Appendix A: Public Outreach Plan

10/25/22

Meridian Avenue (SR 161) Corridor Study Public Outreach Plan

Presented by

transpogroup

Project Overview

The purpose of this study effort is to assess multimodal, access, safety, and environmental needs for SR 161 (Meridian Avenue) from 24th Street E to the southern City limits and confirm future cross-sectional elements and intersection treatments. Key intersections will be analyzed, and strategies and concepts will be developed to improve operations, safety performance, and accessibility for all corridor users. To support the eventual outcomes, input will be sought through a stakeholder outreach effort, and preliminary designs and cost estimates will be prepared for the study recommendation to assist in seeking funds to implement the improvements.

Overall 2022 Work Plan

- Corridor Assessment: Aug – Nov 2022
- Community Outreach: Sept 2022 – July 2023
- Development and Evaluation of Alternatives: Oct 2022 – May 2023
- Summary of Recommendations: Jan – July 2023

Project Background

The City of Edgewood's 2023-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) contains Project #2 that will conduct a preliminary design study of the Meridian Avenue E corridor south of 24th Street. The project will assist the City in defining the extent of the corridor "complete street" improvements such as number of travel lanes, sidewalks, bicycle facilities, and stormwater treatment and detention. The design effort will also consider intersection and access management improvements to address level of service and safety issues along this segment of the corridor.

The Meridian Avenue Preliminary Design Study has been informed by a feasibility assessment that was conducted in 2020 of installing a traffic signal or constructing a roundabout at the Meridian Avenue / 32nd Street E intersection. The traffic signal was found to not meet signal warrants, and constructing a roundabout was shown to cost more than $2 million dollars. The roundabout would primarily benefit the approximately 30 vehicles per hour that are attempting to turn left from the west approach. Vehicles attempting to turn left from the east approach have alternative routes they could utilize during periods of heavy congestion.

Due to the costs and impacts of constructing a roundabout at the Meridian Avenue / 32nd Street E intersection, and the fact it would benefit a few vehicle trips, a more comprehensive evaluation of alternatives is needed to address the LOS and safety issues along Meridian Avenue between 24th Street E and 36th Street. Alternatives could include access management treatments with complimentary designated u-turns at 24th Street E and 36th Street E intersections. A roundabout at 36th Street E, as identified in the recently prepared Chrisella Road Alternatives Assessment, will provide more benefits at a similar cost to a roundabout at 32nd Street E. Similarly, the section of Meridian Ave between 36th Street E and the southern

City limits will be evaluated to determine how to transition the preferred cross-section at 36th Street E to an appropriate multi-modal section between 36th Street E and the southern City limits, while also evaluating appropriate access to the growing areas on the southern end of the City.

The Meridian Avenue Preliminary Design Study will help the City work with WSDOT to confirm the long-term strategy for addressing operations and safety needs along this stretch of Meridian Avenue, collaborate and coordinate approvals with WSDOT for the future design, and support the City's Town Center Plan effort and other planned land use growth along the corridor.

Public Involvement Plan Overview

The public involvement plan consists of a number of goals and objectives across a few different groups.

A **Corridor Working Group** will first be established to help guide and inform the study throughout the project. The efforts of this group will be a critical element to the study to confirm outcomes and build support for the final recommendations.

Stakeholder interviews will be conducted to help gain a broader understanding of diverse interests in identifying solutions along this segment of the highway.

A **public online survey** will be conducted to inform and gather feedback on the corridor. In conjunction with the survey, we will host a **virtual open house** as an additional way to inform the public of the corridor study and gather input, ideas, and feedback, helping to ensure the study is meeting public needs and expectations. After alternatives and project priorities have been identified and the survey completed, we will then host an **in-person public workshop**.

And finally, the **City Council** will receive periodic updates on preliminary design study and final recommendations.

Communication Goals

- Establish a working group to guide the study, provide input, and help summarize and communicate recommendations.
- Actively engage stakeholders and potentially impacted property owners to ensure broad understanding of common interests and concerns.
- Educate and engage the public to generate ideas, gather input, and ensure public expectations are being met.

Plan Elements

Working Group

The Working Group will help guide the study and provide input on key findings and recommendations. The project team will prepare and present materials and seek feedback from this group throughout the study. The meetings are expected to be held generally every other month (4 total), or more frequent as deemed appropriate.

Working Group Members to include:

- City of Edgewood staff
  - Jeremy Metzler, Public Works Director
  - Morgan Dorner, Senior Planner
  - Evan Hietpas, Associate Planner
  - Jamie Ward, Associate Engineer
  - Chuck Hendricksen, City Engineer
- WSDOT
  - Sarah Ott, Olympic Region Traffic Engineer (ottsara@wsdot.wa.gov)
  - George Mazur, Olympic Region Planning Manager (mazurg@wsdot.wa.gov)
- Pierce Transit
  - Tina Vaslet, Planner II – Bus Stops (tvaslet@piercetransit.org)
  - Darin Stavish, Principal Planner (dstavish@piercetransit.org)
  - Tina Lee, PMP, Planning Manager (tlee@piercetransit.org)
- Puyallup Tribe
  - Russ Ladley, Fisheries (russ.ladley@puyalluptribe-nsn.gov)
  - Andrew Strobel, Land Use (andrew.strobel@puyalluptribe-nsn.gov)
- City of Milton
  - Dustin Madden, Public Works Director (dmadden@cityofmilton.net)
  - Angelie Stahlnecker, Planning Manager (astahlnecker@cityofmilton.net)
- City of Puyallup
  - Hans Hunger, City Engineer (hhunger@puyallupwa.gov)
  - Chris Beale, Senior Planner (cbeale@puyallupwa.gov)
- Union Pacific Railroad
  - Peggy J. Ygbuhay, UPRR Western States Public Project Manager (pygbuhay@up.com)

Working Group Meeting Agendas:

Meeting 1 – Oct 26 3-4:30pm (Virtual) – 90-minute meeting

- Introductions
- Scope/Schedule/Project Overview
- Data Inventory Overview
- Confirm Project Objectives - purpose and need
- Next steps, what to expect

Meeting 2

- Review Existing and Future Needs
- Develop List of Preliminary Alternatives

Meeting 3

- Review Evaluation Findings
- Review Conceptual Designs / Costs

Meeting 4

- Review Recommendations and Phasing
- Discuss the Draft Report

Timeframe: September (establish group members), October - June (4 meetings to be scheduled)

Responsibilities:

City: Identify Working Group members. Send email inviting participation.

Consultant: Prepare text of email invitation. Schedule 4 initial Working Group Meetings and finalize agendas.

Stakeholder Interviews

To gain a broader understanding of diverse interests in identifying issues and solutions along this segment of the highway, Transpo will conduct up to 5, one-on-one interviews with local stakeholders, such as impacted businesses or property owners that have an interest or influence regarding the corridor. Additional stakeholder interviews may be conducted by City staff. The interviews will inquire and investigate key challenges, and opportunities for improving the corridor. Transpo will prepare a discussion script and a draft and final summary of responses. The feedback will be used to confirm the issues and inform the types of solutions that should be considered.

Timeframe: October – November

Stakeholders (as identified by Jeremy)

- Mt. View – Edgewood Water Company: Mike Craig, General Manager, 253-863-7348
  Interview scheduled: October 18, 11am
- Nightside Distillery: Tom Greene, Owner, 253-377-1379, etgreene@hotmail.com
  Interview scheduled: October 25, 9am
- The Ballet Theatre School: 253-927-3526, **Kathy Wilson, theballettheatreschool@gmail.com**
  Responded, no formal interview but gave feedback over phone
- North Hill Community Fellowship: 253-446-9902
  Interview scheduled: no response
- Austin's Auto Sales: 253-256-7117
  Interview scheduled: no response

Deliverables:

City/Working Group: Identify key stakeholders by end of September

Consultant: Prepare list of questions, Schedule/conduct interviews Oct-Nov

Final Questions (to be sent to stakeholders prior to phone interview):

1. How does your organization use the corridor today (storefront, parking, employee commute, transit, etc.)?
2. What issues do you currently experience that impact your organization?
3. Do the conditions along Meridian Avenue impact your decision on locating your organization in Edgewood? (i.e. Does current layout attract or deter investment? Would new improvements help retain your investment?)
4. Are there examples of street design elements in other communities that you would like to see replicated along Meridian? (Business-friendly, attractive, walkable, safe)
5. Is there anything unique to your organization that the study team should be aware of as we evaluate options for the corridor?

6. Are you interested in staying involved in the study? If so, what is the best way to communicate with you?

Hybrid Open House

Schedule and promote an online open house to the general public to begin educating the public about the study, and gathering general input, identifying issues, and gathering feedback. Initial public meeting will also help to inform a more detailed survey to be conducted in January.

Scheduled Date: November 17, 6:00pm start time (to be run by council first)

Responsibilities:

City/Working Group: Help promote Open House to key targeted groups and general public through Working Group channels

Consultant: Schedule and lead Open House

Checklist for event:

- Begin promoting by October 17. Transpo to provide invite language by this date.
- Who will be there?
- Confirm materials we need to develop, confirm location/date
- Presentation/online materials –
    - Copies of presentation
    - Boards with corridor map/segment/aerial roll plot
    - Copies of Fact Sheet
- Format – hosted both online and in-person at the same time. Materials provided online for download later.
- City/CWG to notify/invite participants and promote event
- Transpo to supply invite materials – postcard to property owners? Promote on social media posts, Tacoma News Tribune ad, electronic reader board announcement, mention at board meetings, email distribution list.

Online Survey

Create and post a public online survey to gather input, ideas, and feedback. The survey will help further ensure input from a variety of groups and will target specific input on alternatives and issues that may have arisen from the Virtual Open House.

Timeframe: January

Responsibilities:

City/Working Group: Provide input on survey contents, help promote survey through variety of communication channels

Consultant: Design and create online survey, summarize results

In-person Workshop

After feedback has been gathered via the initial open house and survey, and alternatives and priorities have been established, we will host an in-person workshop that share the draft alternatives and priorities and gather feedback on those specifics.

Timeframe: February or March

Responsibilities:

City/Working Group: Help promote in-person workshop through various communication channels, host workshop

Consultant: Schedule and lead workshop, create materials for public education of the alternatives

Promotional Strategies

To promote the virtual open house, survey, and in-person workshop, the City will help to identify the key groups/target audiences that should provide input, including identification of hard-to-reach groups to ensure diverse and inclusive feedback throughout the process.

Promotional materials may include a project website, flyers with QR codes to online information and survey, social media posts, personal invitations to key stakeholders, etc.

City Council Meetings

The project team will present to the City Council during two meetings at key milestones of the project to ensure City Council input is utilized in decisions. Presentations will focus on preliminary design study, and review of the final recommendations.

Timeframe: February and June Council Meetings

Overall Project Schedule

transpogroup

Number / Project Name

Meridian Avenue Corridor Study

UPDATED DRAFT (9/20/2022)

	2022					2023						
Work Task	**Aug**	**Sept**	**Oct**	**Nov**	**Dec**	**Jan**	**Feb**	**Mar**	**Apr**	**May**	**June**	**July**
Community Outreach												
Corridor Work Group Meetings			X		X			X			X	
Establish Project Objectives / Eval. Criteria												
Stakeholder Interviews / Outreach												
Online Survey						S						
Open House and Workshop				O				W				
City Council Meetings							CC				CC	
Project Team Meetings	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Corridor Assessment												
Traffic Counts / Safety Analysis												
LiDAR & Photogrammetry Data												
Base Map Development												
Travel Forecasts & Operations Analysis												
Development and Evaluation of Alternatives												
Develop Alternatives												
Evaluate Alternatives												
Complete WSDOT ICE(s)												
Summarize Recommendations												
Prepare Preliminary Plans and Costs												
Identify Potential Phasing / Funding Strategies												
Document Findings												

O Open House
S Online Survey
W Workshop
CC City Council Meeting

Detailed Public Outreach Work Plan

The overall work plan below will serve as the roadmap for implementation of the Public Outreach Plan. Detailed work plans will be developed for components of the plan that requires coordination between consultants and City staff for successful implementation. A sample detailed work plan follows the overall schedule below.

Overall Work Plan

month	activities
September	• Establish Working Group members • Identify key stakeholders and schedule interviews
October	• Conduct stakeholder interviews • Conduct first Working Group meeting
November	• Conduct stakeholder interviews • Host Virtual Open House
December	• Conduct second Working Group meeting • Create and design online survey
January	• Conduct online survey
February	• Analyze and share results of online survey • Schedule in-person Workshop • Present to City Council
March	• Conduct in-person Workshop • Conduct third Working Group meeting • Schedule in-person Workshop
June	• Conduct fourth Working Group meeting • Present to City Council

Appendix B: Public Outreach Feedback

Appendix B: Stakeholder Feedback Q&A

Meridian Ave Corridor Study – Stakeholder Feedback/Questions

Meeting with WSDOT – March 28th

1. **How would the ranking/scoring of alternatives change if the weighting factors for the Intersection Operations and Safety evaluation criteria were adjusted to give greater influence to the safety criterion?**

   Answer: Although the Intersection Operations evaluation criteria was given the largest weighting factor based on feedback received from the community, the design alternatives which received the overall highest scores were not the Alternatives which scored highest for the Intersection Operations criteria. For Segment 1, Alternative C scored the highest overall, despite Alternative B scoring highest for the Intersection Operations criterion. Similarly, for Segment 2, Alternative A scored the highest overall, despite Alternative B scoring highest for the Intersection Operations criterion.

   If the weighting factors were adjusted so that the Roadway (Vehicle) Safety criterion were given greater influence than the Intersection Operations criterion, the ranking of the alternatives based on overall score would not change for either Segment 1 or 2. Alternatives C and A would continue to score the highest for Segments 1 and 2, respectively.

2. **WSDOT typically uses a threshold of 24,000 vehicles per day for determining roadways which are candidates for road diets. If the study corridor is fed by segments of Meridian Avenue which are two-lane facilities, would the widening of the current 3-lane facility be necessary to accommodate traffic volume demands?**

   Answer: Based on the forecast peak hour volumes, Segment 1 along the corridor is expected to carry approximately 21,000 daily vehicle trips under future (2035) conditions. Generally, a three-lane roadway in an urban setting provides an operational capacity of between 18,000-21,000 daily vehicles. Currently, the portion of Meridian Avenue evaluated by the project represents the narrowest portion of the corridor with the least capacity in terms of the number of travel lanes. Along Segment 1 (between 24th Street and 36th Street), the roadway provides only one travel lane per direction. Along Segment 2, the roadway provides one southbound lane along the entire segment and two northbound lanes between 36th Street and Dechaux Road and one northbound travel lane between Dechaux Road and Spencer Street (across the Union Pacific Railroad tracks).

   North of the project segment, Meridian Avenue provides two travel lanes in each direction through Edgewood's Town Center area and into King County. The roadway continues northward as Enchanted Parkway where it continues to provide two travel lanes per direction past its interchange with SR-18 and I-5 in the City of Federal Way. South of the project segment, Meridian Avenue provides two travel lanes in each direction as it enters the City of Puyallup and connects with the SR-167 freeway. At River Road/2nd Street in Puyallup, the southbound traffic continues via a two-lane one-way segment along Meridian Avenue, while northbound traffic travels via a two-lane one-way segment along 2nd Street.

It should also be noted that, along the project segment of Meridian Avenue, the northbound approach at 24th Street and the southbound approach at 36th Street have already been widened to provide a 4- or 5-lane cross-section. Thus, widening Segment 1 of the roadway would implement a consistent cross-section along the approximately 3,500-foot segment between these two intersections.

Therefore, the project segment of Meridian Avenue is not fed by any other two-lane facilities and the project segment, with reduced lane capacity, serves as the bottleneck constraint along the rest of the corridor.

3. **Since a bicycle trail is proposed parallel to Segment 2, would bicycle traffic be shifted away from the shared used path along the corridor? The plans for the proposed concept plans show bicycle ramps connecting to this proposed facility along the east side of the roadway. Are these ramps necessary?**

   Answer: It is the City's goal to provide a facility for bicyclists adjacent to the Meridian Avenue corridor which support bicycle usage for riders of all ability and comfort levels. This alternate facility would provide a proximate, parallel facility for bicycle traffic away from the high speeds and volumes along Meridian Avenue. While many riders may choose to use the off-street facility, some riders may elect to use the shared use path proposed along Meridian Avenue. The provision of both facilities provides bicyclists with multiple options for traveling between the City and the Puyallup Valley. As such, bicycle ramps are provided along Meridian Avenue to connect to the shared use path along the south approach of Meridian Avenue at 36th Street.

4. **How will the 11-foot shared use path area along Segment 1 be delineated between bicycle and pedestrian traffic?**

   Answer: Upon further design of the pedestrian and bicycle facilities along Segment 1, the City plans to provide marked separation between bicycle traffic and pedestrian traffic along the off-street shared-use path. The marking of dedicated pedestrian and bicycle space along the roadway will be determined as the design of the project is advanced.

5. **The information provided in the presentation appears to provide greater context regarding the decisions behind why the 2-lane configuration for Segment 1 was not advanced to the Level 2 screening process than in the report. Can this information be documented/ expanded upon in the report to provide greater context for the decision-making process?**

   Answer: This comment is received and noted. The report has been revised to include the additional reasoning behind why some measures (primarily the 2-lane configuration for Segment 1 and the potential Business Access and Transit lanes) were not advanced to the Level 2 alternatives screening process. This additional explanation provides more detailed information to better outline and clarify the decisions behind the alternative development.

6. **Can today's presentation be shared with WSDOT?**

Answer: Yes, the presentation slides were shared with the WSDOT team following the meeting.

Meeting with Project Stakeholders – April 2nd

1. **Pierce Transit would need to review detailed plan sets to ensure that the proposed roundabouts and relocated bus stops along Meridian Avenue could be safely traversed and accessed by transit buses. When could these plans be provided for review?**

   Answer: Design plans for the corridor will be shared with project stakeholders and partners as the design of the proposed concept is advanced. At the current stage, the plans for the roundabout and bus stop relocations are conceptual and are likely to change. Pierce Transit will be kept informed throughout the design process and will be provided with the opportunity to provide feedback on design plans for the corridor as the process proceeds.

2. **Please provide further evidence and justification for the need to widen the roadway to provide the second travel lane. There is concern that based on the ADT volumes, this roadway may have the potential in the future (after widening) to become a candidate for a complete streets/road diet project reversing the addition of the travel lanes. If extensive queueing and delay is experienced for a single hour during the peak period under a three-lane configuration, this may be acceptable if the roadway operates well during the remainder of the day.**

   Answer: Previous studies for the corridor have identified Meridian Avenue for widening to a five-lane cross-section between 24th Street and 36th Street (Segment 1), including the Route Development Plan for State Route 161 prepared by WSDOT in January 1997. The widening of Meridian Avenue north of 24th Street, implemented by WSDOT in 2012, was originally intended to extend the five-lane cross-section south to 36th Street. However, due to cost increases and budget constraints, the scope of the project was reduced to end the five-lane cross-section at 24th Street.

   Based on the intersection analysis conducted for the corridor, single-lane vs. multi-lane roundabout configurations were evaluated at serval intersections along Segment 1 which were considered for roundabout improvements. As shown in the table below, single-lane roundabouts were shown to experience high delay and queueing in the southbound direction during the PM peak hour.

Intersection	*Approach*	*Total Approach Volume*	*2035 Conditions – PM Peak Hour*							
			Single-Lane Roundabout				*Multi-Lane Roundabout*			
			LOS	*V/C*	*Delay (s)*	*Queue (ft)*	*LOS*	*V/C*	*Delay (s)*	*Queue (ft)*
Meridian/29th	*NB*	*836*	*A*	*0.719*	*4.6*	*255*	*A*	*0.355*	*4.3*	*47*
	SB	*1281*	*F*	*1.077*	*45.8*	*5,881*	*A*	*0.535*	*4.3*	*96*
Meridian/32nd	*NB*	*771*	*A*	*0.720*	*5.5*	*221*	*A*	*0.350*	*4.7*	*49*
	SB	*1261*	*F*	*1.107*	*58.2*	*3,051*	*A*	*0.544*	*4.6*	*104*

During the AM peak hour, directional flow patterns reverse along Meridian Avenue, with the northbound direction experiencing peak hour flows above 1,000 vehicles per hour.

Therefore, it is expected that the southbound queueing and delay issues experienced at the single-lane roundabouts in the PM peak hour, would be experienced in the northbound direction during the AM peak hour. Additionally, when accounting for anticipated traffic growth along the corridor, it is expected that the roadway will carry direction volumes above 1,000 vehicles not only during the peak hour, but throughout the entire peak periods. Thus, the queuing and delay concerns identified in the table above are anticipated for multiple hours throughout the day.

Further, unlike the segment to the north between 8th Street and 24th Street, the segment of the Meridian Avenue between 24th Street and 36th Street does not have a planned parallel connection as part of the Parallel Road Network. Therefore, traffic to and from planned developments along the roadway will be required to utilize Meridian Avenue as the primary access route. Thus, the second travel lane in the northbound and southbound directions will also be used to accommodate local access to and from anticipated development along the corridor.

Finally, the addition of a second travel lane in both the northbound and southbound direction along Segment 1 will accommodate potential managed lane configurations along the roadway in the future, including the Business Access and Transit (BAT) lane concept identified in the WSDOT SR 167 Master Plan. While this improvement would require that land use densities and transit ridership and headways are supportive of such facilities, the four-lane cross section would provide flexibility in the future to introduce these transit improvements.

Edgewood Comprehensive Plan Update – Transportation Element Open House – April 11th

1. **The proposed concept for Segment 2 provides 2 northbound travel lanes and 1 southbound travel lane. How were these lane assignments determined?**

   Answer: Lane assignments for the corridor were determined based an evaluation of traffic volume forecasts for the roadway. The proposed lane assignments for this segment of the corridor represent no change from the current channelization along the roadway. It was determined that future southbound volumes along Meridian Avenue, south of 36th Street, could be accommodated by a single travel lane. Proposed improvements to the SR 167 interchange with Meridian Avenue are expected to improve flow along the entire Meridian corridor and address some existing congestion issues. While other potential lane assignments were evaluated for the corridor (for example, providing two southbound lanes and one northbound lane), the existing configuration with 2 northbound lanes and 1 southbound lane was determined to best accommodate the forecast traffic flows along the corridor.

   Maintaining the second northbound lane along Segment 2 was necessary to provide a truck climbing lane along this segment of the roadway. This segment of the roadway has an approximately 4,500-foot uphill slope with a 6% grade. Over 12% of northbound volumes along this segment of the roadway are accounted for by single-unit trucks or larger (FHWA Vehicle Class 4 or greater). Per the WSDOT Design Manual Chapter 1270,

and based on the factors above, the roadway meets the warrants requiring provision of a truck climbing lane.

2. **The proposed concept for the Meridian Avenue/36th Street roundabout and realignment of Chrisella Road would funnel all Edgewood Community Park and Chrisella Road traffic onto 36th Street. Has westbound queuing at this intersection been reviewed as it related to the proximity of the intersection to the entrance to the Edgewood Community Park parking lot?**

   Answer: The installation of the roundabout at this intersection is expected to improve operations for the westbound approach. Under the current signal configuration, westbound traffic is served by a single approach lane, requiring all vehicles to wait for the green light (especially if a vehicle making a left-turn or through movement is at the front of the queue). Under the proposed roundabout configuration, the average delay per vehicle along the westbound approach would reduce as all westbound movements would need to only wait for a gap in the circulating traffic to enter the roundabout. A comparison of delays and queueing along the westbound approach to this intersection is provided below:

Intersection	*Peak Hour*	*2035 Conditions – Westbound Approach*					
		Signal Control			*Roundabout*		
		Delay (s)	*LOS*	*Queue (ft)*	*Delay (s)*	*LOS*	*Queue (ft)*
Meridian/36th	*AM*	*137*	*F*	*496*	*14*	*B*	*126*
	PM	*106*	*F*	*389*	*9*	*A*	*45*

   As shown above, the westbound approach of the intersection would experience decreases in the delay and queuing because of the installation of the roundabout. The Edgewood Community Park parking lot is approximately 250 feet east of the Meridian Avenue intersection. Thus, under the signal configuration, the park entrance is frequently blocked by the queue extending from Meridian Avenue. However, under the roundabout configuration, the queueing would be reduced and is not expected to extend beyond the park entrance. Thus, eastbound left-turn movements into the park entrance are not expected to be blocked and would not backup into the roundabout at Meridian Ave/36th St (and would not cause gridlock in the roundabout). Further evaluation would be performed as the design is progressed to ensure provisions are made to prevent conflicts and impacts.

Edgewood City Council Presentation – April 23rd

1. **Transit was shown to score low for all the design alternatives. How is this being addressed as part of the recommended concept?**

   Answer: The ultimate vision for the corridor is to install the Business Access and Transit (BAT) lanes along the roadway, as identified within WSDOT's SR 167 Master Plan. These improvements would greatly improve future transit travel time and reliability through the City of Edgewood and would make transit a more attractive mode of travel for residents within the City. However, Pierce Transit's current plans and funding allocation do not plan for bus service and headways which would support the installation of these

lanes. Research has indicated that exclusive BAT lanes typically are for corridors that serve 10 or more buses an hour, or 15 minute service or greater. Therefore, the BAT lanes are not included as part of the recommended improvements within the corridor study. Instead, in-line transit stops are proposed which will reduce transit delay by eliminating the need for transit buses to merge into and out of the travel lane. These improvements will serve as an interim improvement until more frequent transit service is provided along Meridian Avenue that will support the installation of the BAT lanes.

2. **The proposed concept for the corridor shows the phasing of improvements along Meridian Avenue moving from north to south, beginning around 24th Street. How were the phases determined and did they consider ongoing planning and design efforts for improvements along the corridor (e.g., the 36th Street roundabout and the Chrisella Road realignment)?**

   Answer: Project phasing for the improvements was prepared in such a way that each phase could be installed independently with minimal impacts to operations along other segments of the corridor. Therefore, Phase 2, which contains the improvements at 36th Street, can be implemented prior to improvements in Phase 1. Given the ongoing work with the 36th Street roundabout and Chrisella Road realignment, it is possible that these improvements may be implemented prior to widening of the corridor north of the intersection. The improvements planned for this intersection can tie into the existing roadway width until the segment north of the intersection can be implemented.

3. **The proposed recommendation identifies roundabout improvements at 32nd Street and 36th Street. What level of operational improvement can be expected along the side street approaches at these intersections?**

   Answer: The table below summarizes the side street delay under existing conditions compared to the future conditions with the installation of the roundabout at these two intersections. As shown, these approaches are expected to experience reductions in delay of up to 90% during the peak hours. This substantial reduction in delay is expected to accommodate additional vehicular throughput along these intersection approaches.

Intersection	*Peak Hour*	*Approach*	*Existing (2023) Conditions*			*Future (2035) Build Conditions*		
			Int. Control	*Delay (s)*	*LOS*	*Int. Control*	*Delay (s)*	*LOS*
Meridian/32nd	*AM*	*EB*	*TWSC*	*70*	*F*	*RAB*	*9*	*A*
		WB		*70*	*F*		*8*	*A*
	PM	*EB*		*89*	*F*		*9*	*A*
		WB		*76*	*F*		*11*	*B*
Meridian/36th	*AM*	*EB*	*Signal*	*47*	*D*	*RAB*	*10*	*B*
		WB		*50*	*D*		*14*	*B*
	PM	*EB*		*51*	*D*		*10*	*B*
		WB		*55*	*E*		*9*	*A*

4. **Meridian Avenue narrows in front of the Simon's Mill Apartment complex. Can the proposed 5-lane cross section be accommodated along this segment?**

Answer: Due to limitations on the available right-of-way in front of the Simon's Mill development, a 4-lane cross-section has been proposed along this segment. The cross section will provide 2 travel lanes in each direction (with no raised median provided along this segment). Access management measures will be installed along the centerline of this segment to prevent left-turn movements into and out of the apartment complex.

5. **The weighting factors assigned to the evaluation criteria prioritized community support over safety. How was safety prioritized in the final recommendation for the roadway (especially for bicyclists and pedestrians)?**

   Answer: In the Alternative Evaluation for Segment 1, the alternative which received the highest overall score was Alternative C, which scored highest in all three safety criteria. This concept (which included roundabouts at intersections to slow travel speeds along the corridor) was advanced as part of the final recommendation for the corridor. Changes to the weighting factors to prioritize the safety over community support would not have an impact on which alternative scored the highest for Segment 1.

   For Segment 2, the alternative which received the highest overall score (Alternative A) did not receive the highest scores for the three safety criteria. However, when this alternative was advanced to the final recommendation some of the safety improvements from the other alternatives were incorporated into the final recommendation to improve the safety rating of the proposed concept. This included access management improvements at 102nd Avenue and traffic calming measures (roundabouts) from Alternatives B and C. It should be noted that scoring for the vehicular safety criterion was heavily reliant on improvements at 102nd Avenue. Options for access management strategies (including right-turn only restrictions from the minor street approach) are being refined for this intersection to determine the improvements which prioritize safety while also maintaining an adequate level of accessibility.

6. **For Segment 1, the proposed recommendation for the corridor moves the bike facility off-street, adjacent to the sidewalk. How does this proposed configuration promote bicycle and pedestrian safety if these two travel modes will be sharing the same facility?**

   Answer: The primary motivation for the selection of the shared, off-street facility was to remove conflicts between vehicles and bicyclists, as these conflicts are those that typically result in serious injuries and fatalities. The selection of the off-street bicycle facilities also aligns with the feedback gathered from community members as part of the public survey. As design for the project advances, delineation between pedestrian and bicycle space along the shared use path will be incorporated into the plans. This will help to provide separation between bicyclists and pedestrians and limit conflicts between these roadway users.

7. **Segment 2 of the corridor, especially near 102nd Avenue, currently presents many safety concerns. How will the installation of a shared-use path for pedestrian and bicyclists make this segment of the roadway safe for these roadway users?**

Answer: As part of the shared use path installation, a 4.5-foot landscaped buffer is proposed between the vehicular travel lanes and shared use path. This additional separation between the auto modes and the pedestrian/bicycle modes will enhance comfort for users along the shared use path. In addition, traffic calming measures along the corridor (such as roundabouts), are intended to slow travel speeds and increase safety along the entire corridor. Nevertheless, some pedestrians and bicyclists may not feel comfortable using the shared use path directly along Meridian Avenue. Thus, the off-street facility proposed west of Meridian Avenue will provide non-motorized connectivity between 36th Street and Puyallup for those users.

8. **There is likely limited transit demand at the 102nd Avenue intersection and installation of a bus stop at this location may increase safety concerns at this intersection which already experiences many collisions. Is a bus stop at this location necessary?**

   Answer: The City will coordinate with Pierce Transit regarding whether transit demand warrants the installation of a bus stop at this location. Other means of connectivity to transit via alternative travel modes are being explored for this neighborhood.

   It should be noted that proposed access control measures are being evaluated for the intersection at 102nd Avenue. To reduce rear end collisions at the intersection, a southbound left-turn pocket is being considered so that left-turning vehicles onto 102nd Avenue are provided a space outside of the southbound travel lanes to queue while waiting for gaps in northbound traffic. Additionally, right-turn only restrictions are being considered for the 102nd Avenue approach given sight distance limitations. The roundabout intersection proposed at 36th Street will provide vehicles from 102nd Avenue with a convenient location to make a U-turn if they want to head south into Puyallup.

9. **As a result of the WSDOT SR 167 project, traffic volumes are expected to shift from the Meridian Avenue corridor. Have these expected changes in traffic flow been accounted for when evaluating the planned configuration for the roadway? Might these changes in flow require different lane assignments (especially along Segment 2) in the future?**

   Answer: The traffic volume forecasts along Meridian Avenue prepared as part of the corridor study were compared to the traffic volume forecasts prepared for the WSDOT SR 167 Master Plan project. The traffic volume forecasts for Meridian Avenue were determined to be consistent and supportive of the traffic volume forecasts from the WSDOT study after completion of the SR 167 Extension. Additionally, the Edgewood travel demand model has already assumed completion of the SR 167 Extension as part of its long-term forecast year, which accounts for traffic shifts along Meridian and across this region of Pierce County. Thus, the traffic volume forecasts were shown to account for changes in travel patterns associated with the completion of the SR 167 project. The lane assignments identified for the corridor are those necessary to accommodate traffic volumes after completion of the SR 167 Extension.

10. **The southbound direction of Meridian Avenue currently experiences extensive delay and queuing in the PM peak hour. Was this existing concern evaluated and how can this problem be addressed as part of the Meridian Avenue corridor study?**

    Answer: The analysis conducted as part of the study identified that much of the delay along the corridor was associated with operations at the Meridian Avenue interchange with SR 167. As part of the SR 167 Extension project, improvements to this interchange will be implemented, which is expected to improve southbound flow along the corridor. Improvements at the interchange are expected to reduce congestion and queuing south of the City, in turn improving flow along the segment of Meridian Avenue in the City of Edgewood. Thus, with the SR 167 improvements planned for the area, the single southbound lane along Segment 2 is expected to accommodate anticipated southbound flow in the future.

11. **There will likely be limited pedestrian and bicycle demand along Segment 2 of Meridian Avenue. Can the off-street facility proposed west of the roadway be used to satisfy pedestrian and bicycle connectivity requirements so that the area for the shared use path can be repurposed to provide additional transit capacity?**

    Answer: In line with WSDOT's Complete Street policies, one of the priorities of the project is to provide alternative mode accessibility to all land uses along the corridor. While the planned off-street facility would provide non-motorized connectivity between 36th Street and the City of Puyallup, it would not provide the necessary pedestrian and bicycle connectivity for residences along Meridian Avenue (and along 102nd Avenue). Therefore, the shared-use path along the east side of Segment 2 is necessary to provide bicycle and pedestrian connections to the north and south for the residential land uses along the roadway and meet the WSDOT complete requirements.

12. **Can the old Puyallup River bridge be used as the pedestrian bridge across the UPRR for Segment 2 of the corridor?**

    Answer: The old Puyallup River bridge has a span of 370 feet, but the UPRR crossing is about 260 feet. Thus, the old bridge is not quite the right fit for the pedestrian bridge.

13. **Is the Meridian Avenue widening project a WSDOT-lead project or a City of Edgewood-lead project?**

    Answer: The lead agency for the Meridian Avenue widening project is dependent on the agency who acquires the funding and has the resources to manage the project. Previous widening projects along the roadway were lead by WSDOT; however, that does not mean that future projects need to also be WSDOT-lead.

