street SW

| Date | Total Entering Volume (Detector Actuations Only) |
| :---: | :---: |
| February 14, 2018 (Wednesday) | 3,574 |
| February 12, 2020 (Wednesday) | 2,969 |
| Change | $-17 \%$ |

As shown, the detector volume decreased by 17 percent from 2018 to 2020. Assuming the ratio of traffic volume to detector actuations remained the same within that time span, this would indicate a decrease in overall traffic volumes since 2018. This reduction was assumed to be a result of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, and the decrease in detector volume also confirmed that current traffic count volumes would not reflect accurate operating conditions. At the direction of the City, the 2018 traffic count volumes were used to develop year 2020 base volumes by applying a two percent annual growth factor to the traffic volumes on mainline SR 99. Figure 4 summarizes the existing conditions year 2020 turning movement counts used in this analysis at each of the study intersections during the weekday PM peak hour. Appendix " $A$ " includes the traffic count data used in this study.

The volumes shown in Figure 4 were used to assess the existing operations at the study intersections. City of Lynnwood staff provided the signal timing information for the SR 99/188 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street SW intersection, which operates under adaptive signal control. As shown, all the study intersections currently meet City and WSDOT standards. Note the westbound approach at the $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW/SR 99 intersection, which is an unsignalized driveway at the Eunia Plaza, currently operates at LOS E under the weekday PM peak hour. No level-of-service standard is defined for driveways - as such, per direction of City of Lynnwood engineering staff, the critical movement reported in corresponding figures and in the report narrative reflect the operations of the eastbound approach on $186{ }^{\text {th }}$ Place SW intersection. Appendix " $B$ " includes the existing conditions traffic analysis worksheets.
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## WSDOT Crash Data

WSDOT provided the latest five years of available reported crash data at the study intersections, summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Summary of WSDOT Crash Data (December 1, 2015 to November 30, 2020)

|  | Crash Severity |  |  | Crash Type |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Crashes | Crash <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | $\stackrel{\pi}{4}$ | $\frac{\text { 空 }}{\underline{s}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\frac{0}{\frac{0}{40}}$ | 皆 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \\ & \frac{2}{3} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \hline \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| SR 99/188 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ St SW | 0 | 20 | 54 | 45 | 15 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 74 | 1.09** |
| SR 99/186 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ PI SW | 1 | 5 | 14 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0.38** |

*Property damage only
**Reported crashes per million entering vehicles

SR 99/188 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street SW experienced an average of approximately 15 crashes a year, with approximately $70 \%$ of these being property-damage only during varying times of day and varying weather conditions. No fatal crashes were identified. The majority of these crashes were rear-end incidents.

SR 99/186 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Place SW experienced an average of 4 crashes per year, with one fatal crash in 2020 involving a southbound motorcycle on SR 99 and a northbound left turning movement-this crash occurred during daylight hours under dry roadway conditions, and no contributing factor was listed in the detailed crash history report provided by WSDOT. Approximately $70 \%$ of the crashes were property damage only, and approximately half were rear-end incidents (predominantly on southbound SR 99).

At the time of preparation of this report, no WSDOT STIP ${ }^{2}$ projects are identified at either study intersection. Based on review of the crash data and the operations analysis herein, no patterns or trends were identified that would trigger safety-related mitigation as a result of the added site development traffic. The addition of sidewalks and related frontage improvements along $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW associated with site development are expected to improve sight distance on the southwest corner of the SR 99 intersection.

Appendix " $C$ " contains the raw crash data from WSDOT.

[^1]
## TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ANALYSIS

The transportation impact analysis identifies how the study area's transportation system will operate in the year 2022 when the proposed dealerships are expected to be fully built and occupied. The impact of site-generated traffic during the typical weekday PM peak hour was examined as follows:

- Year 2022 background traffic conditions (build-out year without the incremental increase in dealership-generated traffic) were analyzed at each of the study intersections;
- New site-generated trips were estimated for build-out of the dealerships and distributed to the study area intersections; and
- Year 2022 total traffic conditions (including dealership-generated trips) were analyzed at each of the study intersections.


## 2022 Background Traffic Conditions

The background traffic analysis identifies how the study area's transportation system will operate in the year the proposed dealerships are expected to open (2022). No funded transportation improvement projects were identified in the analysis that would affect the study intersections. At the direction of the City, a two percent annual growth rate was applied to the existing mainline traffic volumes on SR 99 to account for general traffic growth in the site vicinity. Traffic volumes on $188^{\text {th }}$ Street SW and $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW were not increased in the 2022 background traffic conditions.