Appendix B: Public Survey Results

1. What is your impression of how the Meridian Avenue corridor (between 24th St E and Todd Road E) fulfills the following functions?

	a. A functional street for regional vehicle traffic	b. An accessible street for users with mobility limitations	c. An attractive commercial corridor	d. A safe, comfortable environment to walk	e. A safe, comfortable environment to ride a bike	f. A road with good access to businesses, including parking, and retail destinations
Very Good	48	31	37	38	32	52
Good	188	85	105	73	61	170
Fair	282	128	229	112	103	254
Poor	144	410	286	435	463	177



2. How often do you walk, bike, ride transit, or drive along Meridian Avenue?

	a. Walk	b. Bike	c. Ride Transit	d. Drive
Every Day	64	4	2	406
3-6 Times per Week	53	9	1	192
1-2 Times per Week	91	34	8	52
Infrequently	447	590	622	16



3. The project goals for the Meridian Avenue Corridor Study are listed below. How important are these goals to you?

	a. Develop a long-term strategy for addressing multimodal mobility, access, and safety needs along the corridor	b. Collaborate with WSDOT, stakeholders, and the public to confirm future needs	c. Support the City's Town Center Subarea Plan and other growth along the corridor.	d. Minimize impact to the environment.
Very Important	419	501	335	363
Somewhat Important	191	133	223	228
Not Important	54	31	105	73



4. On a scale of 1 to 5, please indicate level of importance for the following design criteria for Meridian Avenue:

	a. Provide more comfortable pedestrian facilities	b. Provide more comfortable biking facilities	c. Provide aesthetic improvements (street trees, landscaping, lighting)	d. Provide more comfortable bus stop facilities (shelters, benches, lighting)	e. Retaining/adding left turn pockets for access to businesses and cross streets	f. Increase vehicle throughput (capacity) by adding lanes south of 24th Street	g. Improve intersections by adding traffic signals, constructing roundabouts, or adding turn lanes
1 (least important)	89	164	86	146	47	88	90
2	72	109	87	116	49	33	64
3	136	141	159	205	114	76	111
4	144	129	156	118	190	119	131
5 (most important)	228	122	177	80	265	350	268



5. Are there criteria not listed above in question #4 that you feel would be important to include to help improve Meridian Avenue?
Do not extend multimodal past 36th street intersection.
Please, no roundabouts. Whoever permitted Simon's Mill to buil rightup to Meridian should be fired. It makes widening Meridian difficult and completely at expense of the properties in h west side of thestreets.
Encourage small business not more apartments!
3A it’s a road for cars, not anything anyone wants to “travel” on. Stop pandering. 3b - that’s what we’re doing now. 3c - here’s a plan for the suburban Corredor, don’t put 600 more apartment complexes on it. And maybe make the park you guys just finished about three times bigger so it actually accommodates the thousands of new residents that live in said apartments. 3d - every single car driving through Edgewood a day could be a Tesla and it still wouldn’t offset the emissions coming from all the semi trucks at the port and along river road. Expand the road and spare me with the environmental virtue signaling.
Please do not construct roundabouts.
Street lights (aside from aesthetics) would add better visibility at night and safety. Would prioritize that over
A park at city hall wold be nice
Left turn lane
People don't want to walk along Meridian, it is a highway to get from I-5 to Puyallup and from Edgewood to the grocery store in Milton. No one walks on Meridian on the South Hill in Puyallup, for example. Also, only athletes have the stamina to bicycle up the Segment 2 north hill, so don't waste precious space squeezing in a bike route, it won't
Add more lanes all the way to the bottom of the hill to remove the bottle neck. Need more pedestrian friendly
No
If you're not stuck behind someone going 20 in a 35, you've got people passing you going 50. The merging to 1 lane and then back to 2 lanes is super annoying cause everyone drives like they need to defecat.
Add bike lanes and additional walking sections on the main streets that Parallel meridian . It’s not a main throughfair and would allow cechicke traffic to flow without pedestrian interference
Timing green lights through corridor
Must include elements to curtail speeding
I think we missed the boat by not having a larger natural buffer between the earlier improvements along Meridian in Edgewood and Milton. It doesn't look friendly and inviting to have such a small setback to the Commercial and Hi Density areas. We are a unique area and should try to make it as as desirable and beautiful as we can along this
As a resident on 102nd Ave E, I hope for a safer way to enter and exit my street. A traffic light would be ideal but even flashing signs warning of upcoming turns might help. My children will be driving in the next couple of years.
Please exclude or limit roundabouts. They are generally disliked by the public and often create more problems than their creators realize when planning them.
Traffic lights and turn lanes are fine. But please limit or exclude round abouts. The public generally does not like them and they often create problems unforeseen by the engineers that design them.
This survey is poorly worded.
No roundabouts!!! Traffic is too busy on this road for this.
out of A,B,C,D well lit streets first for safety
Need to make right lane at 24th south bound turn only and get rid of two lanes beyond. Having two lanes through and beyond 24th promotes aggressive driving cause assholes are impatient and cut people off trying to squeeze into my ain flow. Making single lane south beyond 24th, and making right lane upto 24th will address this issue.
Maybe it's considered in "f" but providing increase vehicle throughput, while attractive to Edgewood residents, would end up being attractive to our neighbors to the south, thus adding more clogging to the "too much traffic" problem of
Create an environment on Meridian which draws retail businesses that add to a more vibrant and creative community.

5. Are there criteria not listed above in question #4 that you feel would be important to include to help improve Meridian Avenue?
Try to get rid of the Damn billboards that make Meridian look so trashy. Years ago, we tried to make Meridian more of a boulevard, with planted medians, no suicide lanes, more of am attractive road than a thoroughfare. After listening to us, WSDOT said thanks but no thanks and did what they had wanted to do in the first place. We had said things like "no used car dealers" and of course "no apartments" (though I understand, to a point, why we needed them) (though
Stop building self storage places... they are the biggest blight!
Public safety is #1
city cost to maintain center green belt
In order to have effective traffic flow and capacity for the future, the building of additional multi-family units on Meridian should be put on hold. The additional units along with the sudden increase in development in Edgewood off of Meridian corridor has produced a significant increase in the volume of traffic and the safety of pedestrians.
If you widen the lanes, what will you do to go down the hill. Still have a bottle neck there.
Keep Edgewood a more rural community and discourage commuters
Roundabouts are confusing and they eat up a large area stoplights crosswalks and multiple lanes are most important
More crosswalks that are well-lit, with blinking signs.
No used vehicle lots!! Looks trashy
It’s important that meridian is walkable and safe - you should be able to get to the city park without feeling like you have to walk in traffic. Add additional businesses that encourage walking like restaurants, and additional grocery store. Get businesses that will add to the attractiveness of Edgewood and entice people to stop instead of pass through. No more storage or car dealerships on the main drag - ugly and don’t offer much to visitors and arguably
Intersection Meridian & 36th Street E needs a NO right turn going north from 36th Street E (The community Park). This is a blind intersection from traffic heading north from Puyallup. In addition Chrisella intersection is dangerous to
I live on Meridian at Simon Mills apartments the speeding is out of control. Please put up speeding camera located at 24th street at the merge to 1 lane. We also can hear motorcycles speeding up and down day and night. It is a challenge to enter or exit from our apartments.
please keep the lower speed limit and enforce it.
Dislike roundabouts!
Safety barrier between north and south traffic on segment #2.
Consider at least one pop-up toilet, if for no other reason than this. Johns Hopkins indicates over 25 million adult Americans experience temporary or chronic urinary incontinence (https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/health/conditions-and-diseases/urinary-incontinence/urinary-incontinence-in-women). Go in any supermarket or drug store and you will find a section of incontinence supplies. Add to that the children - particularly preschool - who necessitate the immediate use of a lavatory (and the position their parents or guardians are usually relegated to to try to find one that
NA
I'm an avid cyclist when the weather is good and have always wanted to utilize these segments to get down the hill - I'd love to have this as an option.
Lowering speed limit or enforcing speed limit i.e. traffic cameras.
Na
Consideration for property owners on the east side of Meridian. With added traffic to include homeless camps , property owners , now have to time when to leave home (school busses, semi trucks, construction vehicles) now add north/south traffic to/from Puyallup, snarl, tangle, wait lines, is waiting. It can take upwards of twenty minutes, just to get to the bottom of Meridian much less access cross roads (I-5, Hwy 512). With buildings right to the edge of Meridian, who will be the first to lose , due to eminent domain? What will that mean for owners? The original dream
Slowing traffic not addressed and reducing traffic volume not addressed
Yes,add a crosswalk between 16th and near Les,Schwab. Folks running across are dangerous when running across with e lanes of traffic. Should be added so no one is run over.
There are significant incidents of "road rage" as the road narrows after 24th; and the left turns into neighborhoods in Segment Two are very scary. I would make sure both are addressed. In terms of improving our town and the lives of residents, walkability and bikeability are critical items for the future that we do not have now, ESPECIALLY in
Noise reduction
No
As the area keeps expanding, room for more cars is the most important. I don't see many people walking or biking in this area, but tons of cars drive it everyday. Bike lanes are nice, but hardly anyone will use them.

5. Are there criteria not listed above in question #4 that you feel would be important to include to help improve Meridian Avenue?
Without the introduction of a better selection of attractive stores, services and restaurants , there's not much need for improvement, because no one is stopping in their way through town.
Don't add a roundabout on Meridian. Increase to two lanes for traffic in each direction.
parallel road network
As a renter at one of the apartment complexes on Meridian, it is very difficult to take either a right or left turn out onto Meridian during commuter hours. The timing of the signals seems to have traffic coming all at once from both directions. Half of the drivers on Meridian seem to drive like it's a residential neighborhood while others treat it like a highway. It's difficult to determine if oncoming care are going 35 or 55 while waiting for a chance to turn out. In addition, it would be great if the corridor felt more walkable. It's odd to me that I live so close to the grocery store but I don't feel like I can safely or conveniently walk there. I think it's especially important since there are so many children
Keep future maintenance costs of the improvements to a minimum. (No need to cut fancy crosshatch patterns into the sidewalks and pay to pressure wash the moss out of the crosshatch in the future). Also, lighting is important for
I don't think that lighting should be considered aesthetics. Street tree's and landscaping are far less important to me than lighting on the sides of the roads. Pedestrians deserve to see if they are walking and it's much safer for many reasons to have good lighting. Street trees and landscaping should be a separate subject from lighting due to this.
Prevent this section of Meridian from becoming the traffic mess of south hill Puyallup. Maintain the values that make
N/a
We need a larger police presence to lessen speeding and business break-ins and better street lighting.
** NO ROUND-A-BOUTS !!!!!!!!!! **
No roundabouts on Meridian
Make it aesthetically appealing. It currently looks rundown.
City should have looked into this before letting those apartment buildings to have been built so close to the street,
No roundabouts!
cross walks across meridian to community park
#1 - Reduce the noise from the heavy amount of traffic travelling through our city. Edgewood Community Park is a wonderful open space; the noise from traffic detracts from the enjoyment of the park. This will only get worse as the road is modified allowing higher speeds from the transient vehicles. #2 - Reduce the amount of vehicle exhaust pedestrians are exposed to. Sidewalks are a great improvement to our city but walking along Meridian is unpleasant due to the fumes from the traffic.
You missed safety, all your proposal make higher traffic volumes, ie less safe. Need to slow traffic doi to 25mph and ticket reckless speeding the are drivers ding 50+mph and never get pulled over. More round abouts add 4 more between Safeways and top of hill before widening any traffic lanes.
I do not care about biking on or walking on Meridian. It's too busy and I'd rather bike/walk back streets. For question 2 above you should have had a "never" answer, as I never walk/bike Meridian and having to choose infrequently isn't a true representation for many of us, and I believe it skews true results.
These topics se very vague and lump too many topics into one question/response.
Do not add a roundabout at the intersection of Meridian and 36th.
N/A
Avoid turn abouts and when installing traffic signals always include an actual turn signal and not a flashing yellow arrow. I'd like to see crosswalks that have the flashing safety lights to draw attention to drivers warning of pedestrians. NO MORE apartment complexes!!! They are ruining our community.
Definitely need sidewalks on both sides of the street from 24th to 36th - it is very dangerous for people to presently walk. Roundabouts are going to make the traffic worse. Traffic signals work fine except for the one at 24th which often only lets 3 cars through and yet other times it appears normal. Trucks don't work well in roundabouts as they
No roundabouts.
The biggest problem with the corridor is that segment one is just two lanes of traffic. It should have been expanded years ago, so until that is fixed not much else will matter. The second biggest problem is the lack of any retail of interest. No decent grocery, eateries, etc. are anywhere along Meridian. The one destination establishment, Edgewood Flower Farm, was paved over for high-density housing, adding to the already bad congestion and noise on
It's very important when deciding on widening meridian that people's property isn't taken away for this.
No roundabouts! They are a menace and cause more problems then they solve. How much of the publics personal property do you plan on taking to complete these plans? The least invasive is best. There are zero shops going down the hill to Puyallup. No need for a walking or bike lane in that space.

5. Are there criteria not listed above in question #4 that you feel would be important to include to help improve Meridian Avenue?
Sidewalks, signal at 32nd and Meridian
No roundabouts! This should be a hwy not a bike and walking pathway.
No roundabouts!
Meridian is a highway, no place for biker riders, or pedestrians. A round- a -bout is absolutely the most absurd
There does not need to be bike lanes in this area. No one in their right mind rides a bike up or down the hills and the city want to entice that activity would make it unsafe for all.
No roundabouts!!
Make sure to have physical barriers between cyclists and cars. Cycling in the area is dangerous because of the road design and careless drivers. Also many neighborhood elementary or junior high kids like to walk or bike as there are schools, parks, and residential housing nearby. Improve access to public restrooms as cyclist and walkers need
In order to create a more enticing Town Center, I feel more commercial (specifically retail or food related) is needed. While adding high density residential is needed to add growth in the desired corridor, requirements for mixed use and keeping commercial along meridian with residential above and behind the commercial spaces should be used. While the corridor project likely is only looking at improvements to ROW, it would be great to see improvements that
Most importantly, stop over developing Edgewood with apartments, and housing developments please!
Some sort of safety barrier on the hill dividing directions of travel
Roundabout questions
Adding lanes will not increase traffic capacity
Survey is hard to find on website
During rush hour its really hard to get in and out of parking lots once you get off meridian - wall to wall traffic
Be attractive but cost effective. Minimize long term maintenance and related expense.
Keep the feel of a residential community. Do not end up like Aurora Avenue
Combine bike lanes with sidewalk. Keep bikes off the road. Bike lanes on the road are dangerous. No one uses sidewalks so let the bikes go there. Ditch streetlights..those add visual clutter. Do not involve the State authorities as they are bureaucrats and have no understanding of the simple needs citizens of Edgewood have. Edgewood has
Should we be including any wildlife passthroughs?
Connect the walking trail on 36th to the Edgewood park and meridian for improved local pedestrian access. It is a safety hazard for people walking in the road to access the park.
I notice the Planting step in Segment one. PLEASE do not do what was done in the phase north of 24th street. The area is poorly landscaped in the median to the point of non existence. Plans trees and landscaping as you have in other cities. Then provide turn out to allow for U-Turns to businesses like you see in Federal Way, Bellevue, Kirkland,
Add sidewalks
There already is a center lane for turning left across traffic on Meridian. Reduce the speed on Meridian to 30 MPH. Align the end of school zone sign with the flashing yellow lights on the east end of school on 24th for Northwood Elementary. Regarding A & B-Are facilities the same as a lane? Put pedestrian and bike lanes completely away from
Some improvements - such as roundabouts - tend to hinder traffic rather than improve it.
I've lived in Milton for over 20 years and now Edgewood for over 30 years. I feel it's too late to alter Meridian due to the fact you allowed apartments to build on the lot line, now you have no land to add much. I hope the next steps are thought out much better and into the future. David R. Bailey
Explicitly address SAFETY in questions for this portion. During heavy traffic periods, for instance, ROUNDABOUTS (like on 32nd and Meridian) would be MUCH safer as motorists frequently misjudge the speed of oncoming traffic and it’s scary to watch near misses on a daily basis (which wouldn’t be helped significantly without roundabouts). ALSO speeding motorists (drag racing and motorcycles going over 80 miles per hour we have witnessed recently, even at the intersection of 24th and Meridian just as the light is turning red. OUCH!!! We would have been “T-Boned” on these occasions if we hadn’t literally waited at the green light before proceeding. Obviously traffic cams to fine these
Edgewood is not doing much for shops and eating. Just more apartments in the business area. We lost a grocery store but are growing a population.
Efficient movement of cars. Not sure bikes need their own lanes. They can use sidewalks.
The top priority is siewalk in the first segment. The other top priority is a partition of some variety on the meridian hill
Barriers between north and south bound lanes in Meridian Hill, very dangerous/deadly. Why has this not been
The intersection turning onto/ off Chrisella RD E needs improvement.
bike lanes separate from the road

5. Are there criteria not listed above in question #4 that you feel would be important to include to help improve Meridian Avenue?
There is no sidewalk to ride a bike or walk along 24th-36th which I find the most important part. Getting down the hill is the problem. Not getting through town.
The traffic is relentless on Meridian and backs up both morning and night going both ways. I am for widening Meridian as long as it does not venture near private drives or roads in residential areas.
Don't waste money on fancy landscaping that never gets maintained and turns into an eye sore.
The speed at which vehicles travel between 8th st. and 36th must be reduced.Traffic circles will help but is not sufficient.Explore with DOT the possibility of reducing the speed limit by 5MPH between 8th and 36th.The parallel road network is not mentioned in the survey but is essential to managing the flow of traffic on Meridian. An effort needs to be made to change driver psychology when mothering through Edgewood on Meridian.When driving through Fircrest,Fife or University Place, drivers know “they had better slow down or get a ticket”.That same mentality needed to be installed in transiting Meridian in Edgewood.Maybe signage at 36th and 8th street letting motorists know traffic
minimize left turn options
Quit building apartment complexes everywhere
I think the scope should be two parts. Section 4 refers to 24th to Todd. Section 4 should have two criteria, 24th to 36th and 36th to Todd. My answers would change depending on section criteria structure.
increase signage for cross streets
More speed Traps there is way too many people speeding down meridian we'd like to see a slower Speed limit.
yes
People should not be able to turn left out of Safeway parking lot and we need to find a way to make sure they stop before pulling out into traffic. It is so dangerous! I have had a couple people come out of the parking lot without stopping and made left right in front of me that caused me to slam on the brakes. Fortunately, there was not an accident, but I am concerned there will be an accident. I would like people to be able to exit the parking lot to Queens
Just like the Safe Streets to Schools program I believe the city of Edgewood should develop Safe Streets to Parks and Trails. A good start would be a sidewalk extended from 24th to Edgewood Community Park (36th & Meridian) on the north side of the roadway. The progress should be measured, as the saying goes, "What gets measured gets
Making it safer is #1
Stop building apartments!!!!!! This town has a small town feel. Don't turn us into Federal Way!
How about leaving it alone. Doesn’t seem to be broken, so don’t fix it.
Roundabouts are frustrating and take up more land. Traffic lights that run in sync to each other. Should not be a merge lane, as people don't merge properly. If a lane has to end, make it a turn only lane at the previous intersection. No left turns without a light. Make u-turns at the next light to make up for the no left turn.
Serve the people who live here. Commuter traffic should be guided to minimize disruption to edgewood residents. For instance, i will go shopping to another town because traffic is too heavy for shopping in my own.
If bus shelters are created they become sleeping places for homeless and drug use, and litter magnets. Please (!) do not allow benches there which encourage illicit activity - opt for single small stools/chairs
Avoiding impacts to existing homes/businesses (such as taking land via eminent domain)
Sidewalks down the hill of 36th. Tons of families walk to the park from there and the hill is very dangerous to walks. Sidewalks from 36th all the way to todd street.
Increased speed limit monitoring Addition sidewalks on connection side streets. 36th has a park on Meridian and Elementary school to West, natural student traffic - NO SIDEWALK W of 110th
Work more closely with local and state DOTs to improve through put at the south end of proposed corridor.
All his doesn’t work if you don’t fix the railroad crossing bridge t the same time just a waist of money if not done as
I feel with all the new apartment complexes and housing being built in this area, we need better and bigger roads to
No turnabouts
NO traffic circles! More speed signs
Traffic lights at 32nd no roundabouts
Traffic light installed at Meridian and 32nd Street E. Since park opened trying to make a left turn on Meridian is
Pease do not make us into SouthHill. Do not add roundabouts or any more traffic lights.
Methods to control speed limit. There are too many vehicles ignoring the posted speed limit, going way to fast. This is safety issue for walking and bike paths along with cross walks .
Regarding street lighting, please adopt downward shaded lights that will decrease light pollution. Let us see the night sky! https://www.archdaily.com/977131/how-to-reduce-light-pollution-with-street-light-design

5. Are there criteria not listed above in question #4 that you feel would be important to include to help improve Meridian Avenue?
Stop developing until you get the infrastructure ready for more population. It shouldn't take people 30 minutes to go 3
This survey is a waste of tax money. A waste of time and money as the city will not listen anyway.
Better street lighting
If we are making it four lanes there needs to be a traffic light at 32nd and Meridian. There have been many accidents here and I live in the neighborhood. It's hard to turn left .
Yes, on "g" above, no round abouts. Traffic signals or signs. Fife's attempt is dismal at best.
Add a light at 32nd St.
Something needs to be done about the left turn lane at 36th and Meridian. No one knows how to properly turn from
Segment 2 should have some kind of barrier between the uphill and downhill lanes. To me this is more important than
A meridian to prevent or deter head one collisions as you go down the hill toward Todd.
This corridor has needed upgrades for a number of years. The long term plans being put on the shelf by WSDOT has not helped this roadway for safety or mobility. Of course if you stop at 36th then all the traffic must merge to one lane down to Puyallup. That is problematic as has been noted in the past. Choke points are not helpful and cause safety
While doing improvements DO NOT BLOCK ACCESS TO MY BUSINESS OFF MERIDAN AND 31ST!!!!!!
No to roundabouts.
There are very few bikers here. Mostly walkers. Improve sidewalks but do not install bike lanes that will not be used.
Roundabouts are a mess during peak traffic hours. Side streets trying to get onto meridian will just sit there.
Consider that adding sidewalks in Segment 2 will increase homeless traffic into Edgewood from the Puyallup valley and jeopardize community safety. Added shelters and benches will also create opportunity for this as well.
NO ROUNDABOUTS
Make it attractive and not just strip mall or single business sprawl
The intersection at meridian, and 36th and chrisella needs to be addressed. It's an accident waiting to happen.
Importance of increase speed limit through the corridor; very important.
Reducing traffic through the corridor
All of this is silly without businesses to go to. Please entice businesses to come to Edgewood. No roundabouts.
The focus of Meridian is to move traffic effectively. If biking increases, so will accidents. Roundabouts cause accidents. Consider who the population is in Edgewood...mostly older people, and more recently younger families with children. I don't see many people walking or riding bikes along the Meridian corridor, so why focus there ? Side streets to and from Meridian need to all have sidewalks and better lighting. The Town Center plan sounds good...but do we have the population to sustain businesses? The community has been asking for an additional grocery store...Safeway has raised their prices...because they have no competition. Parking lots are not safe. Walk through Rite Aid and Walgreens...hardly anyone shops there. Instead of making Edgewood "pretty" focus more on making it safe. And for heaven's sake please do not put a bike trail or pedestrian walkway along south Meridian Hill...that is
Stop building businesses right AT the roadside. It adds to the crowding feeling and takes away from the spacious neighborly feeling that we see along the city hall block. Green space is needed.
More accountability to stop red light runners at 36th and Meridian. Someone is going to get hurt or worse.
More law enforcement emphasis and presence.
Make improvements to flow with a design that helps limit speeding (example the roundabout)
Meridian currently has a bottleneck where it reduces to one lane. This is greatly hinders traffic.
Add lane southbound.
no roundabouts
STOP building apartments and allowing houses to be constructed on lots less than half acre!!!!!!! We're losing the home town atmosphere we moved into Edgewood for in the first place. All people living here like our privacy and
Frankly, I'm shocked at the number of apartments being build along Meridian considering how lacking the infrastructure is in the area. At this point I don't leave my house after 3:00 as Meridian is a parking lot at that time of
Do not add roundabouts
Timing northbound in the am and southbound in the pm. During construction it will be much worse as it has been with every construction project on Meridian . As a daily user approaching Meridian from Chrisella at 36th how can you support me with alternatives as Chrisella is also in need? Is Chrisella being addressed?
Rethinking some of the fence lines along the siewalks that block the view of pedestrians by cars. More crossing signals along Meridian where there are turn ins.
Get sidewalks now on at least one side of the road down to the park.
If the city approves many more large multi-family units it will put pace the improvements these changes will allow for

5. Are there criteria not listed above in question #4 that you feel would be important to include to help improve Meridian Avenue?
I think more than 2 lanes each way will be really important. So much traffic drives this road as a major road to puyallup. If we are adding over 700 apartments and retail space, where is all of this traffic going to go? Also will the budget for schools and services like police and fire and ambulance be increased to serve such a growing population?
Keeping homeless out
Don't call sidewalks and bike lane facilities!
Minimize the possibility of people using the road to get around other congested areas to preserve the usability of the
If lights are added have them timed so they do not impede the flow of traffic
The big question about traffic on Meridian? What will happen when the Puyallup spur opens? Commuter traffic should decrease, perhaps significantly.
no roundabouts!
Need to stop allowing PD to block private driveways during traffic stops
I would not consider lighting an aesthetic. Lighting is safety. Don't put in fancy medians that you can't maintain. (That seems to be an Edgewood thing.) SAFETY is the most important improvement.
please put sidewalks around the park for safety. i see many people, including children, crossing the street to get to the park. it’s just a matter of time before a tragedy happens.
Do not overfill the corridor with multi-family apartments/condos with very little parking for those residents like Tacoma did. Maintain the existing rural charm with charming building design (not modern). Economic Development should offer better incentives for bringing new, aspiring businesses.
The problem drivers are the ones passing through from Puyallup, not the residents. Don't over-develop, then gum up the works for locals by turning us into another South Hill.
Safe ways to cross the street near bus stops and the park.
We need a solid green arrow at the intersection of 36th/Meridian.
Something to control the speed situation to limit the amount of accidents on Meridian Hill
All new buildings should be set back at least 30 feet from Meridian.
No one wants the Town Center. Keep our town small, listen to the citizens of Edgewood, pull your head out of the sand and listen. Stop apartment sprawl, keep our town rural!
Just stop destroying this quaint city. Your turning it into something Edgewood residents do not want.
Safe bike and pedestrian traffic requires physical separation. It is of the highest importance that the city not just paint bike lanes and call it good enough. Bold, region-leading design choices that take Edgewood into the future are needed.
Increasing lanes is important for long term car movement. I’d prefer to see two lanes each way down the hill, with bike and sidewalks from 24th to 36th to help people get to the new park.
Help so down traffic I'm always doing 35 and it feels like I'm siting still and everyone else just Flies by
Give the main road sr161 lights more priority. And restore the 40 mph speed limit
Avoid any kind of round a-bouts on meridian.
Don’t landscape it if you can’t prioritize keeping up with it like the rest of Meridian through Edgewood
Wait for 167 and I5 projects to be completed so valley people and commerce will stay in the valley and not use the hill as a bypass making life worse for hill people. Re-evaluate after that.
NO ROUDABOUTS
1) Saving lives and injury by improving the primary known safety issues. 2) Should a barrier be installed between the down going and upgoing lanes to further ensure safety. 2) How important do you feel about walking or biking top to bottom should this corridor be improved. 3) How often would you use this improved corridor for walking and/or biking. 4) Would you prefer vehicular safety measures are improved over pedestrian/biking.
No roundabouts. People can't drive in them.
Clean up the business that is along meridian. No more car lots, run down strip malls, weird storage lots without screens to block view from road, incentivize land owners that are holding abandoned property to develop.
The portion of Meridian going down the hill is dangerous. Accidents are abundant cause by drivers going to fast, swerving outside their lane, turning across Meridian, and the lack of proper draining results in icy, oily roads with streams crisscrossing the road at the turns. Option 3, eliminate the second lane going north to provide a buffer between lanes and force drivers to slow down in a single file option. Then they wouldn't be racing to merge at the top

5. Are there criteria not listed above in question #4 that you feel would be important to include to help improve Meridian Avenue?
The chokepoint NB at 36th when it goes to a single lane and then back up to a double lane again is a big issue. Trying to make a left turn at 36 or 32 is pretty uncomfortable with lots of impatient drivers. Adding nicer bus stop areas will look a lot nicer, but it will need its own budget line item for repairs and maintenance and policing. Edgewood will need to remain vigilant or else the bus stop shelters will become like Federal Way's. Adding more trees and
Please, don't add bike lanes. This is not a bike friendly area and it will just cause more accidents.
I'm looking forward to the improvements. The road being widened so their will be less racing thru that area.
leveraging the parallel road network
No roundabouts
Do NOT add any roundabouts
Minimize the use of roundabouts.
Turning right out of the grocery outlet area onto meridian is sketchy. The black railing really obstructs your view of oncoming traffic and should be removed. I believe it is only decorative and isn't needed.
No roundabouts, please!
No
No
Please seek expert advice. The city planners are young and inexperienced.
None noted.

6. Please rank the preliminary options for Segment 1 (24th to 36th)

	Option 1	Option 2
Undecided	71	60
First Choice	142	456
Second Choice	430	136



6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
	First Choice	Bicyclists are safer when further away from traffic.	
Undecided	First Choice	Drivers are crazy on Meridian and bikes and pedestrians need to be separated from vehicular traffic.	Do not extend any multimodal past the 36th street intersection.
Second Choice	First Choice	The drivers are crazy on meridian. Give buffer to create safety for the bikers and pedestrians.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Stop putting bike lanes 4 feet from 5,000 pound vehicles! Riding a bike right next to traffic is terrifying and will absolutely not let my children on option A. It looks just like the insane bike likes I drive along in Seattle. If the choice is available, I do not see any reason to stick bicycles on the road feet away from traffic.	There really isn't enough biking or walking traffic along Meridian to justify the cost of separate lanes, figure out a way to combine them.
Second Choice	First Choice	Separate drivers from bikers/pedestrians from vehicular traffic with buffer. Safer option by far.	How many cars travel on meridian through Edgewood everyday? And How many bicycles a day? Stop prioritizing .001% of commuters and deal with the constant gridlock local residents deal with on a daily basis. We cannot go into puyallup between 4:30-6:30 because it takes 30 minutes to go 1 mile. Roads are for driving. Roads are not for walking or bicycling. Keep pedestrians on a sidewalk. Keep the bike lane off the road.
Second Choice	First Choice	I think bikes can be up on the sidewalk, instead of on the road, considering that this is a state highway.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safety from oncoming traffic by vegetation barrier	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep the bicycle traffic away from the vehicle traffic.	
Undecided	First Choice		
	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I think cyclists would be safer buffered from auto/truck traffic in a buffered lane.	
Second Choice	First Choice	The bikes should be separated from the cars so kids can ride bikes with their parents and to the new park at 36th	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bicycles and walking is separated from cars so kids can ride bikes beside parents not near cars to the park.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	It seems safer to buffer bikes & pedestrians	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B is safer than option A.	Would there be openings in planting strip at each side street (ex 29th where I live), for left turns from Meridian and onto Meridian? Also, how would drivers access businesses on the left when traveling through that section? Or would left turn pockets allow U-turns?
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B is better because it is safer to keep the bikers away from the vehicles	
Second Choice	First Choice		Left turn lanes are important.
Second Choice	First Choice		My greatest concern is the changes that the planting strip will present to local businesses and the decreased ability to take a left turn from a center lane. Also, planting strips present a great difficulty to emergency vehicles especially during high traffic periods whereas a center lane can be used by Fire and Police to pass stopped traffic and reroute traffic if lanes become blocked by accidents.
Second Choice	First Choice	People on bicycles always clog up traffic, and never use the bike lanes.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for bikers	
Second Choice	First Choice	Lessens the widening of the streets	Add aesthetically pleasing foliage and maintain it. Too often municipalities develop nice roads and then let the plants grow out of control. Looks ghetto.
Second Choice	First Choice	Walking and biking can be shared	Doggy poop bag stations
Second Choice	First Choice	Seems safer for kids / pedestrians/ disabled.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
	First Choice	it is safer and more attractive for our area	
Second Choice	First Choice	It is safer to have a buffer between the cars and bikes/walkers versus having bikes close to carS	
Second Choice	First Choice		You've driven this road, let's keep the 2 lanes open and get rid of the merging into 1 lane.
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B is more safe.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikers and pedestrians already often share sidewalks without issue already. And you don't often hear about bikers hitting pedestrians. However you do hear about bikers and pedestrians killed by cars. I think having a visual barrier between motorized vehicles and non-motorized will create a safer environment for everyone.	Allow the bike and pedestrian lanes on the back arterial that parallels merdian
Second Choice	First Choice	I feel that creating a barrier between non-motorized and vehicles is an important safety aspect. Bicyclists and pedestrians often share sidewalks anyways. While I don't often hear about pedestrians hit by bikes I do hear about bicyclists hit and killed by cars.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Giving bikers safer space	
Second Choice	First Choice	I agree with the separation of nonmotorized user's.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't think bike lanes are that important. It is better to keep them of the actual street and closer to the sidewalk	
Second Choice	First Choice	I like the bike lane being farther from the road, especially on Meridian.	there needs to be crosswalks to travel east and west of Meridian.
Undecided	First Choice	trees protect the riders	
Second Choice	First Choice	All non motorized traffic, bicycles and pedestrians on a state highway should be buffered	
Undecided	First Choice	Should be same deign as B but single lanes, need to slow and reduce traffic speeds and volume. Adding more lanes will only make it worse.	

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	I think having a buffer between the non-car lanes would just get trampled on. Most bike/walk lanes in the area don't have a buffer.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I like the bike lane separated from the driving lanes	
First Choice	First Choice	Bikes are vehicles in their own right, and should be further from the sidewalk.	
Second Choice	First Choice	option B looks safer	
Second Choice	First Choice	Keeping a buffer for bicycles and pedestrians would be the safest option for all.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	As a bicyclist I prefer the buffer from traffic.	Clearly section 2 option B
Second Choice	First Choice	Moving the bike lane inside the landscape buffer creates a safer lane of travel for bicyclists. With the volume of traffic that is on Meridian in peak hours, bicyclists are a future part of the commute and need the safety barriers.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep bikes and Pax away from autos	
Second Choice	First Choice	I like having trees as an added barrier between cars and bicycle traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Optopn B is more protected from traffic.	A center turn lane must be maintained to 36th Street. You can't cut off access to the other side of the street. A uturn would be needed at each end of the section if there is no center lane.
Second Choice	First Choice	Thank you I need to look up the age and diversity as a community bicycle lane is not all that important and rural well lit roads and good sidewalks are important	
Second Choice	First Choice	Greater safety for bicycles	No roundabouts added PLEASE
Second Choice	First Choice	Giving bikes space further away from vehicle traffic will be safer for people riding bikes	
Second Choice	First Choice	Cars drive too fast on meridian. I currently ride my bike on existing sidewalks, due to the safety of plantings' visual barriers.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B is safer for pedestrians and non motorized vehicles. Separates vehicles from non vehicles	
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep multi-use non-motorized zones physically separated from vehicle lanes for safety reasons	The goal should be to reduce traffic volume and speeds, adding more lanes only increases volume and speeds making it more dangerous it's bad right now with folks driving ,50+ mph when traffic is light. Adding more lanes in going to get people killed.
Second Choice	First Choice	Biking with children and would want barrier between us and traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice		Creating a uniform look for the business fronts and facades would help to improve the feeling of an Edgewood having a personality and town center.
Second Choice	First Choice		As in the past, when we expressed our opinions, in the end it didn't matter as WSDOT did what they wanted -- I do hope that expressing our opinions helps this time!
Undecided	First Choice	I don't understand the current mind set of traffic engineers who think that co-mingling bicycles and cars is a good or safe option. For example Federal Way, please don't do it.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I chose option B due to the fact of no multi use of non motorized zones are separated.	widening the lanes to 2 each way is #1 priority.
Second Choice	First Choice		
	First Choice	Better option for traffic flow	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Hazards to bikes are worse when exposed to an inattentive vehicle vs pedestrian.	Benches placed along the corridor.
Second Choice	First Choice	Safest set up for pedestrians and bicyclists.	city maintance costs would be millions
Second Choice	First Choice	The separation of vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists is important to me.	Planning needs to include future budgetary impacts of the planting strips down the middle of the roadway and along the sides of the road. This will require additional resources to address the maintenance needs. To me, there is nothing worse than seeing large weeds standing two feet tall in the middle and on the sides of our main roads.
Second Choice	First Choice	Want bike lane separate from street to minimize risk	
Second Choice	First Choice	Biker's may not be using the bike lane so being able to walk in the lane is beneficial. Also like that the bike lane has the tree area to separate it from the cars as drivers' are becoming more reckless.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Increasing safety of both walkers and bike riders	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for bicycle traffic to not be right on the road.	Less traffic encouraged
	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I would like to see the bike lane separated from traffic lanes.	Hopefully there would be a two way turn lane down the center instead of a planting strip.
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B seperates the bike lane from car traffic, which would be safer for cyclists and motorists alike.	Until bicycles are paying tabs like motor vehicles I don't think we should spend a lot of money on bike lanes
Undecided	First Choice	The road is dangerous now need to separate vehicles and non motorized travel	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		Uncontrolled crosswalks need spotlights or overhead light for better visibility. Existing is too dark, even though there are flashing signs; and need barriers & sidewalks on street sides of park at 36th & Meridian. Unprotected footpath uncomfortably close to busy street.
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep all bike traffic away from car traffic for safety of all.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Why do we need a planting strip. Do we need a turn lane.	
Second Choice	First Choice		

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	1. Safety for bicyclers being further from the traffic. 2. Wider space for pedestrians to use when non motorized vehicles are not in the bike lane. Allows more space for families, strollers, pet walking etc. 3. More aesthetically pleasing to have the wider look of the sidewalk/Biking area next to each other	
Second Choice	First Choice		
	First Choice	Bike lane next to sidewalk	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Protect the bikers from the drivers!	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep the bikes away from traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice	More pleasing and safe	
Second Choice	First Choice	I like the idea of having pedestrians and bikes, physically, separated from cars	
Second Choice	First Choice	Protected bike lanes are safer	Placing cameras for speeding located at 24th street light.
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for bikers to ride in a separate safe lane. Plus when there aren't bikes gives more space for peds	must be barrier to separate pedestrian from bike lane
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't feel that a bike lane is needed at all. If it is going to be included, it is safer for the bike rider to be separated from the traffic. I don't like the planting strip down the center at all. From other road projects that have included this, the growing area is never tended regularly and it gets overgrown and messy. Second, it is a place to collect trash and looks bad very quickly. The planting strip idea also makes it hard for there to be a left turn lane for vehicles to access the areas on the other side of the street.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Better bike safety to have it next to pedestrian sidewalks rather than shared with the roadways	
Second Choice	First Choice	Pedestrians as far away from cars as possible.	
Undecided	First Choice		Lighting
Second Choice	First Choice	Keeping bikers with pedestrians is safer than putting them in traffic with vehicles where they disobey traffic laws.	Please refer to my response to enumerated item "5" above.
Second Choice	First Choice	It seems safer for cyclists to have a larger buffer between themselves and cars, especially when so many cars speed through the corridor.	Watching Edgewood's growth over the last 35 years I've become concerned about the lack of sidewalks and bike lanes. Sharing the roads between vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists is putting all of us at risk. Lowering speed limits is not the answer, segregating vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists is. The sidewalks that are required for the new developments is only a partial solution.
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for both pedestrians and people who ride bicycles.	
Second Choice	First Choice	B looks safer.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Biker Safety	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bike lanes are just better if they can be off the street or seperated from cars. Cars and bicycles just don't mix at all.	N/A
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Traffic safety. Kids ride bikes. I do not want my kids riding on the “highway”. Area should include motorized senior/disabled pedestrian transport and skateboards with sidewalk for foot traffic, strollers, wheel chairs	Na
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B seams to be the safest route	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikes should stay separated from the vehicle traffic. People speed currently	
	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		Leave Edgewood alone. You will only make it worse.
Second Choice	First Choice		Provide Greenbelt routes away from main corridor . I have little faith anything proposed will address issues cause by current 4 lane road. I'd rather like to see Greenbelt pathways that are a block or more away from this corridor.
Second Choice	First Choice		
First Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	For the safety of the pedestrians and bike riders	
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Separate	
Second Choice	First Choice	Get bikes and pedestrians away from the street	
Second Choice	First Choice	I think it's important to have a physical buffer to protect bikes against cars. Without it, we may see more bike use on Meridian, but also more car/bike crashes.	
Undecided	First Choice	Just look at the design! Common sense says to keep pedestrians and bicyclists away from a 2 ton moving vehicle is way safer than the other option!	
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't think we need a bike lane. Bicyclist tend to think they're cars anyway and they drive in vehicle lanes even when they have bike lanes available. Shaw road created gigantic sidewalks and yet bicyclist still choose to ride in the lanes of traffic with cars as opposed to using the perfectly adequate sidewalks. I think bike lanes are a waste of resources, and space.	I'd love to see fruit trees planted in the buffer zone and native plants showcased in the planting strip.
Second Choice	First Choice	The seperated sidewalk/bike lane is safest. People drive way too fast on Meridian and the seperation is necessary.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Keeping the bicyclists further away from traffic	Roundabout at 36th
Second Choice	First Choice	Pedestrians and bikes should be as far away from traffic as possible. Option A puts bikes too close to the traffic and can cause wrecks.	

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	I hate bicycles next to me in the road.	
Second Choice	First Choice	It's a busy section of road, so to me it makes sense to have a landscape buffer between vehicles and bicycles.	so much for the rural feel we were promised
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I prefer the plantings to be a barrier between vehicles nd pedestrians/bikers	
Second Choice	First Choice		
	First Choice	Since there will be limited space when you increase to four lanes, I don't see the feasibility of making a buffered lane for bicycles. I personally don't think people should be riding bicycles on Meridan as it is so congested.	Pet poop bag dispensers and trash bins
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	For the safety of bicycle riders and or other non-motorized users , not having them next to the street is a safer option	
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't like to bike or have bikes next to the roadway.	
Second Choice	First Choice		Will the planting strips be kept up? The current planting strips look like crap.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Don't need bike lanes in my opinion, they take up valuable road space and are rarely used. And where is there to ride a bike to in Edgewood anyway? That said, I like the option that keeps the bikes as far away from actual traffic as possible. Bikers in this state think they own the road, so keeping them as far away from real traffic as possible is best for everyone's safety.	We really need good, signaled crosswalks.
First Choice	First Choice	It's the perfect layout for all traffic, pedestrians and bikers	Roundabouts appear to cause more accidents, especially during inclement weather.
Second Choice	First Choice	I think it is safer for bicyclist to be separate from traffic!	Discourage so many vehicles just cutting through Edgewood. Eliminate bottleneck at SR 167.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Years of working construction and being on roadsand a cyclist I prefer the bike lane further separated from traffic lane.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Separation of pedestrian and bike lanes improves everyone's safety.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikes further away from a state highway seems safer for cyclists and less hectic for drivers.	
Undecided	First Choice		Trees. Sync lights at crossing areas with turning traffic. Red no turn for limited time with crossing button pushed
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Tired of fighting bikes to get home. Love for it to be bike friendly but most people on bikes don't watch for cars	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Meridian is a dangerous road as is any 5 lane road. Any people including bicyclists should be separated.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for bikes to be away from traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for bikers	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for biker and walkers.	
	First Choice	Best of the two options. But don't really need the walk and bike lanes.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikes have no business in traffic. Keep separated for the safety of all.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikes need to be out of the traffic lanes.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I'd feel much safer walking/biking with my family if the sidewalk was separated from the cars a bit	
Second Choice	First Choice	This is not an area that needs bike lanes. It's a state highway, not a neighborhood.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	The added buffer from cars on meridian by the trees, bushes, etc is better as a bike rider. This is similar to Alki beach in West Seattle. As long as the bike is labeled such, there wouldn't be an issue.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bike lanes should be separated from cars.	
Second Choice	First Choice	The physical separation for non motorized use seems like a safer option.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Drivers will hit and kill cyclist if there is not a physical barrier to separate cars from cyclists.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Merridian feels like too big of a street and too auto centric to have bike lanes adjacent to the vehicular lane. Physical separation feels safer on this roadway classification.	
Second Choice	First Choice		Pedestrian cross walk and sidewalk access to community park
Second Choice	First Choice	Biking and pedestrians away from traffic is always safer. Cars kill people.	
Second Choice	First Choice	It seems safer for bikers and walkers along Meridian.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Sidewalk and Bike Lane need physical separation from vehicle traffic given the heavy traffic on Meridian	Traffic noise reduction.
Second Choice	First Choice		
	First Choice		Reduce the speed and enforce the traffic laws, ie speeding and aggressive driving.
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B will result in people choosing to bike the Meridian corridor. Option A will fail to adequately achieve any goal.	
Second Choice	First Choice		two lanes each direction with a turn lane in the middle would be ideal. The grassy area in the middle will soon become unkept and ugly. Use Shaw Rd in Puyallup as your example, they redid that area, and it needed turning lanes all the way down to help with traffic flow, instead they stuck these planting islands, that look like crap now because they're not weeded, and if a car breaks down in one of the lanes, they're unable to move to a turning lane if they broke down next to the planting island. It's dumb. If you truly want to aid traiff congestion, two lanes both ways with a turning lane down the middle seems the most practical.

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	Safety for cyclists	
Second Choice	First Choice	It seems safer to seperate the bikers from the vehicles and traffic as much as possible.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for kids and others to separate bike lane from road	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I like bike lanes off the road	Do not put a hotel, motel or anymore appartments, gas stations, coffee shops in Edgewood or Milton. We need another grocery store and better restraunts.
Second Choice	First Choice	Bike lanes don't even seem necessary for this area so it seems like they would be better utilized near the pedestrian area.	
Second Choice	First Choice	It would make more sense and seem safer to have people on bikes farther away from car traffic. I also have 4 kids so them using a bike lane that is seperated from car traffic would seem to be safer for them.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep pedestrians and bikes out of traffic.	Roundabouts over traffic signals. Traffic always seems to move better (as long as it's constructed nothing like the new one on 99). Would really like to see one at Meridian and 32nd.
Second Choice	First Choice	Safety for bikes and pedestrians!	
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep the bikes and people separated from the traffic. The traffic speeds along and a green belt must insure protection of the bikes and people from speeding traffic. Also, allow the bikes to use the sidewalk. This saves money and no one walks on the sidewalks anyway. Make the sidewalk MULTI-PURPOSE; i.e. people and bikes.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Physical separation is preferable to a buffer, for cyclists and pedestrians.	
Second Choice	First Choice	For families and students riding bikes away from the road provides extra safety.	
Second Choice	First Choice	It's safer for bikers and pedestrians to be separated from traffic. As annoying as it will be when rude bikers act like the sidewalk should also be theirs, I'd rather they are as safe as possible.	
Second Choice	First Choice	People drive like crazy on that road and for safety, I like the separation and grouping of pedestrians and bike lane. I also think that lining the road with trees will soften the landscape making it more appealing. Look to Woodenville for example.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B appears to be safer for bicyclists.	I'm curious what the restrictions will be for the bike lanes now that I see motorized bikes, scooters etc? Will it be enforceable ticketing by our police? Sidewalk areas should have containers with bags for collecting pet waste. Planted areas should be extremely low maintenance in order to avoid extensive maintenance costs.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Having a buffer between traffic and cyclists is a plus.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I like the idea of a buffer between cars and pedestrians or people biking.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Having the planting strip between the car lane and the bike lane reduces the risk of distractions for the drivers. We also have a lot of children in the area and with the park near the southern end of segment 1, having a buffer between where the kids will be riding their bikes and the vehicle traffic feels like a better choice.	Provide left turn lane.
Second Choice	First Choice	Bike lanes should have a barrier from traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice	I appreciate that the bike lanes are more protected from traffic - it provides a safer experience for both cyclists and less distraction to drivers. It also allows for the street to look more aesthetically pleasing because if trees are planted in the areas physically separating the road from the non-motorized zone, the overall road space will appear narrower and less gray (i.e. areas of asphalt/concrete will be more broken up by greenery).	Don't see why we need a bike lane for a short stretch. I thought that was what the Urban Trail if for.
Second Choice	First Choice		Eliminate planting strip. It's a waste of money.
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B moves the bike lane away from traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikes will drive on the street anyhow vs the sidewalk	
	First Choice	Bike and pedestrian lane are separated form traffic, but not enough.	
Second Choice	First Choice	It's safer to have a buffer between cars and pedestrians	Remove the bike lanes. Create incentives for decent retail to come to Edgewood.
Second Choice	First Choice	It appears to use less space.	None
Second Choice	First Choice	option b keeps bike out of, or away from traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bike lanes should not be next to drive lanes	
Second Choice	First Choice	I support anything that improves the health and wellbeing of my neighborhood. Protect our walkers and bicyclists.	
Second Choice	First Choice	It seems that keeping bicyclist separate from motor traffic is the safer option.	Street lights on motion detectors so when there isn't traffic the lights dim or turn off.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for people on bikes	
Second Choice	First Choice	Must be a physical barrier between auto's and bikes.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I wasn't aware that this dangerous stretch of road had walkers or bike riders or bus stops	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikes in the roadway will not be as safe as separate lanes	Would prefer not to have so much growth in a small town.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Safety, aesthetics, and bike lanes can double as walking lanes and give a better trail atmosphere.	Zero roundabouts. Minimum use of taking personal property. Combine the sidewalk and bicycle lane. Why does it need t be separate?
Second Choice	First Choice	Like the bike lane separated from traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice		

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Keeps bikers out of traffic. As well as makes bikers need to be more aware of turning Left (cross traffic)	
Second Choice	First Choice	separate bike lanes from the road keeps bikers safe from traffic	Keep this as a hwy thoroughfair. If you want bike lanes put them on residential roads off SR161.
Second Choice	First Choice	Separate the bikes from walkers.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep the traffic away from both bike and pedestrians.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Isn't it safer for bikes to be further from traffic?	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B provides a greater margin of safety for bikers and pedestrians	Remove the bike lanes and add wider shoulders or a middle turn lane.
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B meets the design criteria that I felt are most important from question 4.	
	First Choice	To improve safety and traffic control.	Lots of green. Trees, bushes , etc. Definitely don't want the look of South Hill either.
Undecided	First Choice	Bike lanes next to vehicular traffic spells out disastrous results	
Second Choice	First Choice	Being largely converted to a residential area with a new park, let's keep the kids away from cars that speed. This section is poorly patrolled, and I see cars speeding egregiously daily.	
Second Choice	First Choice		If bike lane is separated from cars consider it only on one side of street to minimize impact.
Second Choice	First Choice	if few active bike riders, more capacity for walkers. Bike riders are farther from car traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice	no third option	Please ensure access to public restrooms as walker and cyclists need access to public restrooms.
Second Choice	First Choice	Bike and foot traffic needs to have a barrier between them and cars, which is why option B is more appealing. I would feel safer traveling on this option.	Pocket plazas as intervals to provide seating, landscaping, lighting and pop up commercial opportunities such as food trucks.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Best to have a buffer between vehicles and bikes / pedestrians	
Second Choice	First Choice		A center turn lane would be a safer more functional option
Second Choice	First Choice	Drivers can be inconsiderate to bike riders. I think it is much safer to have a little barrier between bike lane and where cars drive.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option b appears to offer more protection and buffer for cyclists and pedestrians	
Second Choice	First Choice	Physically separated non-motorized lanes are safer for those users, especially with how busy that road can be. Physically separated can also be less distracting for drivers	
Second Choice	First Choice	I think the bike lanes should be farther from the cars	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safety	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	The way I am observing a number of people are driving concerns me (I no longer bike). I will leave it up to bicyclists who actually ride to help decide this one.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B provides better safety for bicyclists.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikers should be as safe as possible	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Prefer no bike lanes. Never see cyclists on meridian.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Protected bike paths offer safer routes for cyclists and don't suffer from being a catch area for road debris. More accessibility and safer routes for pedestrians and cyclists is very important.	Seems that the cost of maintenance could be avoided by not having so much greenery and the trees eventually cause issues.
Second Choice	First Choice	I worry about 161 being a highway that non-Edgewood locals pass through for commuting and thinking about the safety of local bikers	
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Allow families to safely bicycle around town. I ont seemany commuter bicyclist around that would feel comfortable biking next to cars.	Make sure there is efficient street lights.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B is safer for pedestrians and bicyclists as there is space between vehicles.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Seems safer	Be attractive but cost effective. Minimize long term maintenance and related expense.
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B is safer for bicycles.	
Second Choice	First Choice	getting bikes away from traffic. People get killed riding on roads with traffic.	Underground utilities
Second Choice	First Choice	B just made more sense.	Restrict the speed limit on the winding road going down to TODD
Second Choice	First Choice	The second option seems much safer. The first option looks more dangerous	
Second Choice	First Choice	I think it's safer for both cars and bikes to have a physical buffer. That allows car drivers to not be worried about suddenly having a bicyclist cross over into their lane. And helps bicyclists have a physical barrier between them and potentially inattentive drivers.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Seems safer.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I like bikers having more of a barrier from traffic.	Not a dog owner, but if there's an anticipated increase in dog walking traffic, we should consider offering some garbage/dog poop bags.
Second Choice	First Choice	Bicyclists need protected space from motorized vehicles.	
Undecided	First Choice	N/A	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for bicyclists to be further from motor vehicle lanes	
Second Choice	First Choice		
	First Choice	get the bicycle off the main roads.	

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	Seems like option B is a safer option to keep away from motorized traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep a division between the bikes and cars. Several bicyclist's do not adhere to traffic laws and jut out into traffic whenever they want. My preference is to put them on 122nd instead.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Separation from cars is key	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I want safety for ALL, and especially younger bike riders, (ages 10+) to keep them away from speeding cars.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikers will be much safer away from the vehicle lanes.	
Second Choice	First Choice	keep bicycles away from traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikes should be separated from walkers and vehicles because all three modes have significantly different sppeds	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	The barrier between vehicle traffic and bike/sidewalk is extremely important! I n order to increase bike/foot traffic, folks MUST feel safe.	With a central planting strip down segment one, making sure that there is an easy way to get into businesses without blocking traffic would be ideal. If I'm no longer able to get to my local coffee shop or brewery or favorite sandwhich place without having to drive past and U-turn or take side/back roads, it would be very unfortunate.
Second Choice	First Choice	It seems like bike riders will be better protected by option B, although you may need on/off bike lanes in some places.	
Undecided	First Choice	I am an avid cyclist. I avoid meridian at all costs. If I were to ride my bike on meridian, which is rare, this option would give the most protection.	Turn lanes, both LH/RH, at intersections or larger business areas.
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikes hitting people is more safe than cars hitting bikes. Wider pedestrian lanes off more flexibility for safe travel away from vehicular traffic. Adding bike lines next to car lanes see rare use.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B is safer	
Second Choice	First Choice	A barrier to protect pedestrians and cyclists is a good idea.	Please plant trees and landscaping in the planting strip! Do not make the same mistake that was mad in the road north of 24th street. It looks terrible!
Second Choice	First Choice	Keeping bikers safe	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikes are separated from traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I like that pedestrians have a buffer from drivers.	There is limited space on both sides of Meridian at this point. I believe the planting strips should be removed. Is there truly a large number of bicyclists that might use Meridian? Or is this wasted money spent needlessly...
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't think bikes belong on the street next to a traffic lane. It isn't safe for either the biker or the driver.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't bike, but feel that it is safer to have cyclists further removed from vehicle traffic.	Trees don't provide anything....have you seen how ugly the ones further north on Meridian look
Second Choice	First Choice	I like the idea of keeping bikes a bit further from the road.	My feelings and comments are above. Too late to solve traffic issues.
Second Choice	First Choice	Not having bike lanes on the street is safer	Please also make Chrisella safe for walkers/runners/bicyclists.
Second Choice	First Choice	Bike lanes next to cars more likely for accidents to bicyclists, safer for bikes, walkers into park	Although the cyclists are to adhere to road rules, if the lane will be separate from the motorist perhaps some kind of designated crossing over intersecting roads would be prudent.
Second Choice	First Choice	Option A put bikes to close to traffic. We see to many distractions, and bikes on the roadway would present a distraction that could cause a driver to drive into the biker.	
Undecided	First Choice		WITH all of the electric bikes etc. out there, it is delusional to think that the "non-motorized" lane will stay that way. E-bikes, powered skateboards are quickly becoming the norm and the police will not be the ones to constantly monitor this and keep these off the Non- People track. (Spend half a Saturday or Sunday at the new 36th street park and you can see this in action.)
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Undecided	First Choice	CARS KILL PEDS AND BIKES. GET THEM FUTHER AWAY FROM MOVING TRAFFIC	I think the added bike or sidewalk area would make it safer for people to get around that don't have a vehicle. But I do think the main priority is making traffic flow better & safer.
Second Choice	First Choice	cars and bicycles don't mix well	
Second Choice	First Choice	Both sidewalk & bile lanes are buffered, by the trees, from the cars.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I like option B because the bike lane is safer for the bikers and cars alike. It would be best to keep traffic moving, some bikers ride the outside of the bike lane making drivers nervous that they will hit them causing a slow down to go around them or wait for them to pull to the middle of the bike lane for easy passage.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I think the option B of segment 1 would improve the safety for both pedestrians and commuters driving on the street. Option b offers that buffer distance between both which is great for when a biking accident may occur or traffic accident. They deserve to have their own space	
Second Choice	First Choice	I do get a little nervous with bicycle lanes so close to the vehicle lanes. As I see Edgewood growing, I see more kids on bicycles than I do adults. Because of that, I feel option B is safer for kids on bikes.	Use the funds to improve roads around Edgewood so commuters will drive around and not through.

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	Would prefer bikes be off the road for safety.	Use the funds to improve roads around Edgewood so commuters will drive around and not through.
Second Choice	First Choice	We do not need dedicated bike lanes. A multiuse sidewalk will work better.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Too many incidents of high speed cars/motorcycles on meridian.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Keeps bikes away from cars	
Second Choice	First Choice	Separate humans from cars.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I prefer option B because it provides increased safety for pedestrians and bicyclists from motor traffic. With the increase of traffic through this corridor it will provide added safety.	
Second Choice	First Choice		Landscape needs to be better maintained or better designs that require less maintenance. Not maintaining looks sloppy, lack of pride for community.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep the bikes away from traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice		The intersection at Chrisella needs to be fixed.
Second Choice	First Choice	Physically separated for safety	
Undecided	First Choice	Moving the bike/non-motorized zone further away from traveling vehicles would be safer for pith the vehicle drivers as well as those in the bike/non-motorized lane.	
Second Choice	First Choice	It's too dangerous to be that close to the motorized vehicles for safely walking or biking.	
Second Choice	First Choice		Get sidewalks and round abouts in place where lights aren't in ppace for side streets trying to get onto meridian!
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for my kids to ride bikes to park with physical barrier	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for people on bicycles and cars	
First Choice	First Choice		
	First Choice	Keeps bicycles separate from vehicles.. less confusing to motorists.	There's no bike lane north of 24th. Why would we need one from 24th - 36th? This makes ZERO sense. Sidewalks are what we need here.
Second Choice	First Choice		See comments in Box #5 above
Second Choice	First Choice	I would prefer to have the waling and bike path separated from traffic.	Landscape the center planting strip with plants and trees.
Second Choice	First Choice	Same amount of lane. Bike lane location.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B looks much better, and would be better for Safety	
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep pedestrians away from traffic. Drivers don't pay enough attention	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bike lanes would not be used. Better to have a single sidewalk.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for families going to/from the park, although it's a relatively short section of road.	Why the planting strip where turn lanes should be? Will be a poor choice for business access.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer to have bicycle further from road.	at intersections, signage for traffic to watch for bikes and bikes to watch for traffic.
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for bikers and feels more like a path. Those fast moving cars. Someone on a bike is going to get hit.	To really make the corridor attractive the elimination of all billboards would be a huge plus.
Second Choice	First Choice	Concerned about cars turning into businesses crossing multiple lanes of bike/pedestrian.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Looks safer	will do so
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I prefer a buffer between cars and people due to the speeding on Meridian	
Second Choice	First Choice		NO MIDDLE BOULEVARD. Such a bad idea and only limits access to businesses / homes, as well as affects intersections where u-turns will now be necessary if boulevard is installed.
Second Choice	First Choice	I like the idea of a swerving car that there is the possibility of still being safe.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Can't get down to Puyallup after 4pm sometimes	We need some sort of indicator for business and street driveways/roads that cross the bike lane. I think the bikes should stop just like pedestrians.
Second Choice	First Choice	with the amount of traffic and how fast people drive in this area, it would be safer to have the pedestrian lanes separated from the traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	walkers and bikers then the planting. cars should not have to worry about bikers	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safest option for children riding bikes.	Would love to see Edgewood get rid of the big ugly billboards along Meridian
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Moving the bike away from the road is important for child safety.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Important to separate bicycle and pedestrian traffic from vehicle traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	As a driver I'm much more comfortable with cyclists not adjacent to cars. When I lived in Seattle the cyclists would drift over to the auto lanes way too easily. Very dangerous for both parties. Let's be realistic here, lots of cyclists do not obey the rules of the road.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer to separate bike lane from drivers who aren't paying attention	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bike path away from cars improves safety and allows traffic to flow without obstacles.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for bikes	

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	I do not like the bikes possibly sharing the same level with cars just not safe, is there curb separation?	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	In other cities the bike lanes between the sidewalk and traffic lanes are very consuming. I like the one where they are adjacent to pedestrian lanes.	
Second Choice	First Choice	There should always be a buffer between cars and walkers for safety	
Second Choice	First Choice	Separation of bikes from cars would be better	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	The bike lane will remain safer and the surface will be cleaner	Connecting bike and walking paths through neighborhoods.
Second Choice	First Choice		Don't need sidewalks/ bike lanes in both sides of the street
Second Choice	First Choice	Moving bikes away from traffic is safer.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Not that many people bike or will bike along Meridian.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Improve pedestrians safety.	Traffic alleviation. Sidewalks all the way along meridian to the hill.
First Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Need to keep the bikes and non motorized transportation any from the lanes of traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice	Separating bike lanes from car lanes has historically been safer for both parties	
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep cars separate from the seldom seen if ever bicyclist.	
Undecided	First Choice	Bicyclists would be much safer off of the road but it would have to be designated away from pedestrians also.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I see the bike lane being used more by kids and families going to the parks and business than commuters so it should have a safer separation from motorized vehicle traffic. The tradeoff is that drivers may not be as aware of the bike traffic when turning into businesses and walkers may not always stay on their side presenting a hazard both to themselves and the pedestrians.	Better visibility at the intersection of 36th St E, Meridian, and Chrisella especially for right turners from 36th on to Meridian. It's really hard to see people on Meridian coming around that curve in the road, so some kind of reflective mirror (or trimming back of trees would be quite helpful). Or potentially a protected merge/yield lane for people to get on to Meridian and then merge when they can see the traffic.
Second Choice	First Choice	options are for A, and B, yet you have us choosing option 1 and 2. very confusing. to answer the question though, I prefer the bikers be farther away from traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice	An additional lane will keep traffic moving..outways the need for bike lane..there are hardly any bikes travel	
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep bikes away from traffic; less accidents; more kid friendly	Improved visibility on corners especially at intersections
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikes along this corridor need to be moved away from primary traffic. We've seen too many accidents in the Seattle metro area when trying to combine the two. Commuters driving through our city sot want to slow down for bikers who aren't paying attention.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Take away the badly maintained beauty strips and incorporate that into bike lanes. None of this makes sense if you spend too much money on it either	
Second Choice	First Choice	Traffic moves very quickly on Meridian and having the extra buffer between pedestrians and drivers is important.	We just need better flow of traffic between 24th and Todd rd. It's getting to over crowded and the roadways don't accommodate for that much traffic.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Please separate the bikes from the cars the best you can.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
First Choice	First Choice	safety	
Second Choice	First Choice	I'm assuming option a is option 1, option b is option 2. If so I think a barrier with distance between humans and vehicles is prudent, I like option B (option 2?) since most non vehicle traffic will most likely be on foot.	Landscaping and most important keep them cleaned, trimmed and maintained. They were an embarressement last year.
Second Choice	First Choice	With distracted drivers, a buffer between motorized and non motorized vehicles is important.	
Undecided	First Choice	I walk two big dogs; need insulation from traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice		I have lived here since 1970 and the changes are awful! You have allowed too many low-income housing units to be built. Just look at the increase in the crime--used to be able to go to Safeway without worry but now criminals are stealing our purses and trying to car jack us.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Like the divider between cars and divider between bikes and cars best safety	
Second Choice	First Choice		Sidewalks down 36th to make it safer to walk to the park.
Second Choice	First Choice	Separating bike and pedestrian traffic from vehicle traffic will improve safety and increase the amount of people using the bike lane	
Second Choice	First Choice		The corridor from 36th to 24th is so trashy looking. It is not very reflective of our town. To make people want to bike and travel to these businesses/areas it needs to feel nicer and have safe places to walk, park, and hold bike equipment.
Undecided	First Choice	Bike lanes? Not necessary. Sidewalks only. No one rides bikes in this area. Period.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Opinion B allows for a safe bike riding lane and ability for pedestrians	Less fancy street lights, I would like to see the city spend money more efficiently. The seating on the corners of 24th is a prime example of waste. Looks pretty when you drive by in a car but never gets used. Please stop trying to mimick bellevue or redmond or whatever crazy rich city you're trying to become.
Second Choice	First Choice	Gives clear indication where vehicles and bikes are to be also keeps bikes from riding in street where there are turn lanes etc	
Second Choice	First Choice	Pedestrian > bike > trees > cars seems to provide the most space and safety for all	
Second Choice	First Choice	I feel safer knowing my family could use their bikes without being on the road.	

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	Safety. Simple as that. People do not abide by the speed limit of 35mph. It's not safe unless people are physically separated.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I believe it would be safer for adult and youth riders to be separated from motorized vehicles on this busy street	SR161 needs to be 4 lanes all the way to SR167. It could be done in three phases; Replace the overpass that goes over the Unio Pacific RR, expand to 4lanes from 24th to 36th, then tackle the hill. As a temporary solution, make the existing center lane NB, a reversable lane.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I'd feel better knowing bikers are protected more by not being right next to cars. Drivers already have a hard time staying in their lanes so adding a buffer between road and bikers protects more	
Second Choice	First Choice		Make it safe and easy for people to access the new park.
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	The bike lane should not be next to the traffic. It's dangerous.	
	First Choice	This survey is confusing. Option 1, A, or B, you make it option 1 or 2. Very unclear when related to pictures.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safety	More trees! From both an environmental and aesthetic aspect, naturalizing the corridor will make it feel more welcoming, soothing, and homey than the sparse / industrial aesthetic it gives off today. Also, as summers get hotter, the shade will be increasingly important to encourage walking and reduce road heat.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Safety for pedestrians	
Second Choice	First Choice	safety. i think a buffer between pedestrians/bicyclists is extremely important especially with the speeds.	
Second Choice	First Choice	If there are bike lanes and families use them then it would be nice to be away from the road for children's safety. I would not ride in a bike lane next to a busy road with children.	
Second Choice	First Choice	As an underconfident bicycle rider, I don't like to be near cars.	
Undecided	First Choice	If the bike infrastructure is not physically separated, then don't bother. It won't get used. When building a bike lane on Meridian, you should be asking "Will a 10-year-old be able to use this? Will an elderly person be comfortable riding here?" Do not design a bike lane for recreational riders because it's a waste of time.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I like separating people from cars.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Cars go to fast unsafe for bike lane on road	
Second Choice	First Choice	More separation for the bikes and cars is good.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Need to develop walking and biking places. Less cars more other stuff	I think there definitely needs to be a traffic light at 32nd. Very difficult for residents to turn onto meridian without a light. This forces traffic to use 106th as an arterial to get to 24th and be able to use the light there to turn onto Meridian. At the very least new an improved speed limit signs along 106th would be appreciated.
Second Choice	First Choice	Safety	
Second Choice	First Choice	Busy road, need to sp pedestrian from automobiles	
Second Choice	First Choice	The second choice keeps bicycles safely out of traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice	Ffewe bikers making it less of an issue for pedestrians to navigate bike lanes. Also a larer buffer for children from the street	
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	People honestly have no business walking or biking up or down meridian to todd road. Barrier or not it's a fatality waiting to happen. You can widen all you want but those blind corners are not conducive to pedestrian traffic. Plus there is nothing to connect. The car dealership and what? The park? The gun store? The park that doesn't even have any sports fields? No thanks.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Having the buffer between the bike lane and vehicle lanes would make me feel much safer and more comfortable with biking along Meridian (and allowing my pre-teen and teen to do so as well).	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option 2 appears to be a safer option for the public as well as providing a buffer between bike lane and motor vehicles	
Second Choice	First Choice	Feels safer to move all non-vehicle traffic away from a busy road.	Street light on 32nd St
Second Choice	First Choice	More safety for non motorized	I prefer Option B as it protects the bike lane from the traffic lane. A better safety option in my opinion.
Second Choice	First Choice	Assuming option 1 = A and option 2 = B. Separating the bikes from vehicles provide the riders with greater protection. A pedestrian and cyclist impact will be far less impactful than a car and cyclist. This also separates younger or more inexperienced riders further from vehicles who may be more likely to abruptly swerve into traffic or react poorly to passing vehicle. Particularly the very large or loud ones.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Seems safer for drivers and bikers	
Second Choice	First Choice	Better pedestrian and bie safety.	
Second Choice	First Choice		HOW ABOUT ENFORCING TRAFFIC SPEED LIMIT AND LAWS LIKE EDGEWOOD USE TO!!
Second Choice	First Choice	The buffer between bikes and vehicles should be standard. Even with designated bike lanes, cars can creep to the edge lines or not pay attention and cross over. In addition, that extra bike space can turn into parking for vehicles doing quick errands or deliveries which would then negate the purpose of the lane.	Finish 167 1st

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	I think it would feel safer to have the buffer for bikes, considering familes with children will bike to the new park etcm	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safety of bikers and motorists	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option 2 appears to be the safer option for bicyclists by increasing the buffer area for bicyclists.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Because of how twisty that road is, I would feel more comfortable waking or biking with a buffer between that and the cars- people drive crazy on this section.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer for pedestrians	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option 2 is safer	
Second Choice	First Choice		Will there be turn lanes? Not included in sketch above. That would be a better use than a green strip in the middle that will need the road shut down to maintain and will be full of weeds.
Second Choice	First Choice	I like the idea of having separation of the bike lane from the road for safety- especially since it goes to the new park and kids may be using it more.	
Second Choice	First Choice		No roundabouts.
Second Choice	First Choice	I like the safety and comfort of separated, bike/walking lanes	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikes away from cars is safer	
Second Choice	First Choice	Keeping pedestrians farther from the road	The new 36th park has virtually no separation between cars and the park. The entire Play area park should've been build on the east side of that property. Very exposed to creepers, kidnappers and cars.
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B has more room for walking and biking. The plantings are only necessary IF they are going to be kept up! The current plantings are in TERRIBLE condition!	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikes in traffic create danger.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't like driving right next to a bike lane. Option B has a barrier between bikes and cars.	
Second Choice	First Choice	A barrier between bike lane and drive lane would be the most safe option for persons riding bikes to be safe doing so.	
Second Choice	First Choice		I would like to see a rode that does not encourage people outside town to travel through town. Roundabouts in numerous locations might help. Reduce speeds with red light cameras. My only worry is this would make them travel down side roads. Widening the roads is a good idea making it as pretty as possible. I like a roundabout at the corner of 36th. That corner is hard to see around the people speeding up the hill.
Second Choice	First Choice	I like the idea of keeping bikes away from vehicles, rather than having them closer to traffic. I understand the bike lanes give bikers more room, but accidents happen. It's safest to have them off the side of the road if possible. It also gives an area where kids can safely ride up/down Meridian, whereas we wouldn't allow our younger children to ride in the bike lane if it's adjacent to the road.	
	First Choice	With trees separating the bike lane from traffic, aesthetically it looks "smaller" and less like a big, wide busy street. Visually it would look less like our roads have been impacted by the numbers of people moving here.	
Second Choice	First Choice	It seems safer that bicyclists be further away from vehicle traffic rather than closer.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Don't need a separate lane for bikes and pedestrians. They can share.	
Second Choice	First Choice	A sidewalk and beautification of the street is absolutely necessary. A bike lane is not necessary.	Keep truck traffic off these roads. Too dangerous to mix local traffic w trucks. Please landscape and do so logically (appropriate tree selection & planted according to tree needs when mature etc)
Second Choice	First Choice	Is "Option 1" really "Option A"? If so, the above rankings apply.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Off-street bike lanes for safety	No bike path needed. Distance is very minimal and riding a bike such a short distance is impractical. If we were attached the urban trail that would be different.
First Choice	Second Choice	Keep the trees you will be planting from growing over the road way quite as much; avoid bicycle/pedestian conflict.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Safer for pedestrians	
First Choice	Second Choice	In theory bicycle traffic should be moving in the same direction as vehicles. It is probably easier to avoid negative pedestrian interactions by separating walkers from other non-vehicular traffic.	Widening the road isn't feasible or optimal, but giving people alternatives to driving with safe walking and biking sidewalks/lanes would help. Stop building multifamily units in Edgewood. There are too many people as it is.
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Cyclists know how to navigate a bike lane alongside traffic. speed limit is only 35 mph and it is reasonable to put the lane next to traffic. This will also encourage cyclists to obey traffic signals. Alternatively, a bike lane next to the side walk will result in pedestrians (naively) walking in the bike lane and will inevitably result in mishaps or worse. Orting foothills trail is an example where the bike lane and walking paths are merged and cyclists ignore stop signs.	
First Choice	Second Choice	I think option A looks more attractive.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Keep bike lane separate from walking path	
First Choice	Second Choice	safety	
Second Choice	Second Choice	No bikes to many cars more lanes please	
First Choice	Second Choice	This seems like the normal layout.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Bike lane separate from the walking lane.	