In addition to the background growth assumption, one in-process development was identified by the City: a proposed UPS Distribution Center at 18100 Highway 99. City engineering staff indicated that this development's trip generation would not have a measurable impact on the intersections in this study area during the PM peak hour. Therefore, no additional in-process trips were added to the background traffic volumes beyond the two percent annual growth that represents general regional growth in the area.

Figure 5 illustrates the resulting forecast 2022 background traffic volumes at the study intersections during the weekday PM peak hour. As shown, all study intersections are forecast to continue operating acceptably during the weekday PM peak hour.

Appendix " $D$ " contains the year 2022 background traffic analysis worksheets.
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## Proposed Development Plan

The proposed development plan includes two auto dealerships which will be constructed on a phased timeline. This analysis includes the full development scenario, and any construction phasing will be coordinated between the applicant and City staff. Based on the current site plan, one driveway is proposed along the SR 99 frontage approximately 325 feet south of $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW. This driveway will provide turning movements restricted to right-in-right-out and left-out to SR 99. No left-in movement will be permitted, restricted by the raised median as shown in Figure 2 and further illustrated in Exhibit 1 below. Additional details and conceptual exhibit of the potential design are included as part of the application package under separate cover. A conceptual rendering of the median treatment and resultant center-lane striping is shown below in Exhibit 1.

Exhibit 1. Left-Out Median Treatment


In addition to access to SR 99, one full access driveway is proposed along the $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW frontage approximately 350 feet west of SR 99 . Occupancy of the dealerships is assumed to occur in 2022, and the analysis herein includes full buildout of the site.

## Trip Generation

Trip generation rates for the proposed dealerships were prepared based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition (Reference 5). Table 4 displays the estimated trip generation for the proposed dealerships. To reflect a conservative analysis, no trips were internalized between the two dealerships.

Table 4. Trip Generation

| Building | Land Use | ITE Code | Size ( $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) | Weekday Trips | Weekday PM Peak Hour Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out |
| North dealership | Auto Sales (New) | 840 | 34,076 | 948 | 83 | 33 | 50 |
| South dealership | Auto Sales (New) | 840 | 57,502 | 1,600 | 140 | 56 | 84 |
| Total |  |  | 91,578 | 2,548 | 223 | 89 | 134 |
| Less Pass-By (20\%)* |  |  |  | 510 | 44 | 22 | 22 |
| Total Net New Tri |  |  |  | 2,038 | 179 | 67 | 112 |

*A localized pass-by rate was identified based on conversations with City staff. The Cities of Burien, WA and Kent, WA both apply a $25 \%$ pass-by trip reduction to auto sales land use. Due to the anticipated upscale nature of the proposed dealerships, a lower pass-by trip reduction of $20 \%$ was agreed-upon by City staff and applied to the analysis.

The above trip generation estimate is based on national rates published by ITE and was used in this analysis for the purposes of reflecting a reasonable worst-case trip generation scenario on the roadway system. Local data was collected at three similar auto dealerships in Lynnwood and the resulting trip generation at similar dealerships is lower than that in Table 4. As such, the analysis in this report reflects reasonable worst-case trip generation impacts, and the actual operations of intersections and driveways are expected to be better than the conditions presented herein. The local data summarized later in this report should be applied to the calculation of the site Transportation Impact Fee (TrIF) at the time of building permit. Additional details of the local trip generation data are provided at the end of this report in the TrIF Considerations section.

## Trip Distribution/Assignment

The trip distribution pattern for the proposed dealerships was developed based on existing travel patterns and a review of the market share analysis for the automobile dealerships. As shown in Figure 6,30 percent of site-generated trips were assumed to be distributed to/from the north on SR 99 and 70 percent of site-generated trips were assumed to be distributed to/from the south on SR 99 (and then distributed according to existing turning movement volumes at SR 99/188 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street SW) based on market and demographic data provided by the applicant. This analysis also assumes all vehicle trips originate to/from SR 99. Recognizing that there may be a small percentage of vehicles that originate from the west, this assumption reflects a potential reasonable worst-case impact to the $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW/SR 99 intersection.


$\overrightarrow{X X \%}$ - TRIP DISTRIBUTION
Negative values indicate pass-by trips

Site-Generated Trips
Weekday PM Peak Hour Lynnwood, Washington

Figure

## 2022 Total Traffic Conditions

The total traffic conditions analysis forecasts how the study area's transportation system will operate with the inclusion of traffic from the proposed dealerships. The estimated site-generated traffic shown in Figure 6 was added to the 2022 background traffic volumes for the weekday PM peak hour shown in Figure 5 to arrive at the 2022 total traffic volumes shown in Figure 7.