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
First Choice	Second Choice	Option A looks like it would cost less and not take as much land from individuals	
First Choice	Second Choice	Option B seems like it would be more safe for cyclists.	Planter strip actually sized correctly for trees
First Choice	Second Choice	the question is really where bike lanes should go. I'm guessing putting bike lanes with regular traffic is less costly but less safe for bikes. However, bike and pedestrian lanes don't always mix well either and have to think much more expensive (but only guessing)	
First Choice	Second Choice	I like the separation of vehicles and bicycle path.	We need businesses. Talk to businesses and see what features could be added to get them to come to Edgewood. Add sidewalks to the park.
Second Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Safety	
First Choice	Second Choice		Turn lanes at intersections. Less green space because of cost for upkeep and dog walkers will allow their dogs to poop there. Planting strip has not previously been maintained, and that probably won't change. Sidewalks are nice but who will be walking? I drive from 24th to Safeway and beyond...hardly ever see a walker.
First Choice	Second Choice		Stop building apartments right at the curb on Meridian! They add to congestion. And get rid of all the shabby, dilapidated properties there now. Clean up! What about the roundabout at 36th? And closing the top of Chrisella?
First Choice	Second Choice	As bikes are a form of transportation, I think the bike lane should be closest to the street/traffic. In my opinion, it is nonsensical otherwise.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Option A makes the bike lane like most other bike lanes, and I think that's appropriate for the segment.	Better left turn options
Second Choice	Second Choice	Na	Install a camera to catch red light runners at 36 and Meridian. Force people to slowdown. Charge a toll. Force people to use other roads. If you care about safety do something big about it.
Second Choice	Second Choice	Leave it alone. We don't need to change the current street.	
First Choice	Second Choice	We seldom see bikes on hwy 161. Its not a place for them. Seattle has tried option B and its made thenstreets less accessable and harder for cara to see bikes.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Some people tend to speed on their bikes and could endanger young children or elderly people who are walking. Separating them would keep walkers safe.	Is a planted strip in the middle the most cost effective or environmentally friendly option?
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	I am a cyclist. Option A seems safer but more prone to homeless camps that is why I chose option B	
First Choice	Second Choice	I prefer the bike path for travel with roads and allow the sidewalks for pedestrians only	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	I don't like the idea of a bike lane next to the sidewalk.	
First Choice	Second Choice	I am a very hard core bicyclist and typically travel at 15-20 mph on my bike on flat terrain. My preference is driven by needing a buffer between me and pedestrians who typically are not aware of fast moving bicycles coming from behind.	No roundabouts no additional traffic lights
First Choice	Second Choice		Some type of traffic control for speeders and people who aggressively merge into other lanes. Any improvements need to have sidewalks for safe access to the new park and the numerous apartment complexes down the road.
First Choice	Second Choice	Safety of pedestrians and cyclists.	
First Choice	Second Choice	As a walker who sometimes brings my dog, bikes and dogs on leashes don't always mix well. As long as the buffer for bikes next to the car lane is also safe for kids, by preference is option A. Also, there are a few bikers who don't respect the lane designation and it makes it hard for pedestrians to negotiate space.	
First Choice	Second Choice	As a pedestrian, would not feel comfortable walking next to bicyclists speeding past me in as in Option B. Vehicles may not see bikes when making turns since their lane is further out of site.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Separate the bikers from the walkers.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Not many bikers, the combined area separated from traffic will allow more foot traffic, families with kids both walking and biking.	
First Choice	Second Choice	bikes are separated from walkers	Less greenery, because what we have now is not being maintained, is costly and is ugly.
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	People should be walking a safe distance away from vehicles.	
First Choice	Second Choice		Do not add too much green stuff that will not be maintained.
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
First Choice	Second Choice	Bike lanes work well	Not sure what the solution is but driving on Meridian in Milton/Edgewood is frustrating at times. If I travel at the speed limit I'm flipped off, tailgated, honked at and on occasion I've had trucks pass me then get in front of me and slam on their brakes (to teach me a lesson, I suppose). Consequently, I travel on Meridian at close to 40mph FOR MY SAFETY! Yes, I admit I speed. But I feel safer speeding a bit than following the law in this case. Too many short fused angry people with guns.
First Choice	Second Choice	Bikers will still be safer away from cars but will be able to use all traffic lanes without cutting into pedestrian area.	Concentrate on vehicle lanes and simple sidewalks. Anything else is a waste of money.
First Choice	Second Choice	Cyclists will overrun pedestrians if put next to them. They will use the sidewalk	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Separating the pedestrian and bike lanes is important.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	I live on Meridian in the Simons Mills apartment complex. It's hard to get out on Meridian to take a right. It's really hard to take a left. I'm a little concerned about 2 lanes in both directions.	
First Choice	Second Choice		Alternatives to the planting strip
First Choice	Second Choice	The bike lane is not useful to me personally, but seems to offer better options for turn lanes at appropriate times than option B.	
Undecided	Second Choice	I grew up in UP and they actually decrease the width of Bridgeport and 67th to decreas traffic and speed - we don't need t increase accessibility for faster speeds	
First Choice	Second Choice	Ever walked toddlers or dogs on a Sidewalk during the hot summer? Ugh! Sidewalks heat up incredibly and having trees closer to the PEOPLE and pets who are on foot is preferred. Also, having been at Greenlake and the like, know from experience the pain of having a pedestrian or pet repeatedly being nearly mowed over by bicyclists who want to cheat and use the sidewalk or "non-wheeled" sidewalk for a passing lane around other slower riders.	
First Choice	Second Choice	I think double lanes on each side would help with traffic.	I dislike seeing planting strips in the middle verses two way turn lane. Your plan requires going to a intersection and making a U-turn and does not provide an alternate lane when traffic accidents happen.
First Choice	Second Choice	It would be safe for my family to walk and ride bikes with this plan	
First Choice	Second Choice	Keeps pedestrians safe from bikes and skateboard riders	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	More important to keep bikes away from walkers than cars. And it appears there will still be a divider between cars and bikes.	More room for traffic
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Biking is low on my priority list but bikes I believe would endanger pedestrians more than be endangered by automobiles on the road.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	I would prefer to bike ride with a median between the sidewalk and bike lane.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Pedestrians tend to not pay attention and walk down bike paths as well. Splitting the two will eliminate Pedestrians walking down the bike path. Also, having the bike path on the road will allow extra space for emergency vehicles to get through during heavy traffic.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		Make sidewalks and bike lanes one. Makes for a wider path and allows for events.
First Choice	Second Choice	Like keeping pedestrians separate from bikes	
First Choice	Second Choice	Bikes move quickly like cars. It would be nice to have a walking path separate from fast moving vehicles and bikes.	
Second Choice	Second Choice	Bikes interfere with traffic flow. Having a separate lane will help that and keep them safer.	
	Second Choice	Cars speed way too fast- too risky putting bikes next to car lanes	
First Choice	Second Choice	Traffic is and will likely become more aggressive with these changes, max buffer important	Leave it all as is.
Second Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Needs to pedestrian friendly.	
First Choice	Second Choice		Properly sized round a bouts work well. See 70th in Fife for an example of a DISASTER round a bout.
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		Arrows that show the direction walkers and bikers should be facing to ensure they see each other. Use different asphalt types for bicycle lane and walking path to ensure each stay to their lane. (bumpier/quick drain walking path)
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	An established break between bikes and walkers would reduce conflict and be safer.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Seems to be very little bicycle traffic along here.	less use of runabouts
First Choice	Second Choice	Shared pedestrian and bike lanes tend to cause accidents in my experience.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Bikers should be closer to vehicle traffic since they should follow traffic laws.	

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	I like the idea of a bike lane for those who would like to ride their bike through town. Not sure I have really seen people riding their bikes through town and maybe that is because they do not feel safe.	
First Choice	Second Choice		Stop spending so much money trying to make Edgewood into Seattle JR and keep it a small town
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
Second Choice	Second Choice	I feel the buffer space is a more safe option for bikes	
First Choice	Second Choice	Bikers next to pedestrians/dog walkers is never a good idea. 2nd option has trees close to cars...where are the lights?	SAFETY. Lose the trees and lawn. I don't want tax money going to landscaping.
First Choice	Second Choice	Keep the bike lane off the sidewalk.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Don't need physical separation for bike traffic.	
Second Choice	Second Choice		barrier around park next to meridian to protect young children who may stray towards the road
First Choice	Second Choice	I like the bike path being separated from the sidewalk, bikers flow with traffic vs pedestrians	A fence on the border of the new park.
First Choice	Second Choice	Bike training puts them in line with cars not pedestrian.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
Second Choice	Second Choice	If the bikes can be closer to the cars I think that would be safer. Or bikes always weave in and out of traffic and if people in cars are turning they may not see bikes if trees and sidewalks are blocked them.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Looks like option one would cost less. We need round abouts!	
First Choice	Second Choice	There should be an option C to not have a bike lane. There simply is not enough, or ever will be, bike traffic.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	If the bike lane is next to the sidewalk people will bike on the sidewalk!	I wish the lights turning onto16th and 24th were left turn yield, especially during low traffic time.
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Shouldn't the options be listed as A and B not 1 and 2? That is a little confusing. Bikes belong with traffic not with pedestrians unless it's a small child.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Where do electric scooters go? if they can use the bike lane when attached to the road, then thats my preferrence. if when the bike lane is attached to the side walk... where do you expect electric scooters to be? With the lack of bus routes off meridian, using electric scooters to get to the core, carry on the bus, and then use for last mile access on the other end it is more convinient.	Be consistent with Right-of-Way dedication. Right of way should be taken consistently from big developments as well as small businesses/residences along the corridor. You can already tell that the City of Edgewood has been inconsistent with the developments between 24th and 36th, allowing the big multi family developers not to dedicate ROW. Additionally, the merge between 24th and 36th is poor and the intersection of 36th/Chrisella and Meridian needs to be redesigned. It is a very dangerous and poorly designed intersection that does not take the safety of the new park patrons into consideration.
Second Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	The buffer seems sfficient to me.	More lighting
First Choice	Second Choice	There are very few bikers in Edgewood, mostly because the weather is so poor. The few bikers should be next to the drive lane so that the many pedestrians can enjoy their peaceful and serene walk.	Too many apartments bringing crime and traffic. We are quickly becoming South Hill. We will have to move when all of this comes to fruition.
Second Choice	Second Choice	Less cost	
First Choice	Second Choice	Physically separating bike lanes for riders safety	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Bikers can ride fast and injure pedestrians. Also pedestrians may not be paying attention causing accidents with bikers.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Most roads I've seen have the bike lane on roadways.	A barrier between the 4 lanes to reduce head on collisions.
First Choice	Second Choice	I believe to improve the corridor and create improved safety features is paramount primarily for vehicular travel, which is the highest users of the corridor. Also, that approach could assuredly get the project planned, permitted, and constructed sooner, compared with more studies and greater cost considerations for pedestrian, biking, and tree planting facilities.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
Second Choice	Second Choice		
Undecided	Second Choice		Do not plant trees. They grow to big. The roots will crack the roads and sidewalks. Their limbs will scratch the vehicles or cause drivers to swerve into other lanes.
First Choice	Second Choice	Bke lanes are not as important as people think they are. There are not THAT many people riding bicycles on Meridian that require a full bike lane.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Keep bikes separate from strollers and children walking.	
First Choice	Second Choice		Intersection @ columbia bank needs addressed. Gain accessibility to safeway parking lot. A light there or roundabout needed.
First Choice	Second Choice	The separated bike lane is awkward.	Crosswalks with yellow flashing lights
First Choice	Second Choice	Safer for walkers with the tree buffer in between	It's a small country town. Do not make it more.
First Choice	Second Choice	As long as there's a very good buffer (highly raised curb for instance) between the vehicle traffic and the bicycle lane (Option 1), I would prefer this option to keep bicycles away from pedestrians.	

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
Second Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	driveways and bicycles don't get along well	
First Choice	Second Choice	To beautify Edgewood.	
Undecided	Undecided		
Second Choice	Undecided	The bike/multi use lanes take up too much of the already limited space.	Just please be bold in designing something that allows safe travel outside of a car. Milton and Edgewood are choking with car traffic, and we cannot add lanes to get out of the problem. The leadership must come from designing proper, safe infrastructure.
First Choice	Undecided		Street plantings that won't look dead in a few years or cost a lot to maintain.
Undecided	Undecided	Provides sidewalks	
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	I see a no-win scenario. Too much traffic for any kind of pedestrian usage along Meridian. How many people walk along 512, I-5, or for that matter any major road in Pierce County? How many deaths would take place? One accident on Meridian will lock up traffic for miles in any direction. Add a roundabout, and migraines will follow, to say nothing of the impact to schools /students/school busses.	
Undecided	Undecided	I don't walk or bike this area, so I don't have a preference.	
Undecided	Undecided	I can't see the difference in the picture example	
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	Adding any more lanes will increase traffic volumes and make it more dangerous, pedestrians will get killed!	Landscaping that is simple enough to be maintained well. Edgewood currently cannot/does not maintain what it has along meridian
Undecided	Undecided		Idea: do nothing. These ideas aren't good. Put some sidewalks or bike lanes or even a decent road shoulder from the neighborhoods in Milton and Edgewood and connect them to the business center (if one can honestly call a couple dive bars and an abandoned video store a business center). Let the highway be a highway. Nobody is taking a leisurely Sunday stroll down a highway because it's a fucking highway. Look at 99 in Fife. Nobody riding a bike or wandering the side of the highway is up to much good. Get highway people thru town as quickly as possible. Don't stop until they get to Federal Way. So do nothing. Let other road projects work out and maybe the commuters will have better options.
Second Choice	Undecided	I like the bike lane away from traffic.	
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	I wish there was a neither option, no bike lanes are needed. These are not functional options for Meridian. Too much wasted space with tree buffers and bike lanes. I can see the benefits of a sidewalk but the remaining area should be used to increase the flow of traffic that is going to continue to grow.	
Undecided	Undecided	They both look the same to me.	
First Choice	Undecided	I gave the rankings that high or low weather they are important to me	
Undecided	Undecided		Remove bike lanes, planting strips as traffic separations, and minimize landscaping.
First Choice	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	Use the funds to improve roads around Edgewood so commuters will drive around and not through.	
Undecided	Undecided	Use the funds to improve roads around Edgewood so commuters will drive around and not through.	
Undecided	Undecided	Why would you need a separate bike lane and pedestrian lane? In would be sufficient and probably more cost effective.	
Undecided	Undecided		Traffic light at 32nd and meridian
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	Traffic is going to be awful during construction	
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		More crosswalk options.
Undecided	Undecided		
First Choice	Undecided	We need better flow for vehicles, sidewalks and biking wouldn't be used enough or have that many people using them.	
First Choice	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	In 15 years of having a retail business directly in the area under study it only needs more lanes for cars and a sidewalk, the mount of bicycle traffic does not justify the expense of a bicycle lane, they can share the road or the sidewalk when necessary. Enough of the foolish spending of money and resources.	
Undecided	Undecided	I don't understand the pros and cons of each.	Better lighting especially at intersections.
Undecided	Undecided		Maybe benches at intersections like the one on 24th to make it feel more friendly.
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	This seems very confusing as how it connects to puyallup and federal way or even within Edgewood, does not align. 2 lane 2 ways, seems like it should be 2 lanes one way and 2 lanes another?	
Undecided	Undecided		

6. Please rank the		7. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	8. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Undecided	Undecided		
First Choice	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	Need sidewalk to park. Either build a city with useful features to bring in businesses or stop wasting our money.	
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		
First Choice	Undecided	Having the bike lane so close to the sidewalk will result in pedestrians being mowed over by bikers or ebike riders.	A planting strip down the middle of the road is a waste of space and tax payer dollars as it serves no purpose other than looking pretty and will have to be maintained. A center turn lane allows vehicles and traffic to continue to move as people can get into the various business along the way. Also duing emergencies, the center turn lane allows emergency vehicles to easily bypass traffic. Keep the center turn lane for the entire stretch of road.
Undecided	Undecided	Concentrate on vehicle lanes and simple sidewalks. Anything else is a waste of money.	
Second Choice	Undecided		
First Choice	Undecided	Better option	
Undecided	Undecided	Don't like the center grass island. What we have is currently isn't maintained. And the cost of added employees to maintain the added would only help to increases my taxes.	
First Choice	Undecided	First, you should not call it option A then in your question call it option 1. If you put the bike lane next to traffic, delivery drivers will park in them.	
Undecided	Undecided	Because your taking away why people chose to live here	
Second Choice	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	The current pedestrian access to the highway is sufficient. This is not an urban environment where non-motorized travel is frequent or necessary. Anyone not driving is typically a transient. No option that includes expanding non-motorized travel along the corridor is in the best interest of the populous that is primarily motorized commuter based.	
Undecided	Undecided	Physical separations (planting strips) between car lanes will impact the ability to enter and leave many of the businesses between 24th and 36th. They will also cost much more money to develop and maintain the landscaping. Bike lanes do not make sense to include as there aren't many other streets with bike lanes or sidewalks for bikers to even safely get to 24th or 36th in the first place.	
Undecided	Undecided		
First Choice	Undecided	Bike riders separated from walking	
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	I don't know what would be better	
Undecided	Undecided	Meridian needs two lanes in each direction with a turn lane. Plus side walks on both sides and a bike lane. Anything less is a waste of time.	
		neather option	
First Choice		This is unacceptable	
Second Choice		No enough bike traffic to warrant their own lane.	
			None of Edgewood's inhabitants want more development. This is why we have chosen to live here , to help maintain a "small town" feel. Understandably, there will be growth. I would like to see the city work with local, environmentally progressive Design-Build contractors. Invest in hiring a great architecture firm that will set us apart. Put the money into the DB effort that will build for now and the future.
First Choice			
First Choice			
Second Choice			
First Choice		Bikes don't belong with pedestrians	
Second Choice			
			A the main stretch of the city, I'm looking forward to it looking purposefully beautiful
First Choice		It's not possible to truly compare without also knowing the costs and funding sources.	
First Choice			Is "Option 2" really "Option B"? If so, the above rankings apply.
		From 36th down the hill is too dangerous for bikes and pedestrians . Need more car lanes to ease back up on Meridian	

9. Please rank the preliminary options for Segment 2 (36th to Puyallup City limits)

	Option 1	Option 2
Undecided	92	74
First Choice	177	414
Second Choice	373	164



9. Please rank the		10. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	11. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	2 lanes each way will improve movement around accidents and road repairs/maintenance.	
Undecided	First Choice	This is not a safe section of road for multimodal traffic. Save lives and make it for vehicular traffic only.	Keep any multimodal zones within the city and do not connect to outside areas. We don't need homeless and desperate people ruining our nice city.
Second Choice	First Choice	The hill is a traffic nightmare and adding a sidewalk will help 0 actual residents wile providing hundreds of homeless (houseless neighbors) access to leave the river at the bottom of the hill and walk on up and commit crimes.	
Second Choice	First Choice	This road has to be fixed in some way. It's an accident waiting to happen	Multimodal traffic should not extend beyond 36th street. We don't need homeless and dangerous transients infiltrating our community from the encampments that exist down the hill. Please keep our community and children safe! Thank you!
Second Choice	First Choice	Better traffic flow during peak commute times	I've lived here since 1992 and the last 5 years as a homeowner in Edgewood have been very disappointing. The city cares more about fancy center median planters and pretty rustic lamp poles than they do about the gridlock they've allowed to fester as they build as many apartment complexes as humanly possible. Instead of expanding the lanes of travel for tax payers /residents. I hear that "if we widen the roads, that will just encourage more people to drive through Edgewood"… news flash people, everyone already does use Edgewood as a cut through and a bike lane isn't going help a damn thing.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Moving traffic up and down Meridian is more important to me than the pedestrian access. Work with State and Puyallup to widen the road all the way to Valley Ave.	
Undecided	First Choice		
	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Need tow lanes each way down the hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice	During icy/snowy road conditions or wind-fallen trees, the two lanes downhill are extremely important to improve safety. Walking space is a nice idea, but the needs of the drivers far exceed the needs of the very very few pedestrians that would have any need to walk up or down that hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Scary to imagine a bicycle careening down the hill out of control	
Second Choice	First Choice	To remove the traffic bottleneck.	Make it 4 lanes all way to Valley Ave.
Second Choice	First Choice	I think option B is best because it is safer for pedestrians.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	People drive 50-60mph on this road. Widening it would relief the stress of the driver on your tail for no reason other thanthey have no respect.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't envision a lot of people walking up the hill. I'm afraid it would encourage homelessness to trickle into Edgewood	There's mention of putting in a round-about in this section of road - ?32nd? Or 36Th?. That may cause problems for people turning left onto/off of Meridian during high traffic hours. Currently during high traffic hours I'm only able to turn left onto/off of Meridian to/from side streets when there is a pause in traffic due to the traffic light at 36th. With a roundabout there might never be a pause, forcing drivers to turn left at traffic lights at 24th or 36th and then drive through residential areas to get to their destination/home. This would cause increased traffic on smaller residential streets where many people walk, children are at play, etc, etc.
Second Choice	First Choice	It might help more with evening traffic to have more lanes.	Before deciding, I would like to know if expanding to 4 driving lanes, option B, will be instrumental in improving traffic flow when the 167 is extended at to connect to I-5 in Fife. Will 2 southbound lanes going down the hill allow traffic to flow mor easily into a right turn onto the new 167 westbound extension?
Second Choice	First Choice	The pedestrian/bike area doesn't need much space. Space should be used for vehicle traffic.	Can you provide a walk pathway off the shoulder west of the drive lanes to allow safe walk or bicycle down the hill.
Second Choice	First Choice		Thank you for asking for input. I would like to see this type of survey used more on other projects in Edgewood. Although the developers may not like my ideas, at least I can be part of the process without having to attend a meeting.
Second Choice	First Choice	If 2 lanes end at 36th, we are right back to the traffic mess we now have at 24th.	The left turn into 102nd is very dangerous. The sign that shows a left turn is weak. We need a stronger signage or flashing yellow light showing a left turn is a possibility and that sign must be before the curve. Maybe the sign should read how many feet ahead is the turn. The the left turn issue is going down the hill into Puyallup.
Second Choice	First Choice		A safe route west of and separate from Meridian for pedestrians and cyclists
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B for added car capacity. I don't agree with this drawing though, you should still have room to build 4 lanes and a sidewalk. You need to straighten the road, buy a couple houses and build retaining walls. If you don't think it can be built, hire a new Engineer.	You should add a center lane for cars turning on this road. It's very dangerous without it.
Second Choice	First Choice	The population residing in Edgewood and Milton has seen a big spike with the addition of new homes and apartments recently. And there are still more apartments, housing communities, and retail spaces currently being built. 98% of these people are going to be driving and not walking. One lane roads aren't going to support that amount of traffic without severe congestion, especially during peak commuting times. Putting a significant amount of money to add a walking lane that few people will use on a consistent daily basis doesn't make much sense and solves no issues. I never hear any complaints about not being able to walk down the hill. However I have heard growing concern over the increased traffic. A second lane to support the new and future influx of people to our growing community makes much more sense for the future. Construction takes a lot of money and time. We need to make sure we are spending it while keeping the future in mind instead of waiting until it becomes an issue, and then having to throw more resources at it to redo it in 5 years.	Please ensure that the alternate pedestrian route is a safe and welcoming route in that it is well lit and visible so people will feel comfortable walking away from the car traffic that may provide the safety of a public space with lots of witnesses
Second Choice	First Choice	The population residing in Edgewood and Milton has seen a big spike with the addition of new homes and apartments recently. And there are still more apartments, housing communities, and retail spaces currently being built. 98% of these people are going to be driving and not walking. One lane roads aren't going to support that amount of traffic without severe congestion, especially during peak commuting times. Putting a significant amount of money to add a walking lane that few people will use on a consistent daily basis doesn't make much sense and solves no issues. I never hear any complaints about not being able to walk down the hill. However I have heard growing concern over the increased traffic. A second lane to support the new and future influx of people to our growing community makes much more sense for the future. Construction takes a lot of money and time. We need to make sure we are spending it while keeping the future in mind instead of waiting until it becomes an issue, and then having to throw more resources at it to redo it in 5 years.	
Second Choice	First Choice	To many cars need more lanes no one tides bikes or walks on meridian	
Second Choice	First Choice	Traffic flow on this stretch is more important than pedestrian access	
Second Choice	First Choice	This hill backs up all the time with vehicles. It is narrow and dangerous to drive with many blind corners.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Two lanes going downhill.	It's really the behavior of the citizens that are the problem. What are they even late for? 60 in a 35?
Second Choice	First Choice	Two lanes is needed all the way down the hill. The afternoon backups are crazy.	
Second Choice	First Choice	We need to free up traffic and more lanes does that	
Second Choice	First Choice	No sidewalk is needed here in my opinion. People RARELY walk, unless they're homeless. It's a steep hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Same as #7 above	
Second Choice	First Choice	It is too tight of an area to have pedestrians alongside of traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice	A sidewalk would be nice to have along that route.	Elements to limit speed. Keep people at 35, not 50.

9. Please rank the		10. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	11. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
	First Choice	best option	I don't see a lot of non-motorized users on that steep hill.
Second Choice	First Choice	This is a dangerous road to place pedestrians and bicyclists on. To create the flow of traffic adding the second lane downhill will be a significant improvement to this bottle neck.	
Second Choice	First Choice	The cost is less put in a plan for future development cost to property owners but have what is expected	
Second Choice	First Choice	Consistent in both directions.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I can't even believe people consider option A as a viable choice. There definitely needs to be a second southbound lane.	Traffic lights or a stop sign with a turn option at Meridian and 102nd Ace E is imperative for safety and convenience for residents of 102nd Ave.
Undecided	First Choice	3 lanes is a waste of resources because we already know we med 4 lanes due to traffic and growth. Why wait to do it. That's poor planing. Do it all now.	
Second Choice	First Choice	The segment doesn't seem like it has much foot or bike traffic because it is so steep. Therefore the precious extra width would be better used for southbound vehicle traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice	There needs to be better access to Southhill too. Many people are driving through North Hill downtown Puyallup to get to Southhill. There's not good freeway exits, so I think the problem is bigger than Edgewood.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Greater flow of traffic both directions and greater safety for bicycles/peds	
Second Choice	First Choice	Without a second down-hill lane, traffic problems Sou-bound will not be alleviated, coupled with people are not naturally inclined to walk such steep hills. And traffic travels up the hill too fast for it to be a very safe pedestrian route. Chrisella Rd is a better pedestrian route, though indirect.	
Undecided	First Choice	Option A is unworkable as no one will walk or ride bikes on the hill. This does not provide any serious improvement.	More lanes
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	The commute down the hill needs an additional lane to ease traffic congestion. More of a priority than pedestrians. Currently never see people walk the street unless the occasional homeless person. There are other routes to use to get up and down the hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice		This all would be much simpler if the apartments had not been built so close to meridian. How will you account for that? Also, Meridian is very steep, will that need to be mitigated? I can't imagine how much this would cost and if it is indeed doable at
Second Choice	First Choice		none
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I chose option B due to the fact that Edgewood is growing and will continue growing if the city of Edgewood is going to spent the money to extend the road then why would it have one lane going one direction?	
Second Choice	First Choice	with so steep a decline having a pedestrian walk alongside is potential hazard.	
	First Choice	Need to decrease southbound bottleneck	
Second Choice	First Choice		Separate pedestrian traffic well away from vehicle traffic use alternative street for pedestrian and bicycle traffic.
Second Choice	First Choice	The need is greater for two lanes in each direction than opening adjacent pedestrian access.	We need some safety measures (lights?) for turning onto 102nd Ave E.
Second Choice	First Choice	More lanes southbound are needed.	I don't see them lighting in the drawings but I assume it is part of the plan. Lots of lighting makes a place feel safe and clean.
Second Choice	First Choice	The safety the added south bound lane outweighs the need for a sidewalk.	On the way down the hill, there is a small community of homes that have much trouble accessing Meridian (on the left, it's Lucy Lowry's neighborhood). Something is Needed there -- roundabout or ?? Seems that this would not be an appropriate spot for a light however something needs to change to allow better/safer accessibility!
Second Choice	First Choice	Increase lane amount to open up traffic blockages	
Second Choice	First Choice	Two lanes both ways allows for more traffic flow and it a better longer term option than keeping the three lanes	have to imagine adding a new lane will be very expensive and disruptive while adding the non-motorized uses (option A) would be cheaper.
Second Choice	First Choice	Cyclists will definitely utilize bike lanes in both directions of this segment. Also, the afternoon rush hour down the hill always bottlenecks with the single lane, so an additional lane would be very helpful.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Dangerous traffic not having enough room going downhill, would be improved by 2 lanes. Sidewalk seems unnecessary.	
	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Segment 2 needs a 2nd drive lane for moving southbound traffic in the afternoon. I don't see many pedestrians walking that segment but an off-corridor bike lane would be useful.	Benches along the route.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	We need 4 lanes all the way down to Puyallup.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I think there are fewer people walking/biking along the hill area and that the priority is to get the traffic through to the freeways or into town.	Add speed bumps reduce speeds to 25 discourage commuters
Second Choice	First Choice	The distance is too large from the bottom to the top to invite regular pedestrian traffic, as well as no businesses on the hill. Vehicle traffic will remain the biggest throughput, therefore adding a southbound lane would decrease congestion	
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't think it's necessary to have a bike/walking path down the hill. I can't imagine there's a huge need for that	Hopefully this plan includes a solution to the landslide issue on the downhill/western side where the asphalt has repeatedly cracked as if the southbound lane is going to slide down the cliff (and trees are leaning that direction too).
Second Choice	First Choice	Four lanes are a given.	We need to get the city Council to start making the people building all those apartments pay for the extra road means you can't take for homes and make it an apartment complex and expect there not to be traffic problems
Second Choice	First Choice	Its laughable to think people will use a walking path up this hill. LOL They park as close as they can to safeway to avoid walking.	
First Choice	First Choice		There should be a solid barrier between non-motorized lane and the motor lanes.
Second Choice	First Choice	Hardly anyone needs to walk this stretch of road. That's a long way up or down hill. We need more lanes instead. That'll make a larger impact.	A roundabout at 36th and Meridian would be good, as well; to resolve the problem of Chrisella coming out there. If it could help manage traffic flow, slowing speed of everyone with curvy lanes, but also keep traffic moving.
Second Choice	First Choice	I hav never seen a pedestrian or bike on this hill, but lots of cars, especially during commute hours. Second option seems like it would be more practical.	
Second Choice	First Choice	With the increased traffic, and more to be added when the 528 units go in behind Northwood Elementary, there will be even more traffic moving up and down the hill. To plan for this effectively, there needs to be two lanes going up and down the hill to Puyallup in both directions. Otherwise, traffic will bottleneck at the top of the hill waiting to go down.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Visibility is poor on the tight hill corners going either direction. It would be safer for pedestrians and bikers to not be there.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I drive this segment 4+ times per week on my commute. It feels really dangerous and a lot of drivers are pretty aggressive through this segment in terms of speed. I would prefer those drivers had the option to pass others. I am also not confident anyone will want to walk or bike up that hill, although there are some residences there.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Better traffic flow.	