As shown in Figure 7, all the study intersections are forecast to continue to meet the operational standards during the weekday PM peak hour.

Appendix "E" contains the year 2022 total traffic analysis worksheets.



# Year 2022 Total Traffic Conditions Weekday PM Peak Hour Lynnwood, Washington 

Figure

## 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$-percentile Queuing Analysis

A $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queuing analysis was performed using Synchro at each of the study intersections. Table 5 summarizes the existing and future $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queues for each movement during the weekday PM peak hour. Queues are rounded to the nearest vehicle length and assumed to be approximately 25 feet. $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue information is contained in Appendix " $B$ ", Appendix " $D$ ", and Appendix " $E$ ".

Table 5. Summary of 95th-percentile Queues

| Intersection | Movement | Queue <br> Storage (ft) | 95th-percentile Queue (ft) |  |  | Adequate Storage Provided? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Existing | 2022 Background | 2022 Total |  |
|  |  |  | PM | PM | PM |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 1: SR 99/ } \\ 188^{\text {th }} \text { Street SW } \end{gathered}$ | EB L | 140 | 325 | 325 | 325 | No |
|  | EB T/R | - | 300 | 300 | 300 | Yes |
|  | WB L | 160 | 300 | 300 | 300 | No |
|  | WB T/R | - | 300 | 500 | 500 | Yes |
|  | NB L | 220 | 100 | 100 | 100 | Yes |
|  | NB T | - | 775 | 900 | 950 | Yes |
|  | NB R | - | 125 | 125 | 125 | Yes |
|  | SB L | 140 | 100 | 100 | 100 | Yes |
|  | SB T | - | 425 | 475 | 500 | Yes |
|  | SB R | - | 25 | 25 | 25 | Yes |
| 2: SR 99/ <br> Site Access | EB L | 25* |  |  | 25 | Yes |
|  | EB R | 25* |  |  | 25 | Yes |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 3: SR 99/ } \\ 186^{\text {th }} \text { Place SW } \end{gathered}$ | EB L/T/R | - | 25 | 25 | 25 | Yes |
|  | WB L/T/R | - | 25 | 25 | 25 | Yes |
|  | NB L | 100 | 25 | 25 | 25 | Yes |
|  | NB T | - | <25 | <25 | <25 | Yes |
|  | NB R | - | <25 | <25 | <25 | Yes |
|  | SB L | 100 | <25 | <25 | <25 | Yes |
|  | SB T | - | <25 | <25 | <25 | Yes |
|  | SB R | - | <25 | <25 | <25 | Yes |
| 4: 186th Place SW/ <br> Site Access | WB L/T | - |  |  | 25 | Yes |
|  | NB L/R | 25* |  |  | 25 | Yes |

[^2]As shown, all queues are projected to be accommodated within the existing turn lane storage lengths under year 2022 total traffic conditions during the weekday PM peak hour, with the following exceptions:

- The eastbound left-turn queue on $188^{\text {th }}$ Street SW at SR 99 is projected to exceed the painted storage length under year 2022 background and total weekday PM peak hour conditions; however, the estimated queue of 325 feet can be accommodated within the existing two-way left-turn lane.
- The westbound left-turn queue on $188^{\text {th }}$ Street SW at SR 99 is projected to exceed the painted storage length under year 2022 background and total conditions during the weekday PM peak hour; however, the estimated queue of 300 feet can be accommodated within the existing two-way left-turn lane.

Traffic from the proposed development is not forecast to increase the queue lengths over existing conditions. As such, no improvements are recommended to address the queues at the study intersections as a result of the traffic volumes associated with the proposed development.

## SR 99 Site Access Sensitivity

The left-out movement proposed at the site access on SR 99 provides significant relief to the eastbound approach to SR 99 from $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW. While the analysis herein assumes a left-out/right-in/right-out as proposed, a sensitivity analysis was prepared to document the impact of no left-out movement at the site access (right-in/right-out only). Table 6 compares the level of service, delay, v/c ratio, and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues at the site access on SR 99 and on the eastbound $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW approach at SR 99 under each access scenario.

Table 6. Access Scenario Comparison

|  | Eastbound $186^{\text {th }}$ PI SW at SR 99 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Access Scenario | LOS | Delay (s) | v/c | 95th-percentile Queue (ft) |
| Right-In/Right Out | E | 47 | 0.57 | 75 |
| Right-In/Right-Out/Left-Out (as proposed) | C | 23 | 0.26 | 25 |

As shown above, the left-out movement as proposed at the site access on SR 99 provides significant improvement of the LOS and queuing at the stop-controlled eastbound approach of SW $186^{\text {th }}$ Place. As such, the site plan as proposed provides the least impact to capacity operations at the study intersections.

## TrIF Considerations

As referenced previously in Trip Generation (Page 14), local auto dealership sites were observed and trip generation data was collected at the site driveways to develop a trip generation rate that reflects the characteristics of regional traffic patterns at auto dealerships in Lynnwood, Washington. Consistent with City of Lynnwood code section 3.105.070 Independent Fee Calculations, the methodology was confirmed with City of Lynnwood traffic engineer. The data collection methodology and resultant trip generation rate are summarized below.

Three sites within Lynnwood were selected based on proximity to state highway facilities, similarity in size to the proposed site, and dealerships that are considered luxury brands similar to the proposed dealerships. The sites were vetted and confirmed with City of Lynnwood engineering staff and are listed below:

- Mercedes-Benz of Lynnwood - 17800 Hwy 99 Lynnwood, WA 98037
- Jaguar Land Rover Dealership Seattle - 19910 Poplar Way Lynnwood, WA 98036
- Lexus of Seattle - 20300 Hwy 99 Lynnwood, WA 98036

Each of the site driveways above were observed during the weekday PM peak period (4:00-6:00 PM), and the number of trips in and out of each site were documented during the peak hour within that time period. The gross leasable area (GLA) of each dealership was obtained to calculate the trip generation rate per thousand square feet of GLA. The results are summarized in Table 7 below.

Table 7. Trip Generation Study Summary

| Site | Size (SF) | Observed Analysis Period | Peak Hour of Generator | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | In | Out | Total |
| Mercedes-Benz of Lynnwood | 34,100 | 4:00-6:00 PM | 4:45-5:45 PM | 35 | 34 | 69 |
| Lexus of Seattle | 33,753 | 4:00-6:00 PM | 4:10-5:10 PM | 20 | 43 | 63 |
| Jaguar Land Rover Dealership Seattle | 28,968 | 4:00-6:00 PM | 4:00-5:00 PM | 18 | 19 | 37 |

The total trips above were observed during the same period as the COVID-19 pandemic. As such, the same calibration factor is applied to the trip generation data in Table 7. The volumes are increase by 17 percent to arrive at the trip generation rate shown below in Table 8.

Table 8. Calibrated Trip Generation Study Summary

| Site | Size (SF) | Observed Total <br> Trips | Calibrated Total <br> Trips (increase by <br> 17\%) | Calibrated Trip <br> Generation Rate <br> (Trips/1,000 SF) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mercedes-Benz of Lynnwood | 34,100 | 69 | 81 | 2.38 |
| Lexus of Seattle | 33,753 | 63 | 74 | 2.19 |
| Jaguar Land Rover Dealership Seattle | 28,968 | 37 | 43 | 1.48 |
| Average Trip Generation Rate | $\mathbf{2 . 0 2}$ |  |  |  |

The calibrated trip generation rate in Table 8 is applied to the proposed development size of 91,578 square feet. The resulting trip generation (and proportional in/out split) thus expected from the proposed development using this rate is summarized in Table 9 below.

Table 9. Proposed Development Resulting Estimated Trips

| Site | Size (SF) | Trip Generation Rate (trips/1,000 SF) | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | In | Out |
| Proposed Development | 91,578 | 2.02 | 185 | 80 | 105 |
| Less Pass-by (20\%) |  |  | (37) | (16) | (21) |
| Total Net New Trips |  |  | 148 | 64 | 84 |

As summarized in Table 9, application of local data results in a trip generation of approximately 148 trips during the weekday PM peak hour. At the time of building permit application, the trips shown in Table 9 should be considered for applicable TrIF assessments.

The raw trip generation data for each car dealership is included in Appendix "F."

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this transportation impact analysis, the proposed dealerships can be developed while maintaining acceptable levels of service at the study intersections. The primary recommendations of this study are summarized as follows:

- Provide a full-access driveway on $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW per the proposed site plan (see page 4 , Figure 2).
- Provide a right-in, right-out, left-out driveway on SR 99 per the proposed site plan (see page 4, Figure 2). Construct a raised traffic separator and provide revised lane striping at the site driveway at SR 99 to restrict left-in movements into the site from SR 99. A concept design is provided in Exhibit 1 of this report (see page 13), and additional details are provided with the civil engineering drawings under separate cover.
- At the time of building permit, refer to the localized trip generation information presented in Table 9 of this report. The resultant trip generation is estimated at 148 weekday PM peak hour trips ( 64 inbound and 84 outbound).
- Landscaping, signage, and above-ground utilities along the site frontage and near the site access should be located and maintained so that adequate sight distance can be provided at the site access driveways on SR 99 and $186^{\text {th }}$ Place SW.