9. Please rank the		10. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	11. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	Easy Traffic flow, not many bikers or walkers would prefer want to go up and down the hill	
Undecided	First Choice	Meed to get traffic moving. Now it's a bottle neck.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Needs to be 4 lanes- 2 up and 2 down	
Second Choice	First Choice	Cheaper to expand to 4 lanes now than it would be to disrupt traffic and have multiple constriction when needed to expand later	Meridian is too steep for a bicycle lane
Second Choice	First Choice	I think it would be too dangerous to have pedestrian traffic going up/down that hill with all of the truck traffic and it would create a way for more transients to come up to Edgewood.	It's clear that at the bottom of the hill there have been many accidents that have taken out the guard rails on both side. Not sure what the solution is for this but the two lane curves up the hill is a good place to race up the hill from what I've seen. Something to slow traffic may be in order.
	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		Add another light with camera for speeding
Second Choice	First Choice	Double lanes going both ways are better for traffic.	Probably not enough right of way but a dedicated left turn lane would be ideal.
Second Choice	First Choice	We need 4 lanes. The traffic often backs up from Valley Ave to 24th and Meridian during rush hour	
Second Choice	First Choice		
First Choice	First Choice		It would be nice to acquire "inter urban trail" type pedestrian access for segment 2.
Second Choice	First Choice		Lighting
Second Choice	First Choice	More people drive this road than the people who would be walking or biking. Traffic going down into Puyallup is often backed up the hill into Edgewood and is a headache.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Traffic problems	
Second Choice	First Choice	Increased car capacity for better flow and funneling high traffic during rush hour up and down the hill	
Second Choice	First Choice	People don't need to walk down the hill. It only adds the chance of pedestrians getting hit by cars adding a sidewalk.	
Second Choice	First Choice	There is no reason to pretend that pedestrians are going to walk up this segment of roadway. The people that do that already use Pacific to Lakeland Hills for that purpose and it is more challenging.	
Second Choice	First Choice	A single downhill lane creates a traffic bottleneck at 36th street, the two lane downhill option eliminates this.	N/A
Second Choice	First Choice	See answer to question 8.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Choosing Option A would be a complete and udder traffic management failure. The bottleneck created driving South and having only one lane down the hill after adding two lanes in Segment 1 would be a waste and fix nothing. Besides that there is ZERO need for sidewalks on Meridian hill.	We need 4 lanes from Edgewood to Puyallup down the hill with no left turns especially in the curves as they're very dangerous. We're retired, live in Milton, have 5 children with grandkids who live nearby and have lived in the area for over 50 years. Thanks for asking.
Second Choice	First Choice		More property owner rights and input. Less developer input. All decisions should be made , by those who live in Edgewood, not those who travel through, or those who live in other cities and or work here.
Second Choice	First Choice	Eliminating the two lane to one lane merge.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I like the idea of having a parallel route for non-motorized multi-use, as long as it's constructed at the same time as the roadway revisions. It would be disappointing to see the walk/bike lane take a back seat to the vehicle lanes since there is NO safe way to get down the hill without a car/bus right now.	Stop changing Edgewood.
Second Choice	First Choice	I do think there has to be options for pedestrians and bikes, but I feel it is more important to improve the traffic flow and alleviate the congestion.	Slow traffic! Decrease volume.
Second Choice	First Choice	It's a busy section of road that has really steep sections of road, so practically it doesn't seem like it's going to get much pedestrian or bicycle use. Plus the traffic jams in this section are awful, so more traffic lanes up and down make the most sense to me.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Accommodation for higher traffic volume	
	First Choice	I feel option B is safer. If you widen the road from 24 to 36th and leave the bottom to Todd Road the same, there will be a real mess traveling south out of Edgewood.	
Second Choice	First Choice	The vole needs four lanes.	
Second Choice	First Choice	We need to move more vehicles in the hill, not pedestrians or bikes.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	We need 2 lanes each direction. Traffic is already slow at certain times of the day with only one lane and the area is continuing to grow.	
Second Choice	First Choice	We need more traffic capacity along Meridian to reduce congestion and reduce the need to alternate routes on the surface streets. That should be the top priority.	2 lanes each way makes much more sense to avoid a bottle neck.
	First Choice		More food trucks!
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Priority to motorized vehicles especially since that is a huge concern. Plus still allows for seperate pedestrian path.	Bike lane, sidewalk not needed on this segment.
Second Choice	First Choice	Improved flow up and down the hill to Puyallup would benefit everyone greatly. Pedestrians given an alternate route away from the road sounds like a much more pleasant walk.	At 36th and Meridian it would be nice if west bound traffic would stop east of Chrisella road not blocking and allowing cars from Chrisella road to pass through and turn right on to Meridian.
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer	
Second Choice	First Choice	There are zero businesses and no appetite from people to walk up and down that road. Focus on car traffic. More lanes will make it safer for the home owners who live off that road.	
Second Choice	First Choice	We need more vehicle movement than pedestrians	
Second Choice	First Choice	Going from two lanes to one lane would create backup traffic. No lane for left turns into houses with only one lane.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Need to allow for even traffic flow in both directions	Dog poop bag dispensers
	First Choice	Keep it a hwy not for bikes and pedestrians.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Foot traffic up the hill is nonexistent except for homeless. Sidewalk only provides area for them to set up camp.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Meridian is a highway and traffic needs 2 lanes both ways. Pedestrians and bicycles should not be on the highway for safety reasons.	Bottleneck issues will need to be addressed in some way at 36th St or the bridge going over the railroad
Undecided	First Choice	Again, this is unsafe Hill for any pedestrian to be on. There shouldn't be a sidewalk. Use the money for a 2nd lane going southbound.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Additional southbound lane should improve traffic flow.	This is not regarding the proposals put forth. I am interested in having an overpass that leads from east meridian to somewhere near key bank and area. crossing meridian is hard during very busy hours and it is not easy to either go up or down to the lights to cross. I would walk more if there were a safer way to get to the shopping area.

9. Please rank the		10. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	11. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	I'm unsure if the extending of i5 to 167 will alleviate the traffic issues as you head down the hill. I would choose the 4 lanes with the parallel walking path because I know the additional downhill lane will help, regardless of the 167 extension.	
Second Choice	First Choice	More traffic moving through than people walking, no one walking to Puyallup from Edgewood!!	
Second Choice	First Choice	Pedestrian lane is not needed for this part as it is a steep grade and would rarely be used. Cost versus reward will s	
Second Choice	First Choice	I think additional lanes are needed for motorized traffic. In my opinion, I think pedestrian use along that segment would be sparse.	
Second Choice	First Choice	The core Town Center area likely will not extend down the hill and instead of pedestrian walkways, extra auto lanes could help alleviate traffic from cutting through residential streets in Edgewood. A safe pedestrian walkway/trail should be added east on 36th from Meridian and down Chrisella to provide safe bicycle and pedestrian corridors connecting residential areas to the core commercial areas on Meridian.	Discourage vehicle traffic just cutting through Edgwood. Eliminate the bottleneck at SR 167.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
	First Choice	There is too much traffic in the afternoon and the road gets backed up. A 2nd lane would help alleviate the back up in	
Second Choice	First Choice		Remove the blind corner. Future increase in traffic will impede safety on the undivided highway.
Second Choice	First Choice	I live on 36th and it will back up traffic at the intersection if the two lanes are not continued down the hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice	The traffic is very bad during the peak commute time in the afternoon. Adding a bike lane doesn't help that congestion.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Undecided	First Choice	Not sure how functional a multi-use non-motorized zone would be for that section of the road. How many people are going to use it to walk or bike up the hill? With how bad the traffic backs up going down the hill in the evenings it would make sense for 2 lanes going down instead of a multi-use non-motorized zone that doesnt really take you anywhere.	
Undecided	First Choice	Don't really like either. I think the problem is that traffic piles up at Valley Ave.. Until that's solved, the additional lane is just temporary car storage capacity.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safety for bicyclists and pedestrians	
Second Choice	First Choice	Four lanes is almost always preferable to three lanes of travel.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B, first choice: Two lanes going South would help with evening traffic. Option A, Second choice, I wouldn't feel safe walking/biking along traffic on that hill; too many people speeding up it.	
Second Choice	First Choice	The traffic on this road going south is always HORRIBLE. It absolutely needs a second southbound lane to decrease congestion.	Change the 24th and Meridian intersection to give better line of sight when making a right turn going south on Meridian
Second Choice	First Choice	Accommodating the growing number of vehicles for efficient traffic flow is very important; more so than adding sidewalks through that stretch of the road.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I like the idea of the walking/biking path down the hill, but I worry about how the merge at 36th would impact traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	There seems to be little need for pedestrian traffic down that hill. Also the road gets very icy in winter and having the pedestrian travel area outside the buffer/shoulder area seems like a much safer choice.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I do not see option A as a realistic need. Walking and biking between these two points seems unsafe given the conditions of the road's curves and slope.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Forget adding a sidewalk. No one is going to walk along this roadway!	
Second Choice	First Choice	Traffic in the afternoon going south at times takes 45 - 60 minutes from 24th down the hill to Puyallup	
Second Choice	First Choice	Really, people going up or down that road on a bike or walking, are you insane?	No sideways on hill, too dangerous for pedestrians and allows for increased potential of homeless or walking travelers. This appears as an invitation
	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Not many people walk up that hill but when they do it is extremely dangerous. Rather than a non-motorized lane I believe an improved shoulder or buffer area would be a better use of funds as well as give some safety for those adventurous to attempt walking up the hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
	First Choice	Realistically foot traffic (and bikes) should be separated in a more realistic way from cars coming downhill. They exceed the speed limit as a rule and there are several "almost blind" curves that would take only a distracted driver answering or sending a text or looking away from the road momentarily for any other reason and then Bam! The pedestrian or biker would pay the price. This is NOT a safe stretch of road to have other than vehicles with air bags so close to each other. The Option B Off-Corrider parallel route for non-motorized users is the Safe and Sane plan.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Less traffic going southbound	Add more round abouts, reduce speeds, and ticket speeders and aggressive driving.
Second Choice	First Choice	Double lanes going down would help the most because that's where traffic backs up the worst.	
Second Choice	First Choice		I find questions 12-17 inappropriate and therefore I answered them incorrectly. What does my income have to do with anything? Will you give them less weight if I'm a woman, or a man? Will you take my answers into consideration if I'm black, rather than hispanic? Just off putting to see these types of questions being asked.
Second Choice	First Choice	The way it wind up the hill is too narrow. Any design must anticipate how the SR167 extension will impact traffic at the intersection of Valley Ave and Meridian. This traffic backs up the hill almost every weekday.	I would like to see a non-motorized buffer added to Option A (in place of what looks like a green buffer) so that cyclists have a safe place to ascend this steep incline and not have to pass pedestrians on the sidewalk.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		Less traffic lights. Roundabouts seem to work well in other cities.
Second Choice	First Choice	Hardly anyone walks this hill - it sucks to bike and walk. Most bikers will go down Milton way or down Yuma because it's not as steep and more scenic. Traffic is a problem and current amount of lanes won't be good long term.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Having 2 lanes each way would help with traffic and hopefully safety on the hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't see walkers using this often. Seems dangerous to walk the road even with the improvements	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Narrowing traffic from 2 lanes to 1 going down the hill creates a bottleneck. That stretch is not multiuser friendly.	
Second Choice	First Choice	We need the extra lane to improve congestion. Example: one afternoon it took me one hour to go from 32nd ave down Meridian to the Puyallup Fairgrounds area. That is approximately 4 miles. Something needs to be done.	
Second Choice	First Choice	More lanes going down the hill will help the most with traffic back-ups. Keeping one lane going down Meridian doesn't solve anything.	
Undecided	First Choice	The funnel effect of single lane traffic will not rectify your traffic burdens we already have.	

9. Please rank the		10. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	11. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Undecided	First Choice	People should not be walking or riding a bike on this dangerous road, also invites transient population up the hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option A does nothing to address the problem of a vehicle backup going down the hill on meridian towards Puyallup.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't envision much bike traffic or pedestrian traffic going up and down the hill. Until the RR bridge is widened, nobody will be going any further on foot.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I would love there to be a sidewalk, but I can't think of that many people would walk that way and the flow of traffic is much more important and will serve a greater number of people. Plus walking on a sidewalk on that road would be scary.	Remove the black metal fencing rail along Meridian and definitely do not extend it along the new roadway changes . The black metal fence railing is a significant safety hazard and should no longer be a part of the roadway. There have been numerous accidents and injuries because this railing blocks a safe view for vehicles entering the roadway. Please find a new configuration that allows for a clear view for all vehicles entering the roadway.
Second Choice	First Choice	I believe very few residents of edgewood would walk down the large hill to puyallup. I believe 2 lanes down the hill would help ease the backup created in edgewood from the intersection of Valley Ave in the evening between 3pm to 6pm.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Highest priority should be to add a lane. During busy times, the traffic can be very backed up through these sections. Many of the drivers are just passing through. This causes massive delays and backups for those of us that live here. Let's get that traffic moving and out of our town so travel is easier and better for us that live here.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		Two lanes southbound with option A.
Undecided	First Choice	Due to increased traffic volume and safety concerns over the years of only having one lane s/b down the hill I think if it can be addressed to it. From personal experience, drivers head downhill tend to want to push others in front of them to go faster and faster thru the curves, while following way too closely. It would be nice to have a lane to get out of the way.	
Second Choice	First Choice	The sidewalk wouldn't lead to anything as there are mostly warehouses at the base of the hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice		Option B is the only one that makes sense. We need to alleviate traffic, not waste valuable space on bike/pedestrian lanes.
Second Choice	First Choice	Makes safe as possible	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		Possibly a roundabout at 36th. It's a very dangerous intersection.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Need two lanes to support traduce demand in both directions	
Second Choice	First Choice	I want to have more walking space where I live. But I'm not super likely to walk down the hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Downhill backs up the hill, which up to 30 minutes to get down at times.	
Undecided	First Choice	I worry about the safety of pedestrians on the hill and think it's important for snowy/icy/rainy days to have multiple lanes going up and down	
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Steep hill and treacherous. I.proving the commuter traffic in this section seems more important.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B makes more sense for traffic flow.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Property to build roads is rare going down the hill. Build a bike/pedestrian lane that will not be used as intensively somewhere else.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Traffic can be terrible because of the current one lane setup. To keep one downhill lane in an "upgrade" project makes no sense	Stop trying to grow in an area that is not designed for growth. Listen to the people that live here we want a small town the whole reason for moving here.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Don't need sidewalk. Need more lanes instead.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Improve safety for bicyclists with separated corridor. Improve traffic through put going down hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice	It won't be worth it to construct it for pedestrians,	
Second Choice	First Choice	N\A	
Second Choice	First Choice	We need more lanes going up and down the hill. Traffic gets too congested.	
	First Choice		
Undecided	First Choice		Try to prep it for the bridge to get upgraded and widened.
Second Choice	First Choice	Consistent look and keeps traffic flow moving to have two lanes both ways	
Second Choice	First Choice	Evening commute traffic needs option B.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	the road up and down the hill is horrible and can be scary.	
Second Choice	First Choice	keep it symmetrical.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B accommodates more vehicle traffic and that is where the volume of transportation is.	
Undecided	First Choice		
Undecided	First Choice	No one is going to walk up meridian even if there is a sidewalk. That's silly and a waste of tax dollars. I might use it if it were a safe and protected bike path. But that's a stretch too.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Safer	Please ensure access to public restrooms in the area. Walkers and bikers need access to restrooms.
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't think this road is safe enough for anyone to walk on.	As mentioned above, improved walkability throughout town would be great. We live on 48th and it would be nice to have a safe connection to the parks, schools and commercial up north.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		If adding an extra lane is this going to cause a worse bottle neck back up at the bridge?
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	A lot less traffic blockage	It would make more sense to have two lanes up and two lanes down Meridian, however, if this is done, I do believe there should still be access for pedestrians to walk, ride bikes, etc. up and down the hill.
Second Choice	First Choice	Need to allow for more traffic off the hill so they stop taking Chrisella.	
Second Choice	First Choice	More lanes of traffic keep vehicles moving and reduce congestion	
Second Choice	First Choice	No one walks down this hill. To much traffic to make it enjoyable.	
Second Choice	First Choice		There needs to be a barrier dividing directions of travel for cars. Also, a staging area for road closed signs in the event of snow so any police officer can close the hill to avoid bottlenecking traffic stuck on an icy hill
Second Choice	First Choice	We need more room for traffic on the hill. It would be too dangerous for pedestrians.	
Second Choice	First Choice		

9. Please rank the		10. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	11. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't think bicycles or walkers need to be going down Meridian hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I think an additional downhill lane would help the late afternoon traffic backup down the hill.	Very difficult to make an informed choice with the given information.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Less backups southbound during rush hour and safer for bicyclists and walkers	
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B is the best choice. This corridor is not set up for walkers. Traffic is heavy and having one lane i one direction to allow for walkers does not seem to be the answer to improve traffic flow.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Undecided	First Choice	DO NOT BOTTLE NECK WITH 3 LANES!	Center barrier going down the hill
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Unfortunately with so much growth there needs to be the 4 lanes on meridian. The 4 to 3 currently has already cause near and also accidents with cars trying to get a head of everyone else and trying to cut back in as the road goes back to 3 lanes. I drive this road every day and these are all people that are more important or in a big rush, these are not people that didn't realize the road goes back to 1 lane south bound. There are markings letting everyone know to get in the left lane unless you are going to 1 or the 3 companies from the corner to where the lane becomes 1 again. From 4 to 5:30 or so I completely avoid south bound meridian it can take 10 to 15 mins to go from 24th to 36th.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't think anybody should be going up and down Meridian hill using a bike or walking. No one would use this sidewalk for exercise as the incline is way too steep. It will only open oppertunities for crime coming from both federal way and Puyallup/Tacoma communities	2 lanes down and 2 lanes up would be helpful - especially if the 2 lanes up continued on between 36th and 24th instead of converging shortly after the light on 36th. Same with coming from 24th to 36th and the lanes converging shortly after the light on 24th. Both situations create problems with people trying to race around getting in front of others. It is especially bad with people trying to race others coming up the hill. I have lived here for 10 years now and how fast people come up the hill is unacceptable and dangerous. Serious recs all the time from people speeding excessively. My childs daycare is located in a house half way down the hill and sometimes it feels like im taking my life in my hands trying to get in and out of their
Second Choice	First Choice	I'm torn between these two. That road is too windy and has no businesses and not very much residential area. I don't think it's a road to be walked on. Yet, once in awhile we will see sketchy looking people walking it. Their safety is at risk.	What can be done to discourage the out of area traffic from moving through Edgewood creating the problem?
Second Choice	First Choice	Preference to increase capacity and widen the road for safety.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Very few people will walk up and down meridian hill. Better use for more lanes of traffic versus a sidewalk.	
Second Choice	First Choice		Keep the bureaucrats out of any planning. Edgewood has largely been destroyed with the help of it's current and past councilmembers who have vested interests to crowd our beautiful main street with apartments I can touch when I roll down the window and stick my hand out. I moved to Edgewood before it became a modern Federal Way.
Second Choice	First Choice	Bottle neck southbound meridian at 36th.	
Undecided	First Choice	We need more vehicle capacity. But the hill should have a sidewalk also.	
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	More capacity	
	First Choice	Traffic down the hill is terrible and will only get worse if no additional lanes are created	
Second Choice	First Choice	I prefer Option B because adding a sidewalk in Segment 2 will increase the opportunity for homeless traffic coming up the hill from the Puyallup Valley and jeopardizing community safety. Right now it's not as accessible which has cut down on our homeless issue on North Hill and making our community safer.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	More lanes, better for traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Does not sound safe at all to have space that encourages people to walk or bike down the road…there is no space as is for emergencies	
Second Choice	First Choice		As stated above, the trail on 36th that ends at 110th needs to be connected to meridian for pedestrian access and safety.
Undecided	First Choice	Auto is far more productive and better for environment. Too much fuel wasted sitting in traffic. This his is not practical for biking or walking path. The only closest place to go is Fred Meyer. No one is going to carry groceries home from there.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Undecided	First Choice	We need more room for vehicle traffic and not foot traffic. The amount of money spent for foot traffic does NOT make financially logic.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Currently can't get into Puyallup during commute times...stuck in backup traffic on the hill	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Not enough people are going to use the sidewalk in that area	
Second Choice	First Choice	The need for 2 lanes going in each direction	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Undecided	First Choice		A barrier between uphill and downhill lanes. The addition of a second downhill lane with safety barrier and buffer is most important in modifying this section.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Car traffic is much more significant and this road needs two lanes both way. Bikes and pedestrians would rarely use tis section of road no matter what	
Second Choice	First Choice	More lanes are needed for future growth	
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't think many people will walk up and down Meridian hill, as compared to 24th to 36th.	What bridge are you talking about over the railroad? Does this segment plan on building a bridge?
Undecided	First Choice	The Meridian Hill is steep and curvy and people/bikers are unlikely to make use of a sidewalk. A pet or child could run into coming traffic and bikers meeting pedestrians is just looking for trouble.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Where and what exactly is this "off corridor" non motorized path further to the west?	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Need two lanes going down is needed. Prevents back ups.	With the steep and curvy section south of 36th Street, I don't believe there is a need for a non-motorized zone. There are not many residents in that area and money could be saved with eliminating that zone and eliminating the cost of maintaining that area.
Second Choice	First Choice		Nope see above this is a bad idea turning it into south hill! It
	First Choice	The least invasive to get the job done the quickest, so it doesn't impact us for too long. The last time meridian was torn apart. Had to do it twice instead of doing everything the first time.	
Undecided	First Choice	Ultimately, North Hill will end up like South Hill. Traffic will overwhelm a three lane very quickly. Other options for ped/bike.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		

9. Please rank the		10. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	11. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	Option B allows for two car lanes in each direction, which should be a priority over a sidewalk to nowhere.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Traffic awful trying to get to puyallup after 4pm	
Undecided	First Choice	i am not sure how safe it would be to have a sidewalk in this area of the road.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Prioritize 2 lanes traffic both directions vs sidewalk for this portion of meridian.	
Second Choice	First Choice	no sidewalks down the hill. we need two lines going each way to eliminate traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice	Traffic flow both directions for morning/afternoon commute.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	The traffic movement is more important than adding other items that will not get used.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Pedestrian from Edgewood not as important along this route	Use the funds to improve roads around Edgewood so commuters will drive around and not through.
Second Choice	First Choice		Use the funds to improve roads around Edgewood so commuters will drive around and not through.
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't think people should be walking on this section of road. Way too dangerous and curvy.	
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Widening road seems more valuable	
Second Choice	First Choice	Going down the hill backs up so badly.	A partition between oncoming traffic. It is dangerous because cars go above speeding limit
Second Choice	First Choice	Increase flow of traffic	Add lights or round a bouts to slow traffic down going northbound. Add some type of barrier between lanes.
Second Choice	First Choice	Priority to traffic congestion.	
Second Choice	First Choice	It needs two lanes in the evening southbound.	
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	South bound afternoon traffic is a bigger hassle than northbound in the morning.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Traffic flow is more important heading into Puyallup. Not many people would walk that corridor.	
Second Choice	First Choice		NO MORE APARTMENTS!!! YOURE ADDING TRAFFIC.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't walk down the hill	
Second Choice	First Choice	For safety, I believe the city's plan to "creates an off-corridor parallel route for non-motorized users farther west" is the best.	4 lanes and sidewalks. Maybe another light to deter all the puyallup residents from using meridian.
Second Choice	First Choice	Three lanes is not enough capacity. I live on that stretch and it is hard to pull out into a signal lane..	
Second Choice	First Choice	Again, almost nobody will be biking or walking on this section of road.	The City/DOT need to look at how the redesign fits into Edgewood's interest in pedestrian access to walking trails in/along the Edgewood Canyon up to the park at 36th street
Second Choice	First Choice	Better traffic flow.	A second southbound lane or continuing the 3td lane to Todd Rd would require widening or building a new bridge over the RR and be reduced to one lane either at the RR overpass or Spencer Street. That doesn't sound like a good investment especially with the SR167 Freeway extension project that likely improves operation of the Meridian/Valley intersection and reduces the PM peak hour delays SB from 36th.
Second Choice	First Choice	Need to keep traffic free and clear going up and down the hill. Along with keeping the bikes and non motorized transportation away from the lanes of traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice		do everything you can to minimize potential head on collisions
Second Choice	First Choice	Keep bicycles and vehicles as far apart as possible.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Undecided	First Choice	Move traffic	
Second Choice	First Choice	2 lanes each way is more useful than anything else you could do.	
Second Choice	First Choice	More lanes in option 2	could potential foot traffic be included with the Wolf Point Trail?
Second Choice	First Choice	I have been driving down that hill for years and there should not be pedestrian traffic, very dangerous for someone to be waling down/up that hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Auto traffic safety and flow need to be a priority through here. Pedestrian traffic again needs to be moved away from the primary road as it would only create additional safety concerns.	
Undecided	First Choice	Prefer.	do nothing
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	That is a crazy road for pedestrians even with a sidewalk. A walking path would encourage the homeless down by the river in Puyallup to venture up the hill easier which I guess would be okay but we have no services here for them. Plus, the bottle necking to one lane going downhill is crazy sometimes- that lane seems so narrow when you are on a bus. Two lanes down hill would be ideal.	Barrier bwtween the sidewalk and the road (metal barrier or concrete).
Second Choice	First Choice	traffic flow s most important	Sidewalk necessary
Second Choice	First Choice		I would prefer the barrier be between the north and south lanes instead of on the edge of the road. This road is so twisty and people drive fast. There needs to be a barrier between the lanes.
First Choice	First Choice	safety	
Second Choice	First Choice	Need to fix getting traffic out of edgewood. That should be the number 1 priority. people will drive through regardless. If you can solve the traffic flow another way, then great, if not, we need to provide the lanes to get the flow out.	
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	There is so much traffic with all the apartments. Need two lanes in both directions	
Second Choice	First Choice	We need more lanes to accommodate the traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	This corridor is too dangerous and steep for pedestrians. It should be expanded to support the heavy vehicle traffic in this section.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	It needs 2 lanes both ways	
Second Choice	First Choice	Neither are good honestly. But I would rather slide or be hit by another vehicle without being worried about hitting the pedestrians.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Realistically, it's a steep enough hill that I don't expect much foot traffic so having the sidewalk seems like it would be a waste of space.	Can a bike lane be added?
Second Choice	First Choice	Traffic is backed up heading south between 3pm and 6:30pm from 36th all the way down to Valley on week nights.	

9. Please rank the		10. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	11. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Second Choice	First Choice	Choice 1 isn't much different than it is now	A divider would feel safer
Second Choice	First Choice	Two lanes both direction to improve traffic flow durin commute times. Downhill in evening hours is terrible	
	First Choice	I choose option B. 2 lanes up and 2 lanes down.	
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		I would say, make uphill one lane. It may slow down the people that fly uphill. Or widen one lane uphill. And no left turns either way. Especially now that they are building more homes off the hill.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	too busy/steep of a street to be bicycling or walking. not much foot traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice	high traffic area and large/incline hill, I don't think too many people will be going up and down it outside of a car; better use is for traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I am supposing that fewer people walk or bike up and down the hill, whereas car traffic is always enmass.	Safer access to Meridian Court off of Meridian needs to be included. There are too many accidents when residents try to enter/exit this side street.
Second Choice	First Choice	We need more lane capacity down the hill. Due to grade I don't think many would walk bike in the second half, compared to 24th to 36th where we would see more walkers.	Considering how his connects to the new 167. What kind of transit facilities will.be available for bikers or walkers in this area. How will the bike lanes connect to puyallup trails.
Second Choice	First Choice		More street lights for better visibility- that stretch of road is very dangerous and dark. Better lighting will help mitigate
Second Choice	First Choice	Frees up traffic heading southbound.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't see often, nor foresee anyone, walking/biking up/down this hill. What I do see and experience is lots of roadway traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Cost. Property tax hikes	
Undecided	First Choice	I'm a little tired of ranting. Please see the manifesto of vitriol written in other sections.	
Second Choice	First Choice	No one should walk that road.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I believe to improve the corridor and create improved safety features is paramount primarily for vehicular travel, which is the highest users of the corridor. Also, that approach could assuredly get the project planned, permitted, and constructed sooner, compared with more studies and greater cost considerations for pedestrian, biking, and tree planting facilities.	
	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	With all the curves on the hill it is not smart to include walking traffic. How many times have crews been down that hill to replace guardrails that have been struck by cars? Once they are fixed it gets hit again shortly after.	Reducing traffic down the hill should be the primary goal
Second Choice	First Choice	The hill is so steep there will be few people walking it. More traffic relief with four lanes.	See note above about intersection with 36th, Meridian, and Chrisella.
Second Choice	First Choice	I imagine this would best alleviate traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice	That area needs to focus on moving vehicles not people	
Second Choice	First Choice		Again added sidewalks throughout Edgewood especially on connecting streets to Meridian
Second Choice	First Choice	Traffic continues to be congested going southbound to 167. Our town can't move during peak times. Adding the additional lane provides overflow to occur on the hill and not back up into our town.	Railroad crossing bridge needs to be widened to four lanes.
Second Choice	First Choice	A fourth lane is needed.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Assuming option 1 = A and option 2 = B.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I'd rather improve the traffic flow. There are better options for walking areas.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Higher vehicle throughput.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	A sidewalk would be pretty wasted in this area. having the double lanes both ways would be future-proofed for future expansion.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Bikes and pedestrians in that section of road is a dangerous idea. An additional downhill lane would alleviate rush hour backups.	
Second Choice	First Choice	I don't think it's a walkable or even bike riding stretch.	
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Pedestrian safety seems to be prioritized with option 2.	Traffic light added ot Meridian and 32nd Street. With additional of park makes trying to make a left on Meridian impossible
Second Choice	First Choice	Safety	
Undecided	First Choice	With the extension of SR 167, more people may need access to meridian going downhill	
Second Choice	First Choice	It needs to be done right the first time. We need to look ahead for the future. It will not be any cheaper to add a lane in the future.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I really don't think there needs to be a sidewalk in such a large hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	An extra southbound lane is needed more than pedestrian space on this road- it gets very backed up going down the hill	Its gonna cost a lot of money, keep it simple. Don't be wasteful.
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Increased traffic capability	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Undecided	First Choice	We absolutely need two lanes going each direction on the hill to Todd Rd.	
Second Choice	First Choice		As stated earlier, we could make the hill part with a reversable lane timed to commuter traffic. When the light rail is finally accomplished, we should have bike and pedestrian modes out of Edgewood that can get people to the light rail stations.
Second Choice	First Choice	The road going down into Puyallup gets severely backed up after work and during Fair time. Two lines on each side would be better.	
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Need more lanes going up and down the hill.	
Second Choice	First Choice	2 lanes going southbound will help with traffic.	
Second Choice	First Choice	Getting more lanes in for traffic is more important to me than pedestrians and bikes.	
Second Choice	First Choice		After the public vote of 73 percent against a utility tax and then have the council pass the tax I believe what I have to say will not be of any importance. And please do not ask my race as it human. The demographic information you request is insulting and prejudicial. This is an insulting waste of time.

9. Please rank the		10. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	11. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Undecided	First Choice		If space were possible, splitting the uphill and downhill lanes into separate streets would be lovely. If more turn-offs are added to the south direction, Option B would improve safety. Option B would not improve traffic through Segment 2 as the bottleneck off the hill occurs down street at the intersection of Meridian and Valley Ave.
Second Choice	First Choice	Adding another drive lane going south of 36th would be the only option I support as it would reduce the bottleneck of traffic going south.	Don't put bikes and pedestrians close to the hill traffic! People are not smart enough to stay out of traffic anymore. Especially young people sadly
Second Choice	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Traffic is bad in both directions at times. Focusing on vehicle throughput should be a priority, especially if a separate pedestrian path was created to the West in Option B.	
Second Choice	First Choice	2 traffic lanes down to one lane will cause issues	
Second Choice	First Choice	Having two lanes each way would help traffic congestion in morning and evening.	
Undecided	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	I have been driving on the meridian corridor for 20+ years and RARELY see anybody walking it or especially biking it. The need for this segment is to get more vehicle traffic through faster.	
	First Choice		
Second Choice	First Choice	Don't see the need for a sidewalk down Meridian. The road is too dangerous already to have pedestrians and bikes in it.	
Second Choice	First Choice	A sidewalk and bike lane is not necessary in that portion of the road. It's far too steep and long and will rarely be used by members of the Edgewood community.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	I think Option B is infeasible due the natural occurring bottleneck at the viaduct over the railroad tracks. I also think accidents are more likely to occur with passing downhill.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Non motor users cannot currently use the hill. This will give them the ability.	
First Choice	Second Choice	because I live on 102nd and have always felt trapped in here with no option but a car to get out	
First Choice	Second Choice		As I mentioned above, the most important improvement to Segment 2 would be a barrier between the uphill and downhill
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	I live on 102nd E - we are trapped on this street unless we have a car (thus my answers above that I only drive). I would love to be able to walk up to the park and city.	
First Choice	Second Choice	It would be very sad to not see an option for pedestrians and cyclist. This would set the tone for the future of Edgewood as not being a friendly place for walkers/joggers/bicyclists.	
First Choice	Second Choice	More lanes just means more cars will travel this way!	Walkers should have a off road trail if this is something the public is asking for. Not sure anyone has every thought this was a road that walking makes sense on. A trial makes sense that would parallel the road but not be connected to it. May work for bikes as well.
Second Choice	Second Choice	More space for cars	
First Choice	Second Choice	while it makes sense to widen the southbound lanes, especially during afternoon commute times, adding the other non-motorized uses is slightly more critical, imo.	
First Choice	Second Choice	safer option	
First Choice	Second Choice	We need sidewalks!	
First Choice	Second Choice	People will walk more if you make space for them to do so safely. It's healthier for people and healthier for the environment. There should be a solid barrier between car lanes and the non-motorized lane.	
Second Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	The two main roads that get you up North Hill (Meridian & Chrisella) are not safe for walking, biking etc. A sidewalk would make sense	
First Choice	Second Choice	The sidewalk for pedestrian traffic gives people more commuting options that does not include strictly driving everywhere.	
Second Choice	Second Choice	Leave it alone. We don't need to change the current street.	
First Choice	Second Choice	I live along this section and I really prefer some kind of walkability/bikeability here. There are a ton of kids who would benefit from walking up to the park or to see friends or even walking to and from school in these neighborhoods. With the curves in the road I would be concerned about the speed traveled if the area was opened up to four lanes.	
First Choice	Second Choice		If option B is chosen, could there be a sign at the top and bottom of hill that says, "No pedestrian traffic"? This road is too windy and dangerous for pedestrians.
First Choice	Second Choice	Would be great to have a walking option	If there is a way to straighten the road more that would be awesome for safety especially in bad weather
First Choice	Second Choice		Will the railroad bridge at the bottom of the hill be removed and replaced?
First Choice	Second Choice	One lane heading down/ south seems to work fine. Just need pedestrian sidewalk	
First Choice	Second Choice	It might be nice to provide a way for people to walk to Puyallup. Going down the hill in one lane has been easier because people have to pay attention and slow down. If there were two roads heading south, seems like more accidents could easily occur as people speed down or try to change lanes, etc. I know the hill backs up during commute hours but it's safer with a single lane heading south.	
First Choice	Second Choice	I like the sidewalk but would many people use it?	
First Choice	Second Choice	Adding another lane without a barrier just seems like that's an accident waiting to happen	
First Choice	Second Choice		
Second Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Safer sidewalks for people walking the hill.	I would like to see added safety measures (turn lane) for cars entering and exiting driveways and streets along Segment 2 to increase motor vehicle safety.
First Choice	Second Choice	This stretch of road is windy and scary! If you can't straighten the lanes, then keep as is and add bike lane.	
First Choice	Second Choice	I think it's important to have the sidewalk easily accessible from the roads. I may be comfortable with Option B, but I'd need to see exactly where the off-corridor parallel route for non-motorized users will be and how much difficult it will be to	
First Choice	Second Choice	I am aware of the costs associated with widening this segment thru this terrain and prefer the least cost option.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Safety of pedestrians and cyclists	
First Choice	Second Choice	There needs to be accommodations for bikes and walkers on that road. Currently none. Reducing the speed limit would also help. I know the speed limit is 35 on that hill but I drove it yesterday and cars were passing me at 60+ MPH.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		

9. Please rank the		10. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	11. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Don't see how an additional lane going southbound is going to make a difference when there is only a two lane bridge eventually unless you plan to rebuild the bridge. If cars have to merge into one lane at the bridge it will just cause back ups anyway. Pedestrian access into Puyallup would be nice.	That is an incredible view sod Rainier there coming down the hill. Would be amazing to have a pull over or some way to allow folks to enjoy it
First Choice	Second Choice	Adding the option for non-motorized or bicycles is ideal due to the necessity of those who don't always drive needing to get up/down the hill	
First Choice	Second Choice	Although it would be nice to have 4 lanes, we really need sidewalk to keep people safe who walk there.	Too many wrecks on this rode with 3 lanes. A barrier between lanes would be better for all and skip the walking path.
First Choice	Second Choice	Would rather have a multi-use lane than two southbound vehicle lanes.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Downhill doesn't need another lane. It would result in those unsafe few causing incident.	Stop building multifamily housing. The extra people and traffic are bad enough as it is. We don't have the infrastructure for it - not enough grocery, shopping or dining aside from fast food for the people we have. We don't need more.
First Choice	Second Choice	More esthetic. Better for bikers and walkers.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Prefer not to create a thorough fare for traffic to go north south through the city.	
First Choice	Second Choice	There have to be safe transportation options for cyclists and pedestrians. Also dog walkers and wheelchairs and strollers need to have a wide sidewalk area.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Need area for walking but not having 4 lanes isn't ideal.	
First Choice	Second Choice	So there is a safe way for people to walk or ride their bikes up and down the hill.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	A sidewalk in segment 2 would be welcome. Not infrequently I see people walking on the side of the road at night which is of course extremely dangerous for the pedestrian (and also for the driver). A physical barrier between the road and sidewalk would be very important. I think the major bottleneck for traffic is the stoplight past Todd road, not the single	Need some type of divider between opposite direction lanes. It is scary driving on inner lane around the curves
First Choice	Second Choice	Option #2 looks SPENDY	
First Choice	Second Choice	There must be pedestrian and cyclist access to the roads	
First Choice	Second Choice	There needs to be a safe place for pedestrian traffic!	
First Choice	Second Choice	Not sure 2 lanes going down are necessary or safer. Like the idea of a place for pedestrian traffic	
First Choice	Second Choice	We need a safe non-motorized option.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Traffic moves fine down the hill but there is no place to walk	
First Choice	Second Choice	Sidewalks going down the hill are needed. City fathers made Edgewood a city fit for renters, and you see apartments everywhere but no sidewalks. Add safe sidewalks going all the way down to Todd. Keep the sidewalks well-separated from the speeding traffic by using a green belt. Make sure they are separated from speeding traffic by using a large green belt. Allow bikes to ride on the sidewalk because bike lanes on the road are silly ideas that Seattle dreams up--look at the number of bike riders killed on bike lanes that are right next to speeding cars !!!! Last I looked, the bikers do not have air	Will the bridge over the train tracks just north of Todd road be replaced?
First Choice	Second Choice		Not every road needs to be accessible to walkers or bikers unless it is designated trails are far enough away from traffic . Then make sure these trails are accessible to everyone. Meridian Hill is just that...it's a hill!
First Choice	Second Choice		Any construction on segment 2 WILL NOT MATTER if you don't widen the bridge at the bottom!!
First Choice	Second Choice	Giving the walking option will give a sense of Home to our area. Not… a prettier Everett	
First Choice	Second Choice		
Second Choice	Second Choice	Anything less than 2 lanes in each direction is short sighted toward future growth and demand. I live near 36th and meridian and have witnessed traffic backed up to 36th various times in the 10 years I've lived in Edgewood.	Unless you do something with the bridge at the bottom of the hill adding another lane isn't going to do much. You need to increase the bridge to four lanes.
First Choice	Second Choice	There are currently zero safe ways for pedestrians to walk from Edgewood to Puyallup. This needs to be a priority	
	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	I see the value in adding a second downhill lane, but I think it would be nice to future proof this corridor with some pedestrian accessibility, so option A eeks out for me, but either way this will be a great improvement.	
First Choice	Second Choice	I believe improving the current 3 lanes of traffic would be more feasible and cost effective.	
First Choice	Second Choice	I prefer quality of life in my neighborhood over cars and traffic.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Must include sidewalks & bike access that is physically isolated from the road.	Not sure why this is being discussed as at a WashDOT town hall meeting years ago they stated this ship has long sailed for widening Meridian down the hill
First Choice	Second Choice	Sidewalk needed	
First Choice	Second Choice	Pedestrian need a way up the hill.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	area for bikes to slowly climb the hill without traffic interference	No roundabout no additional traffic lights
First Choice	Second Choice	Need at least a walking sidewalk	
First Choice	Second Choice	While Option B may increase carrying capacity,this intended consequence increases the probability drivers will travel at excessive speeds between 36th and 8th streets.Option A has the benefit of minimizing additional capacity and enhancing Non-vehicular use.Clearly this portion of Meridian is vastly dated.The whole hillside is moving and fundamental re-engineering of the road design is necessary .	
First Choice	Second Choice	Option A meets the design criteria that are most important from question 4.	
First Choice	Second Choice	There is no safe pedestrian access south from 36th. I would like to walk to the park safely.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	A sidewalk for pedestrians and cyclists would be desirable as currently it is too dangerous for walking or cycling.	
Second Choice	Second Choice	cost will be unreal will not help	
First Choice	Second Choice	There needs to be safe walking options and so option A is more appealing	Really would love to see at least a lane on one side or the other for pedestrian bike/walkway.
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Need a sidewalk.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Need a sidewalk for this area. Option B does not meet this need.	What will be done with the bridge at the bottom of the hill?
First Choice	Second Choice	I am desperate to have a walking path going up and down Meridian	
	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Option B gets more cars down the hill, but at the expense of options for people and non-motor vehicles to safely move up and down the hill.	Hard separator between the directions of traffic except where turns are needed.
First Choice	Second Choice	Space is best used to alleviate traffic. Hill too stee for pedestrian use anyway	

9. Please rank the		10. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	11. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
First Choice	Second Choice	Option A works great as it is...	
First Choice	Second Choice	I seems like it would take less time for the construction.	
Second Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Sidewalks are a must. There is currently no safe way for pedestrians to get from Edgewood to Puyallup on foot.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Keep the road as close as possible to how it is today. I don't want to encourage more drivers to use meridian as their pass through to work.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Adding lanes doesn't work and the traffic will still build up from the light at valley so more pedestrian space is ideal	Center barrier wall and reduced buffers. Provide the pedestrians and bikers with an alternate location trail.
First Choice	Second Choice	There is no safe way for anyone to walk down there. I think people need to have that option and it's the city's job to provide something for walkers.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Maybe widening the existing lanes will improve the number of accidents on the hill. Squeeze if another lane in will put more cars in harms way at the same time.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	If the city could somehow incorporate a SAFE pedestrian path from Edgewood Community Park down the hill would provide more walkability, get more folks outside, exercising, etc.,	
First Choice	Second Choice	You really need a pedestrian option on the hill.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Realistically hardly anyone is going to be walking up and down that hill. It's too far for pedestrians who need groceries or whatnot from puyallup... and no one will want to walk up the big ass hill regularly. Improving the road should improve the transit.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Enabling a pedestrian path off the hill would go a LONG way to creating an important connection necessary for a similar trail to the Interurban Trail further North.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	People use the hill for biking and walking already and it is very dangerous. It would be great to have a sidewalk.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Extend a walking lane to the valley.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
Second Choice	Second Choice		Round a bouts are the way to go. They move traffic much more efficiently
First Choice	Second Choice		
Undecided	Second Choice	Seems like a dangerous road to walk regardless of sidewalk. Curious if having 4 lanes actually helps due to the bridge condensing at the bottom of the hill.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Continuing options for walking and biking would aide in alleviating traffic and give options other than driving.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Walkway provided	Is perhaps more street lights.
First Choice	Second Choice	A second lane southbound would would only increase the speeds of vehicles. How many more accidents are needed?	
First Choice	Second Choice	Sidewalk looks like the safest option	
First Choice	Second Choice	waking/bike path from the bottom of the hill would be of value. There is no safe path to come from the valley to Edgewood via walking og biking	
First Choice	Second Choice		
Second Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	It would be nice to have sidewalks down to the valley.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
Second Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice		The intersection of 36th/Meridian/Chrisella needs to be changed and updated for easier flow onto and off of Meridian. The blind corner makes it a very dangerous intersection.
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Again there needs to be an option Number 3, or option C, suggesting we do nothing to change what is there.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	More walking options, the better.	not spending money on things nobody needs
First Choice	Second Choice	There is no reason to add another downhill lane. the traffic backs up at the light on valley all the way up the hill. the light determines throughput, an extra lane just shuffles the cars around.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Traffic backs up going south on Meridian frequently. I value having a non-motorized path but like the option of not having it directly next to the roadway.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	If the road widens to 4 lanes, it will still need to merge to 3 at the bottom of Meridian. So it feel like adding a lane just moves the inevitable back up. Meanwhile a safe pedestrian and bike lane could be used.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
Second Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Multi Use path!!!	
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	That section needs a safe way for pedestrians to get up/down the hill. It is completely unsafe right now.	
First Choice	Second Choice	I believe this hill needs options for pedestrians and non motorized vehicles to improve the safety of those in need of that type of transportation as well as the safety of the drivers. I do believe we need a better option for traffic and speeds on this hill no matter what as I live directly off of Meridian and have witnessed and assisted in tons of accidents right in front of my	
First Choice	Second Choice		
Second Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	There needs to be a safe way for foot traffic to make it to Puyallup	
First Choice	Second Choice	Additional safe pedestrian walkways are always a good idea.	
First Choice	Second Choice	Safety	
First Choice	Second Choice	Single lane down the hill is okay, but need a space for pedestrians	
First Choice	Second Choice		

9. Please rank the		10. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	11. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
First Choice	Second Choice	Inclusion of a safe sidewalk would be fantastic.	The new multi-use non-motorized zone from Option A should be put in Chrisella Rd E. It has significantly less traffic and a lot more pedestrians who risk their lives trying to walk around those blind turns adjacent to vehicular traffic.
First Choice	Second Choice		
Undecided	Second Choice		More lighting
First Choice	Second Choice	Better for pedestrians	
First Choice	Second Choice		
Second Choice	Second Choice	No one is riding their bicycles up and down Meridian at the hill to Puyallup and if they are, they should be discouraged from doing so for everyone's safety. Fact is, there are driveways and houses off of the roadway and 2 lanes in either direction allows people to turn off the roadway while causing less backups to traffic.	Have turn lanes for driveways. Less accidents
First Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	There needs to be a pedestrian option in this area. People will bike/walk either way -- they must be accommodated for overall safety. Lack of infrastructure does not mean walkers/bikers will not use the road. They currently are and it is incredibly, increasingly dangerous.	
First Choice	Second Choice	I like the separate, yet adjacent bike/walking route.	
Second Choice	Second Choice		
First Choice	Second Choice	Is "Option 1" really "Option A"? If so, the above rankings apply.	
First Choice	Second Choice		
Undecided	Undecided	In 45 years of living in Edgewood I have yet to see sufficient downhill traffic to justify a second lane, unless you are trying to plan for 40 years from now. And I can't imagine enough demand for non-motorized transportation UP Meridian to justify the expense.	
First Choice	Undecided	Should be 2 lanes in each direction.	
First Choice	Undecided	Option B is a poor design. It does not provide safe pedestrian or bicyclist access, and the added lane is not necessary. Better to have ability for people to walk/bike the hill, rather than an added vehicle lane.	
Undecided	Undecided	How much pedestrian traffic is there on this section of the road? I drive this section of road frequently and never see any, so wonder if a sidewalk is needed - especially since it is a fairly steep hill with no businesses and few homes directly on that road. (Not a walk for 'pleasure' or necessity) If segment 1 is expanded to 4 lanes (2 in each direction), there will be a back up during commuting hours when lanes go from 2 to 1. This is already the case where lanes are reduced southbound after 24th St and northbound after 36th. Therefore, option B makes more sense to continue 2 lanes in both directions in both segments.	
Undecided	Undecided	What is the " off-corridor parallel route for non-motorized users farther west?" If there will be a sidewalk up the hill with 4 driving lanes too, I prefer option B. If no sidewalk with B, I prefer A.	
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		
First Choice	Undecided	Do not add an additional lane going south. This will add to the problem of speeders that we have going north. As a resident that live off 102nd Ave, I pray my family and neighbors survive turning in daily.	Same as above.
First Choice	Undecided	I believe there is already too much traffic on this stretch of Meridian. I am a resident in this area and have witnessed many accidents.	
First Choice	Undecided	my moms property has already been reduced to provide the second uphill road. A 4 lane road would take to much land.	
First Choice	Undecided	Option A, but with a 3:ft high barrier between traffic and the sidewalk.	
Undecided	Undecided	Discourage commuters	
Undecided	Undecided		round about and/or median to decrease speeds. way too many accidents on this hill
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	I cannot decide one way or the other.	
Undecided	Undecided		Keep the speed slow. Add trees. Make it attractive, not a sewer for cars to race through.
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	Nothing addresses the eminent domain problem. With monies tight in state /local budgets, what becomes of property owners rights?	
First Choice	Undecided	Need speed bumps also to slow traffic. Currently people drive at 50mph +	Bike path to Puyallup valley
Undecided	Undecided	unnecessary	
First Choice	Undecided	I love the idea of having a walking path, safe up and down that hill	
Undecided	Undecided	Both options will still have bottleneck issues going southbound.	The fairly new 4 way signal by the Autozone, Mc Donalds, In the morning, on the main drag, (161) when there is traffic its not uncommon to see four cars to make it through the light
First Choice	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		"Loops" of pedestrian walkways throughout Edgewood. So many sidewalks to nowhere
Second Choice	Undecided		Destroy the bridge connecting Edgewood to Puyallup. The valley belongs in the valley.
First Choice	Undecided	Reduce traffic volumes and speeds! Do not add lanes, add multiple round abouts to make traffic go elsewhere.	
First Choice	Undecided		
Second Choice	Undecided	I thnk the hill is too dangerous for non-motorized traffic.	
Undecided	Undecided		I am not in favor of keeping this corridor three lanes...too many deaths and accidents. I'm guessing the incident report is available publicly or will be in the results of this study.
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	Don't see how this is possible. You already allowed a developer to clear the trees, which ruined the area, how are you gonna add lanes. This area has steep slopes. How are you going to keep the land from sliding.	
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		Putting a turn lane in for left turns off of the road. A median to prevent head on collisions.
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	I need more information about the off ROW route. Additional lanes going downhill is not necessary.	
Undecided	Undecided	I do not have to commute for work and I use this area of the road less so I am less aware of how painful it is during high traffic times.	
First Choice	Undecided	Sidewalks are very important.	Street lights
Undecided	Undecided		
First Choice	Undecided	Let traffic control (police) issues determine the lay out for safety issues.	
Undecided	Undecided		

9. Please rank the		10. In one or two sentences, please let us know why you gave the rankings you did for the options.	11. Please let us know any other ideas/input you would like to see included:
Option A	Option B		
Undecided	Undecided	See above	We will only continue to grow, even with the extension of Highway 167. Having four lanes creates a more even flow of traffic and allows for less disruption if a lane needs to be closed for construction or disables vehicles.
First Choice	Undecided	option b would be to expensive	
First Choice	Undecided	A safe non-motorized lane is needed, why have a bike lane above but not a safe way back up the hill!	
Undecided	Undecided	Use the funds to improve roads around Edgewood so commuters will drive around and not through.	
Undecided	Undecided	Use the funds to improve roads around Edgewood so commuters will drive around and not through.	Would it be possible to add a bike lane?
Undecided	Undecided	There is no barrier between north and south lanes. I can't approve either until more safety measures are considered. Option B looks like fatalities waiting to happen.	
Undecided	Undecided		
Second Choice	Undecided	Meridian is a nightmare to pull out onto from the side streets. I can easily wait 10 minutes to get onto meridian and with all the apartment buildings being put up it's really frustrating!	
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		
First Choice	Undecided	Walking & biking is nearly nonexistent from Puyallup / Sumner up to Edgewood - multi use for this mandatory	
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	Why are we paying for private development expenses to access the private developments? The developers are once again not paying for infrastructure. This is pure insanity. Just the survey being conducted is an insult as the tax payer is paying for a survey the developers implemented.	
Undecided	Undecided		
First Choice	Undecided	This part of the road needs a side walk/ bike lane for safety.	A sidewalk could open houseless people to the city from Fife. Not too fond of that idea.
Undecided	Undecided	I don't know how bad traffic is. I'd like sidewalks but traffic might be more important	4 lanes is the best option.
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	Where is the turn lane?	
Undecided	Undecided	None of this is required, what is the point?	
First Choice	Undecided	Try not to lay waste to any more of the trees along that downhill part	
First Choice	Undecided	This section is dangerous in the center lane with oncoming traffic. Pedestrian zone would be good, but would it be safe?	
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	Same as above	
First Choice	Undecided	It would be insane to build something new and leave out any option for pedestrian use. It's bad enough there is no dedicated bike path here.	
Second Choice	Undecided	If spending the money to widen over bride you might as well make it 4 lanes	
Undecided	Undecided	Improved shoulders would be great.	
Undecided	Undecided		My concern is that once the road reaches the railroad bridge, won't traffic be one lane in each direction whereby there will be traffic backups and probably accidents as the lane merges into one, especially in the southbound direction?
Undecided	Undecided		
Undecided	Undecided	I am undecided on both of these options. I feel that both options have faults. Whatever is chosen will still have people pass in oncoming lane, accidents due to blind corners. Possibly try a stop light half way up or down? Widen or mark residential streets or signs with warning ahead.	
Undecided	Undecided		

First Choice		
First Choice		
First Choice	It's important to have a sidewalk going down the hill.	
First Choice	Any new road projects must include separate access for pedestrians and non motorized zone for city and regional connectivity.	
First Choice		
First Choice		
First Choice	A sidewalk would be nice	What option that is decided will stay face tons of problems. There is the housing development that hasn't been completed - how will people exit that? Left turns out will be constant accidents. First fix the problem at the top with the light, stop sign weird 5 angle intersection. 36th and Chrisella and Meridian.
Second Choice	Safety and traffic control to actually get home without being run over. Too many cars coming thru Edgewood to get down the hill.	definitely need bicycle/pedestrian path to get up and down the hill
First Choice	While Option B would ease traffic congestion, I oppose this option because it will increase traffic through Edgewood and we will continue to be a city where people just pass through to get to South Hill or Sumner to avoid Hwy 167 or I5	
First Choice		Who is paying for this? Is this survey for non city tax paying commuters that cut through town instead of driving I-5? Is "Option 2" really "Option B"? If so, the above rankings apply.

Gender		Ethnicity		Race		Languages Spoken		Household Income		Age		Connection to Edgewood		Rent/Own	
Woman	332	Not Hispanic/Latino	564	American Indian/AK Native	22	English Only	597	Less than $24,999	8	Under 18 years	1	Resident	574	Own	590
Man	270	Hispanic/Latino	26	White	534	Spanish	25	$25,000-$34,999	18	18-29 years	39	Frequent Visitor	86	Rent/Owr	66
Prefer not to say	48			Asian	28	Korean	6	$35,000-$49,999	19	30-44 years	192	Employee	32		
				Multiracial	38	Chinese	4	$50,000-$74,999	45	45-59 years	170				
				Black or African American	19	German	10	$75,000-$99,999	64	60-74 years	149				
				Native HI or Pacific Islande	14	Vietnamese	151	$100,000-$149,999	149	Over 74 years	24				
						Tagalog	5	Over $150,000	224						
						Russian	10								
						Arabic	3								
						Prefer not to answer	35								

Appendix C: Traffic Data Worksheets

Appendix C: Turning Movement & Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Counts

Meridian Ave E
18th St Ct E



Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM
Peak Hour: 7:15 AM to 8:15 AM



	HV %:	PHF
EB	0.0%	0.69
WB	-	-
NB	4.6%	0.87
SB	6.1%	0.88
TOTAL	4.9%	0.94

Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		18th St Ct E Eastbound				0 Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM		0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	302	0	0	0	105	0	412	0
7:15 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**363**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**101**	**0**	**466**	0
7:30 AM		**0**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**321**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**124**	**2**	**452**	0
7:45 AM		**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**302**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**113**	**1**	**421**	1,751
8:00 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**280**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**134**	**1**	**421**	**1,760**
8:15 AM		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	290	0	0	0	132	2	425	1,719
8:30 AM		0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	272	0	0	0	124	2	405	1,672
8:45 AM		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	250	0	0	0	144	4	402	1,653
Count Total		0	10	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	13	2,380	0	0	0	977	12	3,404	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**1,266**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**472**	**4**	**1,760**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**57**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**29**	**0**	**87**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**14%**	**5%**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**6%**	**0%**	**5%**	**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
7:00 AM	0	0	17	3	*20*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**16**	**4**	***20***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**13**	**8**	***21***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**14**	**6**	***20***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	*1*
8:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**15**	**11**	***26***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
8:15 AM	0	0	13	5	*18*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:30 AM	0	0	19	8	*27*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:45 AM	0	0	20	13	*33*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	4	0	0	*4*
Count Total	0	0	127	58	*185*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	5	0	0	*5*
Peak Hr	**0**	**0**	**58**	**29**	***87***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	***1***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	18th St Ct E				0				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound				Westbound				Northbound				Southbound					
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	3	0	20	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**20**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**21**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**14**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**20**	81
8:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**0**	**26**	**87**
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	5	0	18	85
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	8	0	27	91
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	13	0	33	104
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	126	0	0	0	58	0	185	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**57**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**29**	**0**	**87**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	18th St Ct E			0			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
8:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
18th St Ct E

Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Peak Hour: 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM





	HV %:	PHF
EB	5.6%	0.75
WB	-	-
NB	1.6%	0.87
SB	1.8%	0.93
TOTAL	1.8%	0.90

Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		18th St Ct E Eastbound				0 Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM		0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	180	0	0	0	322	3	512	0
4:15 PM		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	177	0	0	0	309	2	490	0
4:30 PM		0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	169	0	0	0	287	1	464	0
4:45 PM		0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	144	0	0	0	310	1	459	1,925
5:00 PM		**0**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**218**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**322**	**0**	**545**	1,958
5:15 PM		**0**	**2**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**168**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**303**	**4**	**482**	1,950
5:30 PM		**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**173**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**279**	**1**	**459**	1,945
5:45 PM		**0**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**189**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**282**	**3**	**481**	**1,967**
Count Total		0	15	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15	1,418	0	0	0	2,414	15	3,892	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**748**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,186**	**8**	**1,967**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**22**	**0**	**35**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**10%**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**0%**	**2%**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**2%**	**0%**	**2%**	**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	2	10	*12*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:15 PM	1	0	7	8	*16*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:30 PM	0	0	5	5	*10*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	1	0	0	*1*
4:45 PM	0	0	2	4	*6*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**4**	**9**	***13***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**1**	**4**	***5***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	*1*
5:30 PM	**1**	**0**	**2**	**4**	***7***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
5:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**5**	**5**	***10***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	***1***
Count Total	2	0	28	49	*79*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	3	0	0	*3*
Peak Hr	**1**	**0**	**12**	**22**	***35***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	***2***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	18th St Ct E				0				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				15-min Total	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	10	0	12	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	8	0	16	0
4:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	10	0
4:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	6	44
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**13**	45
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**5**	34
5:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**7**	31
5:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**10**	**35**
Count Total	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	49	0	79	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**22**	**0**	**35**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	18th St Ct E			0			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
22nd St E

Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM
Peak Hour: 7:00 AM to 8:00 AM



	HV %:	PHF
EB	-	-
WB	0.0%	0.75
NB	5.0%	0.90
SB	4.3%	0.90
TOTAL	4.8%	0.94



Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		0 Eastbound				22nd St E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**295**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**105**	**0**	**404**	0
7:15 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**337**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**107**	**0**	**448**	0
7:30 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**313**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**126**	**0**	**447**	0
7:45 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**268**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**118**	**0**	**392**	**1,691**
8:00 AM		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	262	2	0	2	132	0	400	1,687
8:15 AM		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	274	0	0	1	133	0	412	1,651
8:30 AM		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	267	1	0	0	121	0	391	1,595
8:45 AM		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	243	2	0	2	128	0	378	1,581
Count Total		0	0	0	0	0	11	0	12	0	0	2,259	9	0	11	970	0	3,272	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**1,213**	**4**	**0**	**6**	**456**	**0**	**1,691**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**60**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**20**	**0**	**81**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**-**	**5%**	**25%**	**-**	**0%**	**4%**	**-**	**5%**	**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
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**17**	**3**	***20***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**16**	**5**	***21***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**13**	**7**	***20***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**15**	**5**	***20***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***1***
8:00 AM	0	0	15	10	*25*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:15 AM	0	1	10	5	*16*	0	0	0	0	*0*	3	0	0	0	*3*
8:30 AM	0	0	19	7	*26*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:45 AM	0	0	24	11	*35*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Count Total	0	1	129	53	*183*	0	0	0	0	*0*	4	0	0	0	*4*
Peak Hr	**0**	**0**	**61**	**20**	***81***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***1***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	0				22nd St E				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound				Westbound				Northbound				Southbound					
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**17**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**20**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**21**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**12**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**20**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**20**	**81**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	10	0	25	86
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	10	0	0	0	5	0	16	81
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	7	0	26	87
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	11	0	35	102
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	128	1	0	0	53	0	183	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**60**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**20**	**0**	**81**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	0			22nd St E			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
22nd St E

Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Peak Hour: 4:15 PM to 5:15 PM



	HV %:	PHF
EB	-	-
WB	0.0%	0.46
NB	2.6%	0.82
SB	2.7%	0.92
TOTAL	2.6%	0.88



Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start	0 Eastbound				22nd St E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	165	2	0	8	315	0	491	0
4:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**176**	**1**	**1**	**5**	**277**	**0**	**462**	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**164**	**2**	**0**	**5**	**281**	**0**	**455**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**142**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**291**	**0**	**436**	1,844
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**210**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**317**	**0**	**539**	**1,892**
5:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	152	3	0	5	286	0	450	1,880
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184	1	0	3	254	0	442	1,867
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	173	2	0	6	267	0	449	1,880
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	0	0	1,366	15	1	37	2,288	0	3,724	0
Peak Hour All	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**692**	**7**	**1**	**15**	**1,166**	**0**	**1,892**	**0**
Peak Hour HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**18**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**32**	**0**	**50**	**0**
Peak Hour HV%	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**-**	**3%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**3%**	**-**	**3%**	**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	2	9	*11*	0	0	0	0	*0*	3	0	0	0	*3*
4:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**9**	**9**	***18***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*3*
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**4**	**5**	***9***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	*2*
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**2**	**6**	***8***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	*3*
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**3**	**12**	***15***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
5:15 PM	0	0	1	2	*3*	0	0	0	0	*0*	5	0	1	0	*6*
5:30 PM	0	0	4	5	*9*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	3	0	*3*
5:45 PM	0	0	5	5	*10*	0	0	0	0	*0*	1	0	3	0	*4*
Count Total	0	0	30	53	*83*	0	0	0	0	*0*	14	0	10	0	*24*
Peak Hr	**0**	**0**	**18**	**32**	***50***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**5**	**0**	**3**	**0**	***8***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	0				22nd St E				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				15-min Total	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	9	0	11	0
4:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**18**	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**9**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**8**	46
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**12**	**0**	**15**	**50**
5:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	35
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	5	0	9	35
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	10	37
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	53	0	83	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**18**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**32**	**0**	**50**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	0			22nd St E			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
5:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
20th St E

Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM
Peak Hour: 7:15 AM to 8:15 AM



	HV %:	PHF
EB	-	-
WB	2.9%	0.92
NB	4.9%	0.85
SB	5.6%	0.90
TOTAL	5.0%	0.92



Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start	0 Eastbound				20th St E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	14	0	0	285	4	0	3	97	0	414	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**22**	**0**	**0**	**345**	**7**	**0**	**3**	**105**	**0**	**485**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**18**	**0**	**0**	**301**	**3**	**0**	**5**	**121**	**0**	**454**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**272**	**6**	**1**	**3**	**113**	**0**	**421**	1,774
8:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**24**	**0**	**0**	**259**	**5**	**1**	**3**	**131**	**0**	**427**	**1,787**
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	19	0	0	274	4	0	5	128	0	433	1,735
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	9	0	0	266	2	0	4	118	0	405	1,686
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	18	0	0	237	6	0	14	128	0	406	1,671
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	42	0	144	0	0	2,239	37	2	40	941	0	3,445	0
Peak Hour All	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**19**	**0**	**84**	**0**	**0**	**1,177**	**21**	**2**	**14**	**470**	**0**	**1,787**	**0**
Peak Hour HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**58**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**25**	**0**	**89**	**0**
Peak Hour HV%	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**11%**	**-**	**1%**	**-**	**-**	**5%**	**5%**	**0%**	**14%**	**5%**	**-**	**5%**	**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
7:00 AM	0	0	17	3	*20*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
7:15 AM	**0**	**1**	**18**	**4**	***23***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:30 AM	**0**	**2**	**12**	**6**	***20***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**14**	**4**	***18***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
8:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**15**	**13**	***28***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***1***
8:15 AM	0	1	12	5	*18*	0	0	1	0	*1*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:30 AM	0	0	20	9	*29*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:45 AM	0	0	23	10	*33*	0	0	0	0	*0*	1	0	0	0	*1*
Count Total	0	4	131	54	*189*	0	0	1	0	*1*	2	0	0	0	*2*
Peak Hr	**0**	**3**	**59**	**27**	***89***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***1***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	0				20th St E				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound				Westbound				Northbound				Southbound					
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	1	0	0	3	0	20	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**17**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**23**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**20**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**14**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**18**	81
8:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**11**	**0**	**28**	**89**
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	0	0	0	5	0	18	84
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	1	8	0	29	93
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	3	0	1	9	0	33	108
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	126	5	0	4	50	0	189	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**58**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**25**	**0**	**89**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	0			20th St E			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
8:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
20th St E

Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Peak Hour: 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM

N

Peak Hour



	HV %:	PHF
EB	-	-
WB	1.2%	0.78
NB	1.8%	0.87
SB	1.9%	0.94
TOTAL	1.8%	0.92



Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start	0 Eastbound				20th St E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	13	0	0	171	5	0	23	306	0	521	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	13	0	0	164	6	0	20	281	0	487	0
4:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	10	0	0	164	9	0	19	278	0	485	0
4:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	6	0	0	144	4	0	13	300	0	472	1,965
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**200**	**8**	**0**	**20**	**298**	**0**	**545**	1,989
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**154**	**5**	**0**	**26**	**286**	**0**	**494**	1,996
5:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**166**	**13**	**1**	**23**	**253**	**0**	**469**	1,980
5:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**19**	**0**	**0**	**172**	**3**	**0**	**23**	**269**	**0**	**493**	**2,001**
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	37	0	102	0	0	1,335	53	1	167	2,271	0	3,966	0
Peak Hour All	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**21**	**0**	**60**	**0**	**0**	**692**	**29**	**1**	**92**	**1,106**	**0**	**2,001**	**0**
Peak Hour HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**23**	**0**	**37**	**0**
Peak Hour HV%	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**2%**	**-**	**-**	**2%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**2%**	**-**	**2%**	**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	2	8	*10*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:15 PM	0	0	7	9	*16*	0	0	0	0	*0*	1	0	0	0	*1*
4:30 PM	0	0	5	4	*9*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:45 PM	0	0	3	7	*10*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
5:00 PM	**0**	**1**	**3**	**10**	***14***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**	***4***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*4*
5:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**4**	**5**	***9***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*3*
5:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**5**	**5**	***10***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	***3***
Count Total	0	1	30	51	*82*	0	0	0	0	*0*	10	0	1	0	*11*
Peak Hr	**0**	**1**	**13**	**23**	***37***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**9**	**0**	**1**	**0**	***10***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	0				20th St E				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				15-min Total	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	8	0	10	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	9	0	16	0
4:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	4	0	9	0
4:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	7	0	10	45
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**14**	49
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**4**	37
5:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**9**	37
5:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**10**	**37**
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	30	0	0	0	51	0	82	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**23**	**0**	**37**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	0			20th St E			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
24th St E



Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM
Peak Hour: 7:00 AM to 8:00 AM



	HV %:	PHF
EB	4.6%	0.87
WB	4.5%	0.73
NB	4.7%	0.94
SB	3.8%	0.86
TOTAL	4.5%	0.93

Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		24th St E Eastbound				24th St E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM		**0**	**15**	**29**	**12**	**0**	**16**	**40**	**25**	**0**	**10**	**261**	**24**	**0**	**10**	**87**	**9**	**538**	0
7:15 AM		**0**	**27**	**17**	**12**	**0**	**18**	**32**	**34**	**0**	**15**	**287**	**8**	**0**	**6**	**96**	**8**	**560**	0
7:30 AM		**0**	**24**	**3**	**17**	**0**	**9**	**22**	**16**	**0**	**15**	**279**	**7**	**0**	**7**	**122**	**10**	**531**	0
7:45 AM		**0**	**17**	**3**	**19**	**0**	**5**	**14**	**15**	**0**	**13**	**238**	**8**	**0**	**10**	**99**	**12**	**453**	**2,082**
8:00 AM		0	20	10	17	0	9	7	7	0	25	233	5	0	6	99	19	457	2,001
8:15 AM		0	22	4	14	0	8	10	9	0	17	242	7	0	8	108	17	466	1,907
8:30 AM		0	23	5	20	0	9	12	9	0	16	236	5	0	8	99	15	457	1,833
8:45 AM		0	22	8	26	0	8	13	8	0	34	214	10	0	3	109	19	474	1,854
Count Total		0	170	79	137	0	82	150	123	0	145	1,990	74	0	58	819	109	3,936	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**83**	**52**	**60**	**0**	**48**	**108**	**90**	**0**	**53**	**1,065**	**47**	**0**	**33**	**404**	**39**	**2,082**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**3**	**5**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**9**	**0**	**2**	**51**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**16**	**1**	**93**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**4%**	**10%**	**2%**	**-**	**0%**	**2%**	**10%**	**-**	**4%**	**5%**	**4%**	**-**	**3%**	**4%**	**3%**	**4%**	**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
7:00 AM	**1**	**1**	**16**	**3**	***21***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:15 AM	**7**	**3**	**15**	**4**	***29***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:30 AM	**1**	**4**	**12**	**6**	***23***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	*1*
7:45 AM	**0**	**3**	**12**	**5**	***20***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**1**	**0**	**1**	**1**	***3***
8:00 AM	1	0	15	10	*26*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:15 AM	3	0	11	4	*18*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	1	0	*1*
8:30 AM	2	1	18	7	*28*	0	0	0	0	*0*	1	0	0	0	*1*
8:45 AM	2	4	22	8	*36*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	2	0	*2*
Count Total	17	16	121	47	*201*	0	0	0	0	*0*	2	0	5	1	*8*
Peak Hour	**9**	**11**	**55**	**18**	***93***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**1**	**0**	**2**	**1**	***4***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	24th St E Eastbound				24th St E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**15**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**21**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**2**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**14**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**29**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**1**	**23**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**10**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**20**	**93**
8:00 AM	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	1	0	0	9	1	26	98
8:15 AM	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	0	1	3	0	18	87
8:30 AM	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	15	2	0	0	6	1	28	92
8:45 AM	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	22	0	0	0	8	0	36	108
Count Total	0	5	7	5	0	2	2	12	0	5	110	6	0	2	42	3	201	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**3**	**5**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**9**	**0**	**2**	**51**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**16**	**1**	**93**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	24th St E Eastbound			24th St E Westbound			Meridian Ave E Northbound			Meridian Ave E Southbound			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
24th St E



Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Peak Hour: 4:15 PM to 5:15 PM



	HV %:	PHF
EB	3.0%	0.91
WB	2.0%	0.83
NB	2.4%	0.80
SB	2.7%	0.90
TOTAL	2.6%	0.90

Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		24th St E Eastbound				24th St E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM		0	25	19	20	0	11	7	9	0	18	135	9	0	15	277	27	572	0
4:15 PM		**0**	**25**	**23**	**23**	**0**	**17**	**17**	**12**	**0**	**22**	**132**	**6**	**0**	**13**	**237**	**27**	**554**	0
4:30 PM		**0**	**40**	**16**	**17**	**0**	**12**	**21**	**8**	**0**	**27**	**116**	**6**	**0**	**11**	**239**	**34**	**547**	0
4:45 PM		**0**	**23**	**13**	**20**	**0**	**9**	**23**	**5**	**0**	**17**	**105**	**7**	**0**	**16**	**221**	**33**	**492**	2,165
5:00 PM		**0**	**28**	**10**	**27**	**0**	**10**	**13**	**6**	**0**	**20**	**174**	**5**	**1**	**12**	**276**	**33**	**615**	**2,208**
5:15 PM		0	19	20	22	0	13	12	7	0	15	124	9	1	21	249	21	533	2,187
5:30 PM		0	29	22	24	0	14	19	8	0	17	147	5	0	13	203	34	535	2,175
5:45 PM		0	27	19	13	0	14	10	6	0	22	133	3	0	13	227	32	519	2,202
Count Total		0	216	142	166	0	100	122	61	0	158	1,066	50	2	114	1,929	241	4,367	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**116**	**62**	**87**	**0**	**48**	**74**	**31**	**0**	**86**	**527**	**24**	**1**	**52**	**973**	**127**	**2,208**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**2**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**29**	**1**	**57**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**2%**	**5%**	**3%**	**-**	**2%**	**3%**	**0%**	**-**	**2%**	**2%**	**0%**	**0%**	**2%**	**3%**	**1%**	**3%**	**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	2	2	7	*11*	1	0	0	0	*1*	1	0	3	1	*5*
4:15 PM	**4**	**2**	**7**	**8**	***21***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
4:30 PM	**2**	**1**	**3**	**5**	***11***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	*4*
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**2**	**6**	***8***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	*2*
5:00 PM	**2**	**0**	**3**	**12**	***17***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	***3***
5:15 PM	1	0	2	5	*8*	0	0	0	0	*0*	4	0	0	0	*4*
5:30 PM	1	1	3	5	*10*	0	0	0	0	*0*	1	0	0	0	*1*
5:45 PM	1	0	4	4	*9*	0	0	0	0	*0*	1	1	0	0	*2*
Count Total	11	6	26	52	*95*	1	0	0	0	*1*	11	2	7	1	*21*
Peak Hour	**8**	**3**	**15**	**31**	***57***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**4**	**1**	**4**	**0**	***9***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	24th St E Eastbound				24th St E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	7	0	11	0
4:15 PM	**0**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**21**	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**11**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**8**	51
5:00 PM	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**10**	**1**	**17**	**57**
5:15 PM	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	1	8	44
5:30 PM	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	4	1	10	43
5:45 PM	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4	0	9	44
Count Total	0	3	4	4	0	1	3	2	0	5	20	1	0	2	47	3	95	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**2**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**29**	**1**	**57**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	24th St E Eastbound			24th St E Westbound			Meridian Ave E Northbound			Meridian Ave E Southbound			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
4:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	1
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
5:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
29th St E

Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM
Peak Hour: 7:00 AM to 8:00 AM





	HV %:	PHF
EB	11.1%	0.75
WB	23.1%	0.65
NB	5.1%	0.93
SB	5.3%	0.95
TOTAL	5.3%	0.95

Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		Driveway Eastbound				29th St E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM		**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**282**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**122**	**3**	**414**	0
7:15 AM		**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**306**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**136**	**2**	**448**	0
7:30 AM		**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**294**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**141**	**2**	**445**	0
7:45 AM		**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**257**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**137**	**1**	**404**	**1,711**
8:00 AM		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	256	1	0	0	124	2	385	1,682
8:15 AM		0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	261	1	0	1	129	1	398	1,632
8:30 AM		0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	249	3	0	1	120	3	382	1,569
8:45 AM		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	249	1	0	0	125	4	381	1,546
Count Total		0	7	0	6	0	6	0	16	0	3	2,154	10	0	3	1,034	18	3,257	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**1**	**1,139**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**536**	**8**	**1,711**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**56**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**29**	**0**	**91**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**20%**	**-**	**25%**	**-**	**22%**	**-**	**0%**	**5%**	**50%**	**-**	**0%**	**5%**	**0%**	**5%**	**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
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**20**	**3**	***23***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**16**	**6**	***22***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:30 AM	**1**	**1**	**9**	**10**	***21***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:45 AM	**0**	**2**	**13**	**10**	***25***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
8:00 AM	0	0	13	9	*22*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:15 AM	0	0	11	4	*15*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:30 AM	0	0	20	7	*27*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:45 AM	0	1	18	13	*32*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	1	0	0	*1*
Count Total	1	4	120	62	*187*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	1	0	0	*1*
Peak Hour	**1**	**3**	**58**	**29**	***91***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	Driveway				29th St E				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound				Westbound				Northbound				Southbound					
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**23**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**22**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**21**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**25**	**91**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	9	0	22	90
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	4	0	15	83
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	1	0	0	7	0	27	89
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	18	0	0	0	13	0	32	96
Count Total	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	117	3	0	0	62	0	187	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**56**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**29**	**0**	**91**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	Driveway			29th St E			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
29th St E



Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Peak Hour: 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM



	HV %:	PHF
EB	0.0%	0.70
WB	0.0%	0.58
NB	1.8%	0.84
SB	2.3%	0.92
TOTAL	2.1%	0.89

Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		Driveway Eastbound				29th St E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM		0	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	159	0	0	0	288	2	455	0
4:15 PM		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	146	1	0	2	258	1	410	0
4:30 PM		**0**	**1**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**142**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**253**	**5**	**411**	0
4:45 PM		**0**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**132**	**4**	**0**	**2**	**247**	**10**	**400**	1,676
5:00 PM		**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**175**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**290**	**3**	**479**	1,700
5:15 PM		**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**135**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**277**	**4**	**422**	**1,712**
5:30 PM		0	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	147	0	0	2	219	1	376	1,677
5:45 PM		0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	155	1	0	2	226	5	394	1,671
Count Total		0	17	0	8	0	4	0	10	0	4	1,191	12	0	12	2,058	31	3,347	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**2**	**584**	**10**	**0**	**6**	**1,067**	**22**	**1,712**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**25**	**0**	**36**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**2%**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**2%**	**0%**	**2%**	**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	2	11	*13*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:15 PM	0	0	6	10	*16*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**3**	**6**	***9***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**1**	**6**	***7***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**6**	**8**	***14***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**1**	**5**	***6***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
5:30 PM	0	0	3	3	*6*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
5:45 PM	0	0	4	6	*10*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Count Total	0	0	26	55	*81*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**11**	**25**	***36***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	Driveway				29th St E				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				15-min Total	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	11	0	13	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	10	0	16	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**9**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**7**	45
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**14**	46
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**6**	**36**
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	6	33
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	6	0	10	36
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	55	0	81	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**25**	**0**	**36**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	Driveway			29th St E			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
32nd St E



Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM
Peak Hour: 7:00 AM to 8:00 AM



	HV %:	PHF
EB	4.0%	0.63
WB	13.3%	0.83
NB	4.4%	0.94
SB	5.1%	0.95
TOTAL	4.8%	0.96

Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		32nd St E Eastbound				32nd St E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM		**0**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**292**	**8**	**0**	**4**	**117**	**0**	**435**	0
7:15 AM		**0**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**304**	**8**	**0**	**4**	**129**	**3**	**458**	0
7:30 AM		**0**	**6**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**285**	**5**	**0**	**7**	**133**	**0**	**451**	0
7:45 AM		**0**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**3**	**257**	**5**	**0**	**5**	**128**	**1**	**411**	**1,755**
8:00 AM		0	2	0	2	0	2	0	6	0	4	246	5	0	6	117	4	394	1,714
8:15 AM		0	0	0	1	0	11	0	17	0	0	255	5	0	2	123	4	418	1,674
8:30 AM		0	4	0	1	0	4	0	10	0	1	239	1	0	3	116	1	380	1,603
8:45 AM		0	6	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	220	2	0	10	109	3	358	1,550
Count Total		0	25	2	14	0	36	0	52	0	10	2,098	39	0	41	972	16	3,305	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**13**	**2**	**10**	**0**	**17**	**0**	**13**	**0**	**5**	**1,138**	**26**	**0**	**20**	**507**	**4**	**1,755**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**48**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**26**	**0**	**84**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**0%**	**0%**	**10%**	**-**	**12%**	**-**	**15%**	**-**	**0%**	**4%**	**15%**	**-**	**5%**	**5%**	**0%**	**5%**	**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
7:00 AM	**1**	**0**	**20**	**3**	***24***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:15 AM	**0**	**1**	**13**	**6**	***20***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:30 AM	**0**	**1**	**8**	**11**	***20***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:45 AM	**0**	**2**	**11**	**7**	***20***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
8:00 AM	0	0	14	10	*24*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:15 AM	0	2	10	3	*15*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:30 AM	0	1	21	7	*29*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:45 AM	0	1	15	13	*29*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Count Total	1	8	112	60	*181*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Peak Hour	**1**	**4**	**52**	**27**	***84***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	32nd St E Eastbound				32nd St E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**19**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**24**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**12**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**20**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**10**	**0**	**20**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**20**	**84**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	0	1	9	0	24	84
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	9	1	0	0	3	0	15	79
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	7	0	29	88
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	1	11	1	29	97
Count Total	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	3	0	0	106	6	0	3	56	1	181	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**48**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**26**	**0**	**84**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	32nd St E Eastbound			32nd St E Westbound			Meridian Ave E Northbound			Meridian Ave E Southbound			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
32nd St E



Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Peak Hour: 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM



	HV %:	PHF
EB	0.0%	0.46
WB	2.9%	0.65
NB	1.7%	0.85
SB	1.7%	0.94
TOTAL	1.7%	0.89

Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		32nd St E Eastbound				32nd St E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM		0	1	0	2	0	5	0	14	0	1	144	6	0	9	274	1	457	0
4:15 PM		0	2	0	1	0	3	0	4	0	0	132	3	0	7	249	1	402	0
4:30 PM		**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**146**	**3**	**0**	**8**	**250**	**4**	**415**	0
4:45 PM		**0**	**4**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**1**	**119**	**8**	**0**	**4**	**235**	**5**	**390**	1,664
5:00 PM		**0**	**4**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**6**	**1**	**5**	**0**	**1**	**165**	**6**	**0**	**11**	**268**	**4**	**474**	1,681
5:15 PM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**3**	**126**	**5**	**0**	**7**	**266**	**3**	**417**	**1,696**
5:30 PM		0	3	0	2	0	2	0	7	0	4	147	3	0	5	222	5	400	1,681
5:45 PM		0	1	0	0	0	6	0	7	0	1	137	2	0	8	209	3	374	1,665
Count Total		0	16	1	8	0	30	1	51	0	12	1,116	36	0	59	1,973	26	3,329	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**9**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**14**	**1**	**19**	**0**	**6**	**556**	**22**	**0**	**30**	**1,019**	**16**	**1,696**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**16**	**0**	**29**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**0%**	**5%**	**-**	**0%**	**2%**	**0%**	**-**	**7%**	**2%**	**0%**	**2%**	**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	3	10	*13*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:15 PM	0	0	6	8	*14*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**3**	**3**	***6***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	***1***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**2**	**4**	***6***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
5:00 PM	**0**	**1**	**4**	**8**	***13***	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	***1***	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*1*
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**	***4***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
5:30 PM	0	0	5	4	*9*	0	0	0	0	*0*	1	0	0	0	*1*
5:45 PM	0	0	2	5	*7*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Count Total	0	1	26	45	*72*	0	0	1	1	*2*	2	0	0	0	*2*
Peak Hour	**0**	**1**	**10**	**18**	***29***	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	***2***	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***1***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	32nd St E				32nd St E				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				15-min Total	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	10	0	13	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	8	0	14	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**6**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**6**	39
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**7**	**0**	**13**	39
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**4**	**29**
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	4	0	9	32
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	7	33
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	26	0	0	2	43	0	72	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**16**	**0**	**29**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	32nd St E			32nd St E			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	1
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	2
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

	HV %:	PHF
EB	10.0%	0.83
WB	5.3%	0.65
NB	4.6%	0.88
SB	5.5%	0.95
NWB	4.0%	0.92
TOTAL	4.9%	0.93



Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start	36th St E Eastbound					36th St E Westbound					Meridian Ave E Northbound					Meridian Ave E Southbound					Chrisella Rd E Northwestbound					15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	UT	LT	TH	BR	RT	UT	HL	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	HR	UT	LT	BL	TH	RT	UT	HL	BL	BR	HR		
7:00 AM	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**14**	**0**	**2**	**238**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**2**	**108**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**53**	**2**	**453**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**3**	**240**	**10**	**2**	**0**	**8**	**13**	**115**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**50**	**2**	**471**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**210**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**16**	**119**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**43**	**3**	**426**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**21**	**0**	**0**	**190**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**15**	**110**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**47**	**1**	**409**	**1,759**
8:00 AM	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	2	0	6	0	2	215	3	0	0	5	12	97	0	0	0	0	44	3	395	1,701
8:15 AM	0	2	0	0	3	0	1	7	0	9	0	2	201	3	1	0	11	19	102	0	0	1	0	34	4	400	1,630
8:30 AM	0	5	0	1	3	0	0	8	3	11	0	3	196	4	2	0	9	10	94	0	0	0	0	20	1	370	1,574
8:45 AM	0	6	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	22	0	1	161	4	0	0	8	17	84	3	0	0	0	25	0	335	1,500
Count Total	0	40	1	1	26	0	1	41	3	101	0	13	1,651	29	5	0	58	104	829	22	0	2	0	316	16	3,259	0
Peak Hour All	**0**	**25**	**0**	**0**	**15**	**0**	**0**	**22**	**0**	**53**	**0**	**5**	**878**	**15**	**2**	**0**	**25**	**46**	**452**	**19**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**193**	**8**	**1,759**	**0**
Peak Hour HV	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**39**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**25**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**2**	**87**	**0**
Peak Hour HV%	**-**	**4%**	**-**	**-**	**20%**	**-**	**-**	**5%**	**-**	**6%**	**-**	**0%**	**4%**	**13%**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**7%**	**6%**	**11%**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**3%**	**25%**	**5%**	**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	NWB	Total	EB	WB	NB	SB	NWB	Total	East	West	North	South	Southeast	Total
7:00 AM	**1**	**0**	**16**	**4**	**2**	***23***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
7:15 AM	**1**	**1**	**9**	**5**	**3**	***19***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
7:30 AM	**0**	**1**	**6**	**12**	**3**	***22***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
7:45 AM	**2**	**2**	**10**	**9**	**0**	***23***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
8:00 AM	0	0	13	10	3	*26*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:15 AM	0	1	9	5	1	*16*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:30 AM	1	3	21	8	2	*35*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:45 AM	0	0	10	11	2	*23*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*
Count Total	5	8	94	64	16	*187*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*
Peak Hr	**4**	**4**	**41**	**30**	**8**	***87***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	36th St E Eastbound					36th St E Westbound					Meridian Ave E Northbound					Meridian Ave E Southbound					Chrisella Rd E Northwestbound					15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	UT	LT	TH	BR	RT	UT	HL	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	HR	UT	LT	BL	TH	RT	UT	HL	BL	BR	HR		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**23**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**19**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**8**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**22**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**23**	**87**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	26	90
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	87
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	35	100
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	23	100
Count Total	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	3	1	4	0	0	90	4	0	0	1	5	56	2	0	0	0	13	3	187	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**39**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**25**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**2**	87	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	36th St E Eastbound					36th St E Westbound					Meridian Ave E Northbound					Meridian Ave E Southbound					Chrisella Rd E Northwestbound					15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	UT	LT	TH	BR	RT	UT	HL	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	HR	UT	LT	BL	TH	RT	UT	HL	BL	BR	HR		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0	**0**


HV %: PHF
EB 3.8% 0.65
WB 2.5% 0.77
NB 1.7% 0.92
SB 1.6% 0.93
NWB 1.1% 0.86
TOTAL 1.7% 0.93
N
idax
Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Peak Hour: 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM
Meridian Ave E
36th St E
Peak Hour
TEV: 1,708
PHF: 0.93
Meridian Ave E
1,038
588
0
26
606
308
98
0
1
36th St E
0
58
2
12
8
0
80
124
2
0
44
26
0
13
2
3
8
2
0
36th St E
Chrisella Rd E
0
2
85
4
2
0
93
324
0
0
12
432
22
5
0
Meridian Ave E
628
471

Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		36th St E Eastbound					36th St E Westbound					Meridian Ave E Northbound					Meridian Ave E Southbound					Chrisella Rd E Northwestbound					15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	BR	RT	UT	HL	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	HR	UT	LT	BL	TH	RT	UT	HL	BL	BR	HR		
4:00 PM		0	3	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	14	0	1	113	6	1	0	18	90	186	6	0	0	0	18	0	463	0
4:15 PM		0	4	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	9	0	1	100	3	2	0	12	87	139	6	0	0	0	20	0	388	0
4:30 PM		**0**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**5**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**20**	**0**	**2**	**110**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**28**	**101**	**119**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**422**	0
4:45 PM		**0**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**4**	**5**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**2**	**102**	**5**	**1**	**0**	**24**	**51**	**145**	**13**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**21**	**1**	**393**	1,666
5:00 PM		**0**	**4**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**19**	**0**	**6**	**116**	**4**	**2**	**0**	**24**	**70**	**177**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**24**	**1**	**458**	1,661
5:15 PM		**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**9**	**0**	**2**	**104**	**7**	**2**	**0**	**22**	**86**	**165**	**5**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**24**	**0**	**435**	**1,708**
5:30 PM		0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	21	0	2	93	8	1	0	12	69	147	4	0	1	0	29	3	394	1,680
5:45 PM		0	2	0	0	2	0	2	5	0	9	0	2	102	8	2	0	26	43	145	3	0	0	0	18	0	369	1,656
Count Total		0	23	3	5	11	0	13	22	5	111	0	18	840	47	11	0	166	597	1,223	45	0	3	4	170	5	3,322	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**13**	**2**	**3**	**8**	**0**	**8**	**12**	**2**	**58**	**0**	**12**	**432**	**22**	**5**	**0**	**98**	**308**	**606**	**26**	**0**	**2**	**4**	**85**	**2**	**1,708**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**6**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**29**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**0%**	**0%**	**33%**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**0%**	**50%**	**2%**	**-**	**0%**	**2%**	**0%**	**0%**	**-**	**1%**	**2%**	**2%**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**0%**	**1%**	**0%**	**2%**	**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	NWB	Total	EB	WB	NB	SB	NWB	Total	East	West	North	South	Southeast	Total
4:00 PM	0	0	3	9	1	*13*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:15 PM	0	0	3	8	1	*12*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	1	0	0	0	*1*
4:30 PM	**1**	**1**	**3**	**4**	**0**	***9***	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***2***	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	***4***
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**0**	***4***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**4**	**6**	**1**	***11***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	***1***
5:15 PM	**0**	**1**	**0**	**4**	**0**	***5***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
5:30 PM	0	2	4	3	0	*9*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*
5:45 PM	0	0	2	6	0	*8*	0	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	2	0	0	*2*
Count Total	1	4	20	43	3	*71*	2	0	0	0	0	*2*	2	1	3	0	2	*8*
Peak Hr	**1**	**2**	**8**	**17**	**1**	***29***	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***2***	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	*5*

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	36th St E					36th St E					Meridian Ave E					Meridian Ave E					Chrisella Rd E					15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound					Westbound					Northbound					Southbound					Northwestbound						
	UT	LT	TH	BR	RT	UT	HL	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	HR	UT	LT	BL	TH	RT	UT	HL	BL	BR	HR		
4:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	38
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**11**	36
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**29**
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	29
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	33
Count Total	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	20	0	0	0	1	9	32	1	0	0	0	3	0	71	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**6**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	29	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	36th St E					36th St E					Meridian Ave E					Meridian Ave E					Chrisella Rd E					15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound					Westbound					Northbound					Southbound					Northwestbound						
	UT	LT	TH	BR	RT	UT	HL	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	HR	UT	LT	BL	TH	RT	UT	HL	BL	BR	HR		
4:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	2
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	2
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	2	**0**

Meridian Ct
Meridian Ave E

N

Peak Hour

Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM
Peak Hour: 7:00 AM to 8:00 AM



	HV %:	PHF
EB	4.6%	0.88
WB	5.9%	0.93
NB	6.7%	0.63
SB	-	-
TOTAL	5.1%	0.93

Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start	Meridian Ave E Eastbound				Meridian Ave E Westbound				Meridian Ct Northbound				0 Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**253**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**114**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**373**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**251**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**119**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**377**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**198**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**132**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**338**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**190**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**119**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**312**	**1,400**
8:00 AM	0	0	224	2	0	1	95	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	324	1,351
8:15 AM	0	0	196	0	0	6	108	0	0	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	317	1,291
8:30 AM	0	0	202	2	0	1	103	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	312	1,265
8:45 AM	0	0	164	0	0	0	92	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	259	1,212
Count Total	0	0	1,678	8	0	13	882	0	0	9	0	22	0	0	0	0	2,612	0
Peak Hour All	**0**	**0**	**892**	**4**	**0**	**5**	**484**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,400**	**0**
Peak Hour HV	**0**	**0**	**41**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**27**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**71**	**0**
Peak Hour HV%	**-**	**-**	**5%**	**0%**	**-**	**40%**	**6%**	**-**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**8%**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**5%**	**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
7:00 AM	**16**	**5**	**0**	**0**	***21***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:15 AM	**10**	**5**	**1**	**0**	***16***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:30 AM	**6**	**7**	**0**	**0**	***13***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:45 AM	**9**	**12**	**0**	**0**	***21***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
8:00 AM	12	9	1	0	*22*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:15 AM	9	5	0	0	*14*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:30 AM	21	8	0	0	*29*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:45 AM	10	12	0	0	*22*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Count Total	93	63	2	0	*158*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Peak Hr	**41**	**29**	**1**	**0**	***71***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	Meridian Ave E Eastbound				Meridian Ave E Westbound				Meridian Ct Northbound				0 Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**21**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**13**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**21**	**71**
8:00 AM	0	0	12	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	22	72
8:15 AM	0	0	9	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	70
8:30 AM	0	0	21	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	86
8:45 AM	0	0	10	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	87
Count Total	0	0	93	0	0	2	61	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	158	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**41**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**27**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**71**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	Meridian Ave E Eastbound			Meridian Ave E Westbound			Meridian Ct Northbound			0 Southbound			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ct
Meridian Ave E

Peak Hour

Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Peak Hour: 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM



Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start	Meridian Ave E Eastbound				Meridian Ave E Westbound				Meridian Ct Northbound				0 Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM	0	0	120	1	0	2	176	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	302	0
4:15 PM	0	0	110	2	0	5	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	253	0
4:30 PM	0	0	116	3	0	1	132	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	254	0
4:45 PM	0	0	115	2	0	3	150	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	272	1,081
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**121**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**175**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**305**	1,084
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**109**	**2**	**0**	**3**	**164**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**281**	1,112
5:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**99**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**149**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**254**	1,112
5:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**114**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**154**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**274**	**1,114**
Count Total	0	0	904	13	0	20	1,236	0	0	8	0	14	0	0	0	0	2,195	0
Peak Hour All	**0**	**0**	**443**	**5**	**0**	**9**	**642**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**11**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,114**	**0**
Peak Hour HV	**0**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**18**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**27**	**0**
Peak Hour HV%	**-**	**-**	**2%**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**3%**	**-**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**2%**	**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	3	4	0	0	*7*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:15 PM	4	6	0	0	*10*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:30 PM	2	4	0	0	*6*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:45 PM	2	2	0	0	*4*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
5:00 PM	**3**	**4**	**0**	**0**	***7***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
5:15 PM	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	***6***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
5:30 PM	**4**	**3**	**0**	**0**	***7***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
5:45 PM	**2**	**5**	**0**	**0**	***7***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
Count Total	20	34	0	0	*54*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Peak Hr	**9**	**18**	**0**	**0**	***27***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ct				0				15-min Total	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	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0
4:15 PM	0	0	4	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0
4:30 PM	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
4:45 PM	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	27
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	27
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	23
5:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	24
5:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**27**
Count Total	0	0	20	0	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**18**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**27**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ct			0			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
Dechaux Rd E

Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM
Peak Hour: 7:00 AM to 8:00 AM



	HV %:	PHF
EB	-	-
WB	0.0%	0.38
NB	4.4%	0.86
SB	5.6%	0.93
TOTAL	4.8%	0.90



Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		0 Eastbound				Dechaux Rd E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**244**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**114**	**0**	**360**	0
7:15 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**260**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**123**	**0**	**383**	0
7:30 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**189**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**130**	**0**	**320**	0
7:45 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**200**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**118**	**0**	**318**	**1,381**
8:00 AM		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213	0	0	0	94	0	307	1,328
8:15 AM		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	207	0	0	0	115	0	323	1,268
8:30 AM		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	190	0	0	0	107	0	298	1,246
8:45 AM		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	179	0	0	0	93	0	273	1,201
Count Total		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	1,682	0	0	0	894	0	2,582	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**893**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**485**	**0**	**1,381**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**39**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**27**	**0**	**66**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**-**	**4%**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**6%**	**-**	**5%**	**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
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**14**	**5**	***19***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**9**	**3**	***12***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**7**	**8**	***15***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**9**	**11**	***20***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
8:00 AM	0	0	12	8	*20*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:15 AM	0	0	9	4	*13*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:30 AM	0	0	21	8	*29*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:45 AM	0	0	12	11	*23*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Count Total	0	0	93	58	*151*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Peak Hr	**0**	**0**	**39**	**27**	***66***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	0				Dechaux Rd E				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound				Westbound				Northbound				Southbound					
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**14**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**19**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**12**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**15**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**0**	**20**	**66**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	8	0	20	67
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	4	0	13	68
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	8	0	29	82
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	11	0	23	85
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	0	0	0	58	0	151	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**39**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**27**	**0**	**66**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	0			Dechaux Rd E			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
Dechaux Rd E

Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Peak Hour: 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM



	HV %:	PHF
EB	-	-
WB	0.0%	0.25
NB	1.7%	0.97
SB	2.5%	0.91
TOTAL	2.2%	0.94



Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		0 Eastbound				Dechaux Rd E Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	0	0	0	177	0	296	0
4:15 PM		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	0	0	0	142	0	254	0
4:30 PM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**117**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**133**	**0**	**250**	0
4:45 PM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**117**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**159**	**0**	**276**	1,076
5:00 PM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**122**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**172**	**0**	**294**	1,074
5:15 PM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**118**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**164**	**0**	**283**	**1,103**
5:30 PM		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	95	0	0	0	135	0	231	1,084
5:45 PM		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	0	0	0	156	0	269	1,077
Count Total		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	913	0	0	0	1,238	0	2,153	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**474**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**628**	**0**	**1,103**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**24**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**-**	**2%**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**3%**	**-**	**2%**	**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	3	5	*8*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:15 PM	0	0	3	8	*11*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**2**	**6**	***8***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**	***4***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**3**	**4**	***7***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**1**	**4**	***5***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
5:30 PM	0	0	4	3	*7*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
5:45 PM	0	0	2	6	*8*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Count Total	0	0	20	38	*58*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Peak Hr	**0**	**0**	**8**	**16**	***24***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	0				Dechaux Rd E				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				15-min Total	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	0	8	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	8	0	11	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**8**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**4**	31
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**7**	30
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**5**	**24**
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	7	23
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	6	0	8	27
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	38	0	58	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**24**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	0			Dechaux Rd E			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
Spencer St N



Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM
Peak Hour: 7:00 AM to 8:00 AM



	HV %:	PHF
EB	0.0%	0.67
WB	12.9%	0.70
NB	4.1%	0.88
SB	5.3%	0.91
TOTAL	4.6%	0.92

Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		Driveway Eastbound				Spencer St N Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**13**	**242**	**6**	**0**	**2**	**104**	**2**	**386**	0
7:15 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**23**	**252**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**125**	**2**	**413**	0
7:30 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**14**	**198**	**7**	**0**	**4**	**131**	**0**	**362**	0
7:45 AM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**9**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**27**	**189**	**7**	**0**	**1**	**114**	**3**	**358**	**1,519**
8:00 AM		0	0	0	4	0	7	0	3	1	9	219	9	0	0	92	1	345	1,478
8:15 AM		0	0	0	2	0	3	0	2	0	6	195	10	0	0	114	0	332	1,397
8:30 AM		0	0	0	5	0	4	0	1	0	6	205	12	0	2	102	0	337	1,372
8:45 AM		0	1	0	5	0	8	0	2	0	9	163	14	0	0	94	0	296	1,310
Count Total		0	1	0	32	0	45	0	16	2	107	1,663	69	0	10	876	8	2,829	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**23**	**0**	**8**	**1**	**77**	**881**	**24**	**0**	**8**	**474**	**7**	**1,519**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**37**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**24**	**0**	**70**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**-**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**9%**	**-**	**25%**	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	**13%**	**-**	**25%**	**5%**	**0%**	**5%**	**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
7:00 AM	**0**	**3**	**12**	**5**	***20***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**10**	**2**	***12***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:30 AM	**0**	**1**	**8**	**9**	***18***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**10**	**10**	***20***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
8:00 AM	0	2	12	8	*22*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:15 AM	0	0	9	4	*13*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:30 AM	0	0	26	8	*34*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
8:45 AM	0	3	14	11	*28*	0	0	0	0	*0*	1	0	0	0	*1*
Count Total	0	9	101	57	*167*	0	0	0	0	*0*	1	0	0	0	*1*
Peak Hour	**0**	**4**	**40**	**26**	***70***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	Driveway				Spencer St N				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound				Westbound				Northbound				Southbound					
	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**20**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**12**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**7**	**0**	**18**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**20**	**70**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	8	0	22	72
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	4	0	13	73
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	3	0	1	7	0	34	89
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	11	0	28	97
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	2	0	0	93	8	0	3	54	0	167	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**37**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**24**	**0**	**70**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	Driveway			Spencer St N			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
7:00 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:15 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:30 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
7:45 AM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Meridian Ave E
Spencer St N

Date: 09/20/2022
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Peak Hour: 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM





	HV %:	PHF
EB	0.0%	0.45
WB	0.0%	0.84
NB	1.4%	0.97
SB	3.0%	0.90
TOTAL	2.2%	0.95

Two-Hour Count Summaries

Interval Start		Driveway Eastbound				Spencer St N Westbound				Meridian Ave E Northbound				Meridian Ave E Southbound				15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
		UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT	UT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM		0	0	0	11	0	3	1	4	0	2	112	9	0	0	171	0	313	0
4:15 PM		0	0	0	7	0	1	0	2	0	3	113	8	0	3	140	1	278	0
4:30 PM		**0**	**1**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**107**	**12**	**0**	**3**	**136**	**0**	**277**	0
4:45 PM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**3**	**1**	**4**	**117**	**7**	**0**	**1**	**155**	**0**	**294**	1,162
5:00 PM		**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**116**	**6**	**0**	**1**	**173**	**1**	**309**	1,158
5:15 PM		**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**3**	**117**	**10**	**0**	**1**	**160**	**0**	**300**	**1,180**
5:30 PM		0	0	0	3	0	4	1	2	0	3	96	8	0	4	137	0	258	1,161
5:45 PM		0	0	0	4	0	7	0	1	0	2	110	9	0	2	147	0	282	1,149
Count Total		0	2	0	43	0	30	2	21	1	19	888	69	0	15	1,219	2	2,311	0
Peak Hour	**All**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**18**	**0**	**15**	**0**	**12**	**1**	**9**	**457**	**35**	**0**	**6**	**624**	**1**	**1,180**	**0**
	HV	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**18**	**0**	**26**	**0**
	HV%	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**-**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**2%**	**0%**	**-**	**17%**	**3%**	**0%**	**2%**	**0**

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

Interval Start	Heavy Vehicle Totals EB	WB	NB	SB	Total	Bicycles EB	WB	NB	SB	Total	Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) East	West	North	South	Total
4:00 PM	0	0	4	4	*8*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:15 PM	0	0	5	8	*13*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**1**	**5**	***6***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	*1*
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**2**	**5**	***7***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	*2*
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**3**	**5**	***8***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	*0*
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**1**	**4**	***5***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***
5:30 PM	0	1	4	3	*8*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
5:45 PM	0	0	2	4	*6*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	0	0	0	*0*
Count Total	0	1	22	38	*61*	0	0	0	0	*0*	0	3	0	0	*3*
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**7**	**19**	***26***	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	***0***	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	***3***

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

Interval Start	Driveway				Spencer St N				Meridian Ave E				Meridian Ave E				15-min Total	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	4	0	8	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	8	0	13	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**6**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**4**	**0**	**7**	34
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**8**	34
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**5**	**26**
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	8	28
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	0	6	27
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	20	2	0	1	37	0	61	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**18**	**0**	**26**	**0**

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

Interval Start	Driveway			Spencer St N			Meridian Ave E			Meridian Ave E			15-min Total	Rolling One Hour
	Eastbound			Westbound			Northbound			Southbound				
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT		
4:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4:30 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
4:45 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:00 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	0
5:15 PM	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
5:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Count Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak Hour	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 - 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