We trust this document adequately addresses the transportation-related impacts of the proposed dealerships. If you have any questions, please contact us at 503-535-7462.

Sincerely,
KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.


Senior Principal Engineer
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## Appendix A

Traffic Counts

## SR 99 <br> 188th St SW

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 4:00 PM | 3 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| 4:15 PM | 2 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 4:30 PM | 3 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 10 |
| 4:45 PM | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Count Total | 11 | 5 | 54 | 49 | 119 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 32 |
| Peak Hour | 2 | 2 | 28 | 17 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 10 |


| $\stackrel{59}{\gtrless}$ <br> 33 |  |  |  |  |  | W <br> r |  |  |  | 11 $\rightarrow_{8}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HV \%: } \\ & \hline 0.0 \% \\ & 0.0 \% \\ & 1.5 \% \\ & 1.6 \% \\ & 1.5 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | to <br> $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \rightarrow$ <br> の <br> 院 <br> 1 <br> 0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:00 } \\ & \text { 6:00 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | 186th St SW |  |  |  | Dwy |  |  |  | SR 99 |  |  |  | SR 99 |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 15-min } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 441 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 249 | 5 | 715 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 394 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 268 | 9 | 695 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 396 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 297 | 3 | 719 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 386 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 266 | 3 | 693 | 2,822 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 436 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 274 | 3 | 736 | 2,843 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 462 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 238 | 6 | 727 | 2,875 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 434 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 302 | 3 | 759 | 2,915 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 444 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 246 | 4 | 725 | 2,947 |
| Count Total | 0 | 24 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 88 | 3,393 | 14 | 0 | 5 | 2,140 | 36 | 5,769 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 9 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 43 | 1,776 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1,060 | 16 | 2,947 | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 52 | 47 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 28 | 17 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

## Appendix B <br> Existing Conditions Traffic Analysis Worksheets

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBU | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 个 |  |  | * | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 44 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 169 | 190 | 39 | 158 | 230 | 61 |  | 41 | 1618 | 190 | 48 | 995 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 169 | 190 | 39 | 158 | 230 | 61 | 1 | 41 | 1618 | 190 | 48 | 995 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 2136 | 2121 | 2121 | 1611 | 1597 | 1597 |  | 2027 | 2027 | 2027 | 1817 | 1817 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 176 | 198 | 0 | 165 | 240 | 54 |  | 43 | 1685 | 136 | 50 | 1036 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |  | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 204 | 394 |  | 185 | 260 | 59 |  | 57 | 2065 | 921 | 71 | 1890 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.10 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.21 | 0.21 |  | 0.03 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.04 | 0.55 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 2034 | 2121 | 0 | 1535 | 1262 | 284 |  | 1931 | 3852 | 1718 | 1731 | 3453 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 176 | 198 | 0 | 165 | 0 | 294 |  | 43 | 1685 | 136 | 50 | 1036 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 2034 | 2121 | 0 | 1535 | 0 | 1545 |  | 1931 | 1926 | 1718 | 1731 | 1726 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 12.8 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 28.0 |  | 3.3 | 54.1 | 6.0 | 4.3 | 29.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 12.8 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 28.0 |  | 3.3 | 54.1 | 6.0 | 4.3 | 29.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.18 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 204 | 394 |  | 185 | 0 | 319 |  | 57 | 2065 | 921 | 71 | 1890 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.86 | 0.50 |  | 0.89 | 0.00 | 0.92 |  | 0.75 | 0.82 | 0.15 | 0.71 | 0.55 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 285 | 438 |  | 266 | 0 | 371 |  | 270 | 2065 | 921 | 242 | 1890 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 66.5 | 54.9 | 0.0 | 65.0 | 0.0 | 58.3 |  | 72.2 | 28.7 | 17.5 | 71.0 | 22.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 17.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 26.4 |  | 7.1 | 3.7 | 0.3 | 4.8 | 1.1 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(95\%),veh/ln | 12.2 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 19.3 |  | 3.1 | 32.8 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 17.2 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 84.1 | 55.9 | 0.0 | 86.9 | 0.0 | 84.8 |  | 79.4 | 32.4 | 17.9 | 75.8 | 23.1 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | E |  | F | A | F |  | E | C | B | E | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 374 | A |  | 459 |  |  |  | 1864 |  |  | 1100 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 69.2 |  |  | 85.5 |  |  |  | 32.4 |  |  | 25.4 |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | F |  |  |  | C |  |  | C |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 10.1 | 85.9 | 22.1 | 31.8 | 8.5 | 87.6 | 19.0 | 34.9 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 21.0 | 54.5 | 26.0 | 31.0 | 21.0 | 54.5 | 21.0 | 36.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 6.3 | 56.1 | 17.9 | 14.6 | 5.3 | 31.1 | 14.8 | 30.0 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 0.2 | 1.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 40.4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |

## Notes

User approved ignoring U-Turning movement.
Unsignalized Delay for [EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{*}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 中4 | 「 |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 9 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 43 | 1847 | 6 | 2 | 1102 | 16 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 9 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 43 | 1847 | 6 | 2 | 1102 | 16 |
| 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 | － | － | － | － | － | － | 100 | － | 0 | 100 | － | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | \＃ | 1 | － | － | 1 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | －6 | － | － | 0 | － | － | －2 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 0 | 25 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 44 | 1904 | 6 | 2 | 1136 | 16 |
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## Appendix D

2022 Background Traffic Conditions Traffic Analysis Worksheets

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBU | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | * | 中4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 44 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 169 | 190 | 39 | 158 | 230 | 61 | 1 | 41 | 1683 | 190 | 48 | 1035 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 169 | 190 | 39 | 158 | 230 | 61 | 1 | 41 | 1683 | 190 | 48 | 1035 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 2136 | 2121 | 2121 | 1611 | 1597 | 1597 |  | 2027 | 2027 | 2027 | 1817 | 1817 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 176 | 198 | 0 | 165 | 240 | 54 |  | 43 | 1753 | 136 | 50 | 1078 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |  | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 204 | 394 |  | 185 | 260 | 59 |  | 57 | 2065 | 921 | 71 | 1890 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.10 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.21 | 0.21 |  | 0.03 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.04 | 0.55 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 2034 | 2121 | 0 | 1535 | 1262 | 284 |  | 1931 | 3852 | 1718 | 1731 | 3453 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 176 | 198 | 0 | 165 | 0 | 294 |  | 43 | 1753 | 136 | 50 | 1078 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 2034 | 2121 | 0 | 1535 | 0 | 1545 |  | 1931 | 1926 | 1718 | 1731 | 1726 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 12.8 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 28.0 |  | 3.3 | 58.1 | 6.0 | 4.3 | 30.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 12.8 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 28.0 |  | 3.3 | 58.1 | 6.0 | 4.3 | 30.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.18 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 204 | 394 |  | 185 | 0 | 319 |  | 57 | 2065 | 921 | 71 | 1890 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.86 | 0.50 |  | 0.89 | 0.00 | 0.92 |  | 0.75 | 0.85 | 0.15 | 0.71 | 0.57 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 285 | 438 |  | 266 | 0 | 371 |  | 270 | 2065 | 921 | 242 | 1890 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 66.5 | 54.9 | 0.0 | 65.0 | 0.0 | 58.3 |  | 72.2 | 29.6 | 17.5 | 71.0 | 22.3 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 17.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 26.4 |  | 7.1 | 4.6 | 0.3 | 4.8 | 1.3 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(95\%),veh/ln | 12.2 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 19.3 |  | 3.1 | 35.1 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 18.1 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 84.1 | 55.9 | 0.0 | 86.9 | 0.0 | 84.8 |  | 79.4 | 34.2 | 17.9 | 75.8 | 23.6 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | E |  | F | A | F |  | E | C | B | E | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 374 | A |  | 459 |  |  |  | 1932 |  |  | 1142 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 69.2 |  |  | 85.5 |  |  |  | 34.1 |  |  | 25.8 |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | F |  |  |  | C |  |  | C |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 10.1 | 85.9 | 22.1 | 31.8 | 8.5 | 87.6 | 19.0 | 34.9 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 21.0 | 54.5 | 26.0 | 31.0 | 21.0 | 54.5 | 21.0 | 36.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 6.3 | 60.1 | 17.9 | 14.6 | 5.3 | 32.8 | 14.8 | 30.0 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 0.2 | 1.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 41.1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |

## Notes

User approved ignoring U-Turning movement.
Unsignalized Delay for [EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

[^5]Synchro 10 Report
Page 1


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \＆ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 中4 | 「 |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 9 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 43 | 1921 | 6 | 2 | 1146 | 16 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 9 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 43 | 1921 | 6 | 2 | 1146 | 16 |
| 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 | － | － | － | － | － | － | 100 | － | 0 | 100 | － | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | \＃ | 1 | － | － | 1 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | －6 | － | － | 0 | － | － | －2 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 0 | 25 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 44 | 1980 | 6 | 2 | 1181 | 16 |



## Appendix E

2022 Total Traffic Conditions Traffic Analysis Worksheets

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBU | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |  | * | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 173 | 190 | 39 | 158 | 230 | 63 | 1 | 41 | 1724 | 190 | 51 | 1105 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 173 | 190 | 39 | 158 | 230 | 63 | 1 | 41 | 1724 | 190 | 51 | 1105 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 2136 | 2121 | 2121 | 1611 | 1597 | 1597 |  | 2027 | 2027 | 2027 | 1817 | 1817 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 180 | 198 | 0 | 165 | 240 | 56 |  | 43 | 1796 | 136 | 53 | 1151 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |  | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 207 | 400 |  | 185 | 260 | 61 |  | 57 | 2050 | 914 | 72 | 1878 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.10 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.21 | 0.21 |  | 0.03 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.04 | 0.54 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 2034 | 2121 | 0 | 1535 | 1252 | 292 |  | 1931 | 3852 | 1718 | 1731 | 3453 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 180 | 198 | 0 | 165 | 0 | 296 |  | 43 | 1796 | 136 | 53 | 1151 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 2034 | 2121 | 0 | 1535 | 0 | 1544 |  | 1931 | 1926 | 1718 | 1731 | 1726 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 13.1 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 28.2 |  | 3.3 | 61.3 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 34.2 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 13.1 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 28.2 |  | 3.3 | 61.3 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 34.2 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.19 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 207 | 400 |  | 185 | 0 | 321 |  | 57 | 2050 | 914 | 72 | 1878 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.87 | 0.49 |  | 0.89 | 0.00 | 0.92 |  | 0.75 | 0.88 | 0.15 | 0.74 | 0.61 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 285 | 438 |  | 266 | 0 | 371 |  | 270 | 2050 | 914 | 242 | 1878 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 66.4 | 54.4 | 0.0 | 65.0 | 0.0 | 58.3 |  | 72.2 | 30.8 | 17.8 | 71.1 | 23.4 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 18.4 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 26.7 |  | 7.1 | 5.6 | 0.3 | 5.4 | 1.5 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(95\%),veh/ln | 12.5 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 19.4 |  | 3.1 | 37.1 | 4.6 | 3.8 | 19.8 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 84.7 | 55.4 | 0.0 | 86.9 | 0.0 | 85.0 |  | 79.4 | 36.4 | 18.2 | 76.5 | 24.9 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | E |  | F | A | F |  | E | D | B | E | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 378 | A |  | 461 |  |  |  | 1975 |  |  | 1223 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 69.4 |  |  | 85.7 |  |  |  | 36.1 |  |  | 27.0 |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | F |  |  |  | D |  |  | C |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 10.2 | 85.3 | 22.1 | 32.3 | 8.5 | 87.1 | 19.3 | 35.1 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 21.0 | 54.5 | 26.0 | 31.0 | 21.0 | 54.5 | 21.0 | 36.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 6.5 | 63.3 | 17.9 | 14.5 | 5.3 | 36.2 | 15.1 | 30.2 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 0.2 | 1.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 42.1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |

## Notes

User approved ignoring U-Turning movement.
Unsignalized Delay for [EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |



[^7]| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | * |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 44 | F゙ | ${ }^{*}$ | 44 | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 19 | 0 | 46 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 104 | 1945 | 6 | 2 | 1156 | 26 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 19 | 0 | 46 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 104 | 1945 | 6 | 2 | 1156 | 26 |
| 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 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | - | 0 | 100 | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | -6 | - | - | 0 | - | - | -2 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 20 | 0 | 47 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 107 | 2005 | 6 | 2 | 1192 | 27 |
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



[^9]
## Appendix F

Local Trip Generation Data


Comments:


Comments:


Comments:




Comments:


Comments:

## Appendix B

Revised 2022 Total Traffic Conditions Traffic Analysis Worksheets

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBU | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |  | * | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 195 | 193 | 72 | 158 | 232 | 62 | 1 | 94 | 1687 | 190 | 49 | 1100 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 195 | 193 | 72 | 158 | 232 | 62 | 1 | 94 | 1687 | 190 | 49 | 1100 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 2136 | 2121 | 2136 | 1611 | 1597 | 1611 |  | 2027 | 2027 | 2027 | 1817 | 1817 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 203 | 201 | 0 | 165 | 242 | 55 |  | 98 | 1757 | 136 | 51 | 1146 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |  | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 230 | 425 |  | 185 | 262 | 60 |  | 121 | 2007 | 895 | 71 | 1724 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.11 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.21 | 0.21 |  | 0.06 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.04 | 0.50 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 2034 | 2121 | 0 | 1535 | 1259 | 286 |  | 1931 | 3852 | 1718 | 1731 | 3453 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 203 | 201 | 0 | 165 | 0 | 297 |  | 98 | 1757 | 136 | 51 | 1146 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 2034 | 2121 | 0 | 1535 | 0 | 1545 |  | 1931 | 1926 | 1718 | 1731 | 1726 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 14.7 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 28.3 |  | 7.5 | 60.3 | 6.2 | 4.4 | 37.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 14.7 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 28.3 |  | 7.5 | 60.3 | 6.2 | 4.4 | 37.3 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.19 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 230 | 425 |  | 185 | 0 | 322 |  | 121 | 2007 | 895 | 71 | 1724 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.88 | 0.47 |  | 0.89 | 0.00 | 0.92 |  | 0.81 | 0.88 | 0.15 | 0.72 | 0.66 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 285 | 438 |  | 266 | 0 | 371 |  | 270 | 2007 | 895 | 242 | 1724 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 65.5 | 53.0 | 0.0 | 65.0 | 0.0 | 58.2 |  | 69.4 | 31.6 | 18.7 | 71.1 | 28.1 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 22.7 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 26.8 |  | 4.7 | 5.7 | 0.4 | 5.0 | 2.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(95\%),veh/ln | 14.1 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 19.5 |  | 6.9 | 36.8 | 0.2 | 3.6 | 21.8 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 88.2 | 53.8 | 0.0 | 86.9 | 0.0 | 85.0 |  | 74.1 | 37.3 | 19.0 | 76.0 | 30.2 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | D |  | F | A | F |  | E | D | B | E | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 404 | A |  | 462 |  |  |  | 1991 |  |  | 1215 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 71.1 |  |  | 85.7 |  |  |  | 37.9 |  |  | 31.9 |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | F |  |  |  | D |  |  | C |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 10.2 | 83.7 | 22.1 | 34.1 | 13.4 | 80.4 | 21.0 | 35.2 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 21.0 | 54.5 | 26.0 | 31.0 | 21.0 | 54.5 | 21.0 | 36.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 6.4 | 62.3 | 17.9 | 14.6 | 9.5 | 39.3 | 16.7 | 30.3 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 8.7 | 0.2 | 1.0 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 44.8

HCM 6th LOS D

## Notes

User approved ignoring U-Turning movement.
Unsignalized Delay for [EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |



[^11]| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | * |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 44 | F゙ | ${ }^{*}$ | 44 | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 0 | 34 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 70 | 1958 | 6 | 2 | 1169 | 21 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 0 | 34 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 70 | 1958 | 6 | 2 | 1169 | 21 |
| 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 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | - | 0 | 100 | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | -6 | - | - | 0 | - | - | -2 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 21 | 0 | 35 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 72 | 2019 | 6 | 2 | 1205 | 22 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | - | rin |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 33 | 0 | 32 | 59 | 0 | 21 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 33 | 0 | 32 | 59 | 0 | 21 |
| 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, \% | -6 | - | - | 6 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 34 | 0 | 33 | 61 | 0 | 22 |



[^12]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ WSDOT level of service standards apply to a peak hour of analysis; therefore, the level of service and queuing results shown on SR 99 may operate better than what is shown for the 15-minute analysis.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (2020-2023)

[^2]:    $E B=$ eastbound, $W B=$ westbound, $N B=$ northbound, $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound, $\mathrm{L}=$ left, $\mathrm{T}=$ through, $\mathrm{R}=$ right, $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{T} / \mathrm{R}=$ shared left/through/right, $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{R}=$ shared through/right
    *Driveway storage based on project site plan

[^3]:    Lynnwood Holman Automotive 01/03/2021 Existing PM ZHB

[^4]:    Lynnwood Holman Automotive 01／03／2021 Existing PM ZHB

[^5]:    Lynnwood Holman Automotive 01/03/2021 Background PM ZHB

[^6]:    Lynnwood Holman Automotive 01/03/2021 Total PM with Right-In/Right-Out/Left-In Access ZHB

[^7]:    Lynnwood Holman Automotive 01/03/2021 Total PM with Right-In/Right-Out/Left-In Access

[^8]:    Lynnwood Holman Automotive 01/03/2021 Total PM with Right-In/Right-Out/Left-In Access ZHB

[^9]:    Lynnwood Holman Automotive 01/03/2021 Total PM with Right-In/Right-Out/Left-In Access

[^10]:    Lynnwood BMW Dealership 01/03/2021 Revised 2022 Total PM ZHB

[^11]:    Lynnwood BMW Dealership 01/03/2021 Revised 2022 Total PM ZHB

[^12]:    Lynnwood BMW Dealership 01/03/2021 Revised 2022 Total PM