	Monday			Tuesday			Wednesday			Thursday			Friday			Saturday			Sunday			Mid-Week Average		
	9/19/2022			9/20/2022			9/21/2022			9/22/2022			9/23/2022			9/24/2022			9/25/2022					
Time	NB	SB	Total	NB	SB	Total	NB	SB	Total	NB	SB	Total	NB	SB	Total	NB	SB	Total	NB	SB	Total	NB	SB	Total
12:00 AM	29	41	70	30	37	67	38	39	77	42	55	97	49	42	91	87	71	158	89	101	190	37	44	80
1:00 AM	16	16	32	20	25	45	27	23	50	23	24	47	25	31	56	40	50	90	51	41	92	23	24	47
2:00 AM	20	20	40	18	16	34	20	28	48	25	20	45	29	29	58	29	49	78	35	44	79	21	21	42
3:00 AM	71	21	92	60	26	86	62	32	94	63	23	86	62	27	89	41	25	66	34	27	61	62	27	89
4:00 AM	190	52	242	225	67	292	225	61	286	229	59	288	203	52	255	42	34	76	50	24	74	226	62	289
5:00 AM	526	125	651	553	115	668	551	121	672	538	118	656	452	99	551	74	52	126	50	43	93	547	118	665
6:00 AM	661	208	869	736	262	998	720	277	997	711	253	964	586	245	831	128	92	220	64	64	128	722	264	986
7:00 AM	673	379	1,052	847	502	1,349	769	469	1,238	723	492	1,215	614	440	1,054	149	195	344	117	127	244	780	488	1,267
8:00 AM	533	421	954	742	402	1,144	638	404	1,042	618	388	1,006	535	374	909	256	316	572	208	197	405	666	398	1,064
9:00 AM	435	428	863	489	374	863	453	428	881	453	406	859	437	437	874	337	426	763	279	356	635	465	403	868
10:00 AM	379	465	844	404	356	760	338	425	763	374	447	821	350	486	836	351	545	896	296	432	728	372	409	781
11:00 AM	372	450	822	398	427	825	376	454	830	395	410	805	434	464	898	411	620	1,031	357	507	864	390	430	820
12:00 PM	359	499	858	388	455	843	388	495	883	343	483	826	427	524	951	440	669	1,109	367	584	951	373	478	851
1:00 PM	413	526	939	391	506	897	411	543	954	373	557	930	440	659	1,099	433	651	1,084	425	596	1,021	392	535	927
2:00 PM	412	810	1,222	419	730	1,149	424	846	1,270	474	788	1,262	448	809	1,257	504	639	1,143	371	621	992	439	788	1,227
3:00 PM	506	798	1,304	493	748	1,241	500	771	1,271	563	810	1,373	524	753	1,277	465	678	1,143	420	524	944	519	776	1,295
4:00 PM	454	628	1,082	454	601	1,055	483	706	1,189	525	595	1,120	448	625	1,073	453	569	1,022	428	523	951	487	634	1,121
5:00 PM	411	708	1,119	426	649	1,075	420	597	1,017	502	621	1,123	394	694	1,088	510	562	1,072	425	462	887	449	622	1,072
6:00 PM	344	568	912	380	537	917	363	642	1,005	342	667	1,009	375	561	936	451	442	893	423	437	860	362	615	977
7:00 PM	289	348	637	272	351	623	367	469	836	312	442	754	315	504	819	456	315	771	386	266	652	317	421	738
8:00 PM	288	234	522	236	264	500	339	264	603	335	257	592	338	258	596	426	271	697	377	213	590	303	262	565
9:00 PM	246	147	393	173	168	341	285	208	493	313	202	515	398	245	643	491	209	700	416	182	598	257	193	450
10:00 PM	232	89	321	77	80	157	467	117	584	274	107	381	411	164	575	492	170	662	402	98	500	273	101	374
11:00 PM	80	59	139	58	70	128	94	66	160	88	72	160	300	120	420	268	140	408	134	71	205	80	69	149
Total	**7,939**	**8,040**	**15,979**	**8,289**	**7,768**	**16,057**	**8,758**	**8,485**	**17,243**	**8,638**	**8,296**	**16,934**	**8,594**	**8,642**	**17,236**	**7,334**	**7,790**	**15,124**	**6,204**	**6,540**	**12,744**	**8,562**	**8,183**	**16,745**
Percent	**50%**	**50%**	-	**52%**	**48%**	-	**51%**	**49%**	-	**51%**	**49%**	-	**50%**	**50%**	-	**48%**	**52%**	-	**49%**	**51%**	-	**51%**	**49%**	-

1. Mid-week average includes data between Tuesday and Thursday.

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Appendix C: Vehicular Speed Data

Vehicle Speed Report Summary

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E

Count Direction: Northbound / Southbound

Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022

Site Code: 01

	Speed Range (mph)																	Total
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	Volume
Study Total																		
Northbound	1	18	286	570	941	9,465	25,625	14,292	3,681	705	138	25	7	1	0	0	1	55,756
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	1.0%	1.7%	17.0%	46.0%	25.6%	6.6%	1.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
Southbound	27	158	700	1,190	4,704	26,655	19,788	2,177	143	6	5	1	2	0	3	0	2	55,561
Percent	0.0%	0.3%	1.3%	2.1%	8.5%	48.0%	35.6%	3.9%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
Total	28	176	986	1,760	5,645	36,120	45,413	16,469	3,824	711	143	26	9	1	3	0	3	111,317
Percent	0.0%	0.2%	0.9%	1.6%	5.1%	32.4%	40.8%	14.8%	3.4%	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%

Total Study Percentile Speed Summary			Total Study Speed Statistics		
Northbound			**Northbound**		
50th Percentile (Median)	38.3	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	38.4	mph
85th Percentile	42.9	mph	10 mph Pace	33.3 - 43.3	mph
95th Percentile	46.4	mph	Percent in Pace	75.6	%
Southbound			**Southbound**		
50th Percentile (Median)	34.2	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	33.8	mph
85th Percentile	37.5	mph	10 mph Pace	29.4 - 39.4	mph
95th Percentile	39.7	mph	Percent in Pace	84.2	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Monday, September 19, 2022
Northbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**29**
1:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**16**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**20**
3:00 AM	0	0	0	2	0	8	21	27	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	**71**
4:00 AM	0	0	0	3	0	2	36	93	37	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	**190**
5:00 AM	0	0	2	2	3	5	71	239	148	36	11	5	4	0	0	0	0	**526**
6:00 AM	0	0	1	2	4	15	180	343	100	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**661**
7:00 AM	0	0	1	5	5	23	257	272	101	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**673**
8:00 AM	0	0	4	7	9	42	237	194	32	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**533**
9:00 AM	0	0	6	9	2	51	215	127	20	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**435**
10:00 AM	0	0	2	6	6	65	176	94	28	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**379**
11:00 AM	0	3	5	3	8	75	187	76	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**372**
12:00 PM	0	0	4	7	5	82	198	55	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**359**
1:00 PM	0	0	4	9	6	106	238	43	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**413**
2:00 PM	0	1	3	3	4	95	220	73	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**412**
3:00 PM	0	1	1	6	16	119	273	76	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**506**
4:00 PM	0	1	2	1	22	115	228	76	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**454**
5:00 PM	0	0	3	4	5	84	223	77	12	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	**411**
6:00 PM	0	0	0	1	8	68	191	59	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**344**
7:00 PM	0	0	1	4	5	47	161	54	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**289**
8:00 PM	0	0	0	0	6	64	145	66	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**288**
9:00 PM	0	0	1	0	8	50	115	56	13	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**246**
10:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	26	120	66	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**232**
11:00 PM	0	0	0	3	2	9	34	24	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**80**
Total	**0**	**6**	**40**	**77**	**125**	**1,168**	**3,552**	**2,207**	**622**	**108**	**22**	**7**	**4**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7,939**
Percent	**0.0%**	**0.1%**	**0.5%**	**1.0%**	**1.6%**	**14.7%**	**44.7%**	**27.8%**	**7.8%**	**1.4%**	**0.3%**	**0.1%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	38.6	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	38.8	mph
85th Percentile	43.5	mph	10 mph Pace	33.9 - 43.9	mph
95th Percentile	46.9	mph	Percent in Pace	74.9	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Monday, September 19, 2022
Southbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	0	0	5	20	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**41**
1:00 AM	0	0	0	1	1	7	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**16**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	0	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**20**
3:00 AM	0	0	0	0	3	13	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**21**
4:00 AM	0	0	0	0	4	23	22	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**52**
5:00 AM	0	0	0	0	6	49	59	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**125**
6:00 AM	0	1	1	2	15	82	96	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**208**
7:00 AM	0	0	2	2	25	203	133	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**379**
8:00 AM	0	0	5	2	43	233	131	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**421**
9:00 AM	0	2	6	5	51	254	103	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	**428**
10:00 AM	2	1	5	5	50	272	123	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**465**
11:00 AM	0	0	4	11	35	248	140	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**450**
12:00 PM	0	1	6	7	28	259	180	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**499**
1:00 PM	0	4	15	13	39	259	172	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**526**
2:00 PM	1	1	10	25	37	385	328	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**810**
3:00 PM	1	2	15	40	48	301	350	37	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	**798**
4:00 PM	1	4	22	23	33	221	278	45	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**628**
5:00 PM	2	3	19	25	42	311	287	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**708**
6:00 PM	0	2	9	22	42	259	210	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**568**
7:00 PM	0	2	3	7	26	176	115	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**348**
8:00 PM	0	0	2	1	26	114	81	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**234**
9:00 PM	0	0	0	2	16	68	50	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**147**
10:00 PM	0	0	0	1	8	45	30	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**89**
11:00 PM	0	0	0	0	3	20	30	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**59**
Total	**7**	**23**	**124**	**194**	**591**	**3,829**	**2,950**	**301**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**8,040**
Percent	**0.1%**	**0.3%**	**1.5%**	**2.4%**	**7.4%**	**47.6%**	**36.7%**	**3.7%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	34.2	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	33.8	mph
85th Percentile	37.5	mph	10 mph Pace	29.4 - 39.4	mph
95th Percentile	39.5	mph	Percent in Pace	84.91	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

idax DATA SOLUTIONS

Tuesday, September 20, 2022
Northbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**30**
1:00 AM	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**20**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**18**
3:00 AM	0	0	0	2	0	1	20	29	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**60**
4:00 AM	0	0	0	2	1	3	32	114	50	19	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	**225**
5:00 AM	0	0	1	2	0	4	80	288	145	28	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	**553**
6:00 AM	0	0	4	8	6	37	189	335	132	22	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	**736**
7:00 AM	0	0	2	12	4	33	275	396	109	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	**847**
8:00 AM	0	0	4	9	12	46	340	292	37	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**742**
9:00 AM	0	0	0	3	6	36	244	149	39	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	**489**
10:00 AM	0	1	3	4	15	72	200	88	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**404**
11:00 AM	0	0	7	5	15	113	199	53	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**398**
12:00 PM	0	0	3	5	9	110	207	48	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**388**
1:00 PM	0	2	4	5	6	128	195	48	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**391**
2:00 PM	0	0	2	4	4	79	236	79	10	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**419**
3:00 PM	0	0	4	3	18	146	240	74	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**493**
4:00 PM	0	0	2	0	12	116	241	68	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**454**
5:00 PM	0	0	3	7	10	105	218	65	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**426**
6:00 PM	0	0	4	3	4	56	202	94	12	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**380**
7:00 PM	0	0	0	2	5	62	131	58	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**272**
8:00 PM	0	0	0	1	7	54	127	41	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**236**
9:00 PM	0	0	0	0	4	27	95	40	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**173**
10:00 PM	0	0	0	0	1	13	31	27	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**77**
11:00 PM	0	0	0	0	1	15	24	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**58**
Total	**0**	**3**	**43**	**77**	**141**	**1,271**	**3,552**	**2,417**	**646**	**110**	**26**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**8,289**
Percent	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.5%**	**0.9%**	**1.7%**	**15.3%**	**42.9%**	**29.2%**	**7.8%**	**1.3%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	38.8	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	38.8	mph
85th Percentile	43.6	mph	10 mph Pace	33.7 - 43.7	mph
95th Percentile	46.9	mph	Percent in Pace	73.4	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Tuesday, September 20, 2022
Southbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	2	0	0	3	17	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**37**
1:00 AM	0	0	0	1	3	11	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**25**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**16**
3:00 AM	0	0	0	2	4	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**26**
4:00 AM	0	0	2	2	8	22	29	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**67**
5:00 AM	0	0	0	1	14	44	50	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**115**
6:00 AM	0	1	2	3	22	132	95	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**262**
7:00 AM	1	1	7	9	44	276	155	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**502**
8:00 AM	0	4	10	11	57	189	120	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**402**
9:00 AM	0	0	3	2	43	207	105	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**374**
10:00 AM	0	0	4	5	29	201	109	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**356**
11:00 AM	0	5	17	15	61	184	130	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**427**
12:00 PM	1	1	4	5	66	211	147	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**455**
1:00 PM	0	0	7	4	34	271	170	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**506**
2:00 PM	2	1	10	10	47	373	259	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**730**
3:00 PM	0	6	11	26	33	351	298	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**748**
4:00 PM	0	8	7	12	58	216	264	35	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**601**
5:00 PM	0	2	14	12	43	266	266	45	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**649**
6:00 PM	0	3	3	2	14	253	236	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**537**
7:00 PM	0	0	8	7	17	177	126	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**351**
8:00 PM	0	0	2	4	35	126	80	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**264**
9:00 PM	0	0	0	2	21	77	58	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**168**
10:00 PM	0	0	1	2	5	33	31	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**80**
11:00 PM	0	0	0	2	5	27	31	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**70**
Total	**4**	**34**	**112**	**139**	**669**	**3,682**	**2,795**	**317**	**14**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7,768**
Percent	**0.1%**	**0.4%**	**1.4%**	**1.8%**	**8.6%**	**47.4%**	**36.0%**	**4.1%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	34.2	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	33.8	mph
85th Percentile	37.6	mph	10 mph Pace	29.3 - 39.3	mph
95th Percentile	39.7	mph	Percent in Pace	84.1	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Wednesday, September 21, 2022
Northbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	7	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**38**
1:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**27**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**20**
3:00 AM	0	0	1	2	1	4	21	20	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**62**
4:00 AM	0	0	0	1	0	4	24	93	69	25	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	**225**
5:00 AM	0	0	0	0	2	11	83	278	147	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**551**
6:00 AM	0	0	0	11	9	32	172	292	139	48	13	3	1	0	0	0	0	**720**
7:00 AM	0	0	0	2	10	14	142	312	195	68	18	7	1	0	0	0	0	**769**
8:00 AM	0	0	2	12	9	16	168	308	102	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**638**
9:00 AM	0	0	1	4	4	19	156	194	65	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**453**
10:00 AM	0	1	1	3	2	33	172	94	30	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**338**
11:00 AM	0	0	2	9	12	65	200	71	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**376**
12:00 PM	0	0	4	7	10	100	202	58	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**388**
1:00 PM	0	0	2	13	5	108	229	46	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**411**
2:00 PM	0	0	2	5	5	103	217	81	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**424**
3:00 PM	0	0	2	3	14	117	283	72	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**500**
4:00 PM	0	0	3	8	11	124	257	69	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**483**
5:00 PM	0	0	4	7	13	84	218	78	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**420**
6:00 PM	0	0	4	2	3	81	189	74	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**363**
7:00 PM	0	0	0	2	3	65	221	56	16	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**367**
8:00 PM	0	0	0	2	6	70	169	77	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**339**
9:00 PM	0	0	0	0	3	75	127	65	12	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**285**
10:00 PM	0	0	0	0	5	83	241	115	18	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	**467**
11:00 PM	0	0	0	0	1	25	45	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**94**
Total	**0**	**1**	**28**	**93**	**129**	**1,245**	**3,571**	**2,500**	**912**	**219**	**45**	**12**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8,758**
Percent	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.3%**	**1.1%**	**1.5%**	**14.2%**	**40.8%**	**28.5%**	**10.4%**	**2.5%**	**0.5%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	39.0	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	39.4	mph
85th Percentile	44.6	mph	10 mph Pace	34.0 - 44.0	mph
95th Percentile	48.4	mph	Percent in Pace	70.7	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Wednesday, September 21, 2022
Southbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	1	0	0	2	16	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**39**
1:00 AM	0	0	0	0	3	8	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**23**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	0	2	12	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**28**
3:00 AM	0	0	0	0	9	16	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**32**
4:00 AM	0	0	2	1	8	26	21	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**61**
5:00 AM	0	0	1	0	12	43	56	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**121**
6:00 AM	0	1	1	8	39	134	86	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**277**
7:00 AM	0	0	5	4	82	286	85	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**469**
8:00 AM	0	1	4	4	53	246	95	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**404**
9:00 AM	0	1	1	4	93	249	76	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**428**
10:00 AM	0	0	4	4	47	269	96	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**425**
11:00 AM	0	3	8	14	43	228	142	13	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**454**
12:00 PM	0	0	6	4	24	246	199	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**495**
1:00 PM	0	4	1	11	34	269	197	24	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**543**
2:00 PM	0	3	9	14	41	426	328	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**846**
3:00 PM	1	0	2	5	14	360	348	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**771**
4:00 PM	0	0	12	11	42	290	306	44	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**706**
5:00 PM	0	5	13	26	55	257	220	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**597**
6:00 PM	0	3	6	22	42	298	245	25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**642**
7:00 PM	0	1	5	7	28	228	179	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**469**
8:00 PM	0	1	6	10	32	139	71	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**264**
9:00 PM	0	0	3	2	21	93	79	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**208**
10:00 PM	0	0	0	1	13	46	49	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**117**
11:00 PM	0	0	0	1	8	30	19	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**66**
Total	**1**	**24**	**89**	**153**	**747**	**4,215**	**2,941**	**292**	**22**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8,485**
Percent	**0.0%**	**0.3%**	**1.0%**	**1.8%**	**8.8%**	**49.7%**	**34.7%**	**3.4%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	34.1	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	33.8	mph
85th Percentile	37.5	mph	10 mph Pace	29.6 - 39.6	mph
95th Percentile	39.6	mph	Percent in Pace	84.87	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

idax DATA SOLUTIONS

Thursday, September 22, 2022
Northbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	0	1	2	13	15	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**42**
1:00 AM	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**23**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**25**
3:00 AM	0	0	1	2	0	8	24	21	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**63**
4:00 AM	0	0	0	1	0	4	35	100	76	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**229**
5:00 AM	0	0	0	2	1	5	92	279	135	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**538**
6:00 AM	0	0	1	7	4	34	236	324	94	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**711**
7:00 AM	0	1	2	8	7	52	292	279	71	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	**723**
8:00 AM	0	0	5	2	6	55	294	224	30	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**618**
9:00 AM	0	0	3	13	6	87	227	94	20	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**453**
10:00 AM	0	1	5	2	5	79	222	51	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**374**
11:00 AM	0	1	4	4	16	120	212	37	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**395**
12:00 PM	0	0	2	6	8	65	198	59	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**343**
1:00 PM	0	0	3	11	11	77	193	68	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**373**
2:00 PM	0	0	3	8	12	134	252	60	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**474**
3:00 PM	0	0	1	5	9	148	302	80	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**563**
4:00 PM	0	0	6	6	20	135	258	91	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**525**
5:00 PM	0	0	2	5	9	97	259	115	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**502**
6:00 PM	0	0	2	2	4	62	185	77	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	**342**
7:00 PM	0	0	1	2	3	61	151	78	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**312**
8:00 PM	0	0	1	4	10	91	162	48	16	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	**335**
9:00 PM	0	0	0	0	5	70	178	51	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**313**
10:00 PM	0	0	0	0	7	63	122	66	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**274**
11:00 PM	0	0	0	0	4	14	40	22	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**88**
Total	**0**	**3**	**42**	**91**	**150**	**1,483**	**3,971**	**2,244**	**555**	**85**	**14**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8,638**
Percent	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.5%**	**1.1%**	**1.7%**	**17.2%**	**46.0%**	**26.0%**	**6.4%**	**1.0%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	38.1	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	38.3	mph
85th Percentile	42.8	mph	10 mph Pace	33.1 - 43.1	mph
95th Percentile	46.1	mph	Percent in Pace	76.5	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Thursday, September 22, 2022
Southbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	1	1	6	19	22	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**55**
1:00 AM	0	1	1	2	3	11	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**24**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	1	2	9	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**20**
3:00 AM	0	0	0	0	2	14	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**23**
4:00 AM	0	0	1	0	7	30	18	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**59**
5:00 AM	0	0	0	1	11	35	57	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**118**
6:00 AM	0	3	1	2	12	89	131	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**253**
7:00 AM	0	0	0	2	43	250	176	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**492**
8:00 AM	0	3	7	9	27	197	134	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**388**
9:00 AM	0	0	2	6	52	235	106	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**406**
10:00 AM	0	1	8	16	73	240	97	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**447**
11:00 AM	0	0	2	9	52	224	114	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**410**
12:00 PM	0	0	2	10	39	251	165	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**483**
1:00 PM	0	0	8	20	57	281	175	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**557**
2:00 PM	1	2	15	14	57	427	247	23	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**788**
3:00 PM	0	2	9	44	70	356	293	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**810**
4:00 PM	0	4	11	20	44	250	235	30	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**595**
5:00 PM	0	0	6	12	54	283	237	28	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**621**
6:00 PM	3	6	18	26	37	338	219	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**667**
7:00 PM	1	3	7	15	41	202	161	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**442**
8:00 PM	0	1	9	1	24	134	77	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**257**
9:00 PM	0	2	4	5	20	86	74	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**202**
10:00 PM	1	1	1	3	9	48	34	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**107**
11:00 PM	0	0	3	1	7	34	26	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**72**
Total	**6**	**29**	**116**	**220**	**749**	**4,043**	**2,816**	**297**	**19**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8,296**
Percent	**0.1%**	**0.3%**	**1.4%**	**2.7%**	**9.0%**	**48.7%**	**33.9%**	**3.6%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	34.0	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	33.6	mph
85th Percentile	37.4	mph	10 mph Pace	29.1 - 39.1	mph
95th Percentile	39.6	mph	Percent in Pace	83.59	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Friday, September 23, 2022
Northbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	0	0	2	9	20	15	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**49**
1:00 AM	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**25**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**29**
3:00 AM	0	0	2	3	0	13	24	15	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**62**
4:00 AM	0	0	0	1	0	5	57	90	37	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	**203**
5:00 AM	0	0	2	2	1	18	98	232	86	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	**452**
6:00 AM	0	0	3	11	7	32	249	223	53	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	**586**
7:00 AM	0	1	3	13	15	67	307	177	26	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**614**
8:00 AM	0	1	3	6	19	58	285	136	23	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**535**
9:00 AM	0	1	8	4	6	58	233	105	18	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**437**
10:00 AM	0	0	7	8	7	55	187	71	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**350**
11:00 AM	0	0	8	13	18	118	211	55	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**434**
12:00 PM	0	0	6	4	12	89	214	82	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**427**
1:00 PM	0	0	12	14	12	76	227	85	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**440**
2:00 PM	0	0	1	11	6	81	250	90	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**448**
3:00 PM	0	0	1	3	6	116	311	72	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**524**
4:00 PM	0	0	1	8	9	114	247	61	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**448**
5:00 PM	0	0	4	2	14	97	184	83	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**394**
6:00 PM	0	0	3	1	0	53	198	107	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**375**
7:00 PM	0	0	3	2	7	70	171	55	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**315**
8:00 PM	0	0	0	6	7	82	168	62	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**338**
9:00 PM	0	0	0	2	9	98	215	63	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**398**
10:00 PM	0	0	1	0	3	96	209	90	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**411**
11:00 PM	0	0	3	1	4	54	155	66	13	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	**300**
Total	**0**	**3**	**71**	**115**	**165**	**1,469**	**4,242**	**2,051**	**389**	**77**	**11**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8,594**
Percent	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.8%**	**1.3%**	**1.9%**	**17.1%**	**49.4%**	**23.9%**	**4.5%**	**0.9%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	37.9	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	37.9	mph
85th Percentile	42.2	mph	10 mph Pace	33.0 - 43.0	mph
95th Percentile	45.4	mph	Percent in Pace	78.7	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Friday, September 23, 2022
Southbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	0	0	6	16	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**42**
1:00 AM	0	0	1	1	2	13	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**31**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	1	2	10	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**29**
3:00 AM	0	0	0	2	5	7	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**27**
4:00 AM	0	0	0	0	4	22	22	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**52**
5:00 AM	0	1	1	1	1	37	55	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**99**
6:00 AM	0	0	2	5	12	101	107	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**245**
7:00 AM	0	2	5	8	53	241	120	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**440**
8:00 AM	0	2	8	12	48	217	81	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**374**
9:00 AM	0	0	4	1	69	253	99	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**437**
10:00 AM	2	0	6	15	48	251	154	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**486**
11:00 AM	0	0	7	15	45	243	141	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**464**
12:00 PM	0	1	4	8	53	253	180	21	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	**524**
1:00 PM	0	2	5	9	42	354	227	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**659**
2:00 PM	0	3	17	42	79	352	267	43	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**809**
3:00 PM	0	1	19	27	39	325	308	32	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**753**
4:00 PM	3	1	11	18	63	238	257	31	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**625**
5:00 PM	2	3	9	24	57	334	246	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**694**
6:00 PM	0	2	7	17	24	274	212	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**561**
7:00 PM	0	1	6	12	43	256	167	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**504**
8:00 PM	0	0	2	5	22	131	87	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**258**
9:00 PM	0	2	1	5	19	115	86	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**245**
10:00 PM	0	0	1	3	23	76	50	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**164**
11:00 PM	0	0	1	2	16	61	31	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**120**
Total	**7**	**21**	**117**	**233**	**775**	**4,180**	**2,941**	**338**	**21**	**4**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8,642**
Percent	**0.1%**	**0.2%**	**1.4%**	**2.7%**	**9.0%**	**48.4%**	**34.0%**	**3.9%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	34.0	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	33.7	mph
85th Percentile	37.5	mph	10 mph Pace	29.2 - 39.2	mph
95th Percentile	39.7	mph	Percent in Pace	83.18	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Saturday, September 24, 2022
Northbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	0	0	2	8	40	23	7	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	**87**
1:00 AM	0	0	0	1	1	8	19	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**40**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**29**
3:00 AM	0	0	2	0	0	2	18	13	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**41**
4:00 AM	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	19	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**42**
5:00 AM	0	0	0	0	1	10	24	34	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**74**
6:00 AM	0	0	0	1	1	16	57	43	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**128**
7:00 AM	0	0	0	1	0	13	47	66	19	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**149**
8:00 AM	0	0	2	2	0	12	116	98	16	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	**256**
9:00 AM	0	0	4	3	6	22	140	119	37	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**337**
10:00 AM	0	0	5	6	0	45	171	95	24	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**351**
11:00 AM	0	0	1	6	5	102	219	64	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**411**
12:00 PM	0	0	2	6	7	89	234	87	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**440**
1:00 PM	0	0	1	4	11	111	235	61	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**433**
2:00 PM	0	0	4	4	8	106	285	78	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**504**
3:00 PM	0	1	5	3	10	131	219	81	11	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**465**
4:00 PM	0	0	3	6	14	124	217	76	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**453**
5:00 PM	0	0	1	2	7	109	286	92	9	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**510**
6:00 PM	0	0	1	6	4	72	224	131	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**451**
7:00 PM	0	0	2	1	5	109	215	98	25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**456**
8:00 PM	0	0	0	0	8	159	191	56	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**426**
9:00 PM	0	0	1	1	7	131	253	74	15	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**491**
10:00 PM	0	0	2	4	13	133	238	83	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**492**
11:00 PM	0	0	1	2	4	67	147	41	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**268**
Total	**0**	**1**	**37**	**60**	**114**	**1,590**	**3,622**	**1,543**	**298**	**58**	**8**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7,334**
Percent	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.5%**	**0.8%**	**1.6%**	**21.7%**	**49.4%**	**21.0%**	**4.1%**	**0.8%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	37.6	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	37.7	mph
85th Percentile	41.7	mph	10 mph Pace	32.8 - 42.8	mph
95th Percentile	45.0	mph	Percent in Pace	79.9	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Saturday, September 24, 2022
Southbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	0	1	10	30	23	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**71**
1:00 AM	0	0	1	0	4	20	23	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**50**
2:00 AM	0	0	1	2	5	22	13	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**49**
3:00 AM	0	0	1	0	5	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**25**
4:00 AM	0	0	0	0	6	13	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**34**
5:00 AM	0	0	0	0	8	29	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**52**
6:00 AM	0	0	0	0	12	51	23	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**92**
7:00 AM	0	0	0	1	16	83	81	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**195**
8:00 AM	0	0	2	6	29	170	98	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**316**
9:00 AM	0	0	2	2	30	249	125	15	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**426**
10:00 AM	0	2	5	12	70	274	157	23	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**545**
11:00 AM	0	1	7	12	35	295	245	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**620**
12:00 PM	0	3	11	21	64	333	219	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**669**
1:00 PM	0	1	12	17	57	306	239	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**651**
2:00 PM	0	8	19	25	25	269	266	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**639**
3:00 PM	0	0	4	9	61	306	275	20	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**678**
4:00 PM	0	0	5	15	49	225	249	24	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**569**
5:00 PM	0	1	2	6	57	277	189	27	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**562**
6:00 PM	0	0	4	16	34	209	159	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**442**
7:00 PM	0	0	0	1	41	166	94	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**315**
8:00 PM	0	0	4	6	37	125	92	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**271**
9:00 PM	0	0	1	6	30	96	68	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**209**
10:00 PM	0	1	1	1	28	96	35	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**170**
11:00 PM	0	1	2	1	19	71	35	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**140**
Total	**0**	**18**	**84**	**160**	**732**	**3,726**	**2,745**	**300**	**25**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7,790**
Percent	**0.0%**	**0.2%**	**1.1%**	**2.1%**	**9.4%**	**47.8%**	**35.2%**	**3.9%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	34.1	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	33.8	mph
85th Percentile	37.5	mph	10 mph Pace	29.4 - 39.4	mph
95th Percentile	39.6	mph	Percent in Pace	84.06	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Sunday, September 25, 2022
Northbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	1	0	1	18	50	16	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**89**
1:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	9	25	11	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**51**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**35**
3:00 AM	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	13	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**34**
4:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	23	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**50**
5:00 AM	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	20	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**50**
6:00 AM	0	0	0	0	1	9	26	24	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**64**
7:00 AM	0	0	1	3	2	7	40	51	9	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**117**
8:00 AM	0	0	1	2	2	16	87	76	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**208**
9:00 AM	0	0	3	8	1	19	109	103	29	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	**279**
10:00 AM	0	0	3	3	1	21	143	95	27	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**296**
11:00 AM	0	0	2	4	7	50	191	91	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**357**
12:00 PM	0	0	1	5	7	79	197	67	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**367**
1:00 PM	0	0	3	3	6	100	239	65	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**425**
2:00 PM	0	0	2	5	12	81	202	59	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**371**
3:00 PM	0	0	1	7	9	87	205	89	19	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**420**
4:00 PM	1	0	3	2	6	108	219	71	15	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**428**
5:00 PM	0	0	1	4	7	102	219	81	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**425**
6:00 PM	0	1	2	2	5	60	236	91	22	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**423**
7:00 PM	0	0	1	3	4	92	217	60	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**386**
8:00 PM	0	0	0	0	8	105	185	67	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**377**
9:00 PM	0	0	0	0	19	118	208	60	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**416**
10:00 PM	0	0	0	2	11	112	199	60	13	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**402**
11:00 PM	0	0	0	3	6	26	61	31	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**134**
Total	**1**	**1**	**25**	**57**	**117**	**1,239**	**3,115**	**1,330**	**259**	**48**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6,204**
Percent	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.4%**	**0.9%**	**1.9%**	**20.0%**	**50.2%**	**21.4%**	**4.2%**	**0.8%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	37.6	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	37.7	mph
85th Percentile	41.8	mph	10 mph Pace	33.1 - 43.1	mph
95th Percentile	45.1	mph	Percent in Pace	79.7	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

idax DATA SOLUTIONS

Sunday, September 25, 2022
Southbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	3	2	8	50	32	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**101**
1:00 AM	0	0	1	1	3	16	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**41**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	0	4	15	20	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**44**
3:00 AM	0	0	0	0	6	9	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**27**
4:00 AM	0	0	0	2	3	9	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**24**
5:00 AM	0	0	1	0	6	22	11	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**43**
6:00 AM	0	0	0	0	9	30	23	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**64**
7:00 AM	0	0	0	1	9	51	50	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**127**
8:00 AM	0	0	0	0	11	102	75	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**197**
9:00 AM	0	1	3	7	19	178	139	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**356**
10:00 AM	0	1	2	6	23	201	182	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**432**
11:00 AM	2	0	10	11	39	258	171	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**507**
12:00 PM	0	2	3	2	40	260	238	36	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**584**
1:00 PM	0	2	8	8	29	266	254	28	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**596**
2:00 PM	0	0	5	5	21	309	251	29	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**621**
3:00 PM	0	0	6	13	29	230	227	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**524**
4:00 PM	0	0	4	13	31	229	221	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**523**
5:00 PM	0	1	6	10	22	194	196	30	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**462**
6:00 PM	0	0	2	5	28	155	206	36	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**437**
7:00 PM	0	1	2	2	18	135	90	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**266**
8:00 PM	0	0	1	1	33	96	70	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**213**
9:00 PM	0	1	1	2	29	92	53	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**182**
10:00 PM	0	0	0	0	10	47	31	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**98**
11:00 PM	0	0	0	0	11	26	24	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**71**
Total	**2**	**9**	**58**	**91**	**441**	**2,980**	**2,600**	**332**	**26**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6,540**
Percent	**0.0%**	**0.1%**	**0.9%**	**1.4%**	**6.7%**	**45.6%**	**39.8%**	**5.1%**	**0.4%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Daily Percentile Speed Summary			Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	34.6	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	34.4	mph
85th Percentile	37.9	mph	10 mph Pace	29.8 - 39.8	mph
95th Percentile	40.2	mph	Percent in Pace	85.47	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Total Study Average
Northbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	0	0	1	10	24	12	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**52**
1:00 AM	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**29**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**25**
3:00 AM	0	0	1	2	0	5	20	20	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**56**
4:00 AM	0	0	0	1	0	4	31	76	40	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	**166**
5:00 AM	0	0	1	1	1	8	66	196	96	18	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	**392**
6:00 AM	0	0	1	6	5	25	158	226	76	15	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	**516**
7:00 AM	0	0	1	6	6	30	194	222	76	15	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	**555**
8:00 AM	0	0	3	6	8	35	218	190	37	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**504**
9:00 AM	0	0	4	6	4	42	189	127	33	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**411**
10:00 AM	0	0	4	5	5	53	182	84	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**357**
11:00 AM	0	1	4	6	12	92	203	64	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**393**
12:00 PM	0	0	3	6	8	88	207	65	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**387**
1:00 PM	0	0	4	8	8	101	222	59	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**411**
2:00 PM	0	0	2	6	7	97	237	74	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**434**
3:00 PM	0	0	2	4	12	123	262	78	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**496**
4:00 PM	0	0	3	4	13	119	238	73	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**462**
5:00 PM	0	0	3	4	9	97	230	84	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**440**
6:00 PM	0	0	2	2	4	65	204	90	13	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**383**
7:00 PM	0	0	1	2	5	72	181	66	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**342**
8:00 PM	0	0	0	2	7	89	164	60	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**334**
9:00 PM	0	0	0	0	8	81	170	58	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**330**
10:00 PM	0	0	0	1	6	75	166	72	13	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	**337**
11:00 PM	0	0	1	1	3	30	72	31	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**145**
Total	**0**	**1**	**40**	**79**	**133**	**1,352**	**3,661**	**2,040**	**529**	**99**	**19**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7,957**
Percent	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.5%**	**1.0%**	**1.7%**	**17.0%**	**46.0%**	**25.6%**	**6.6%**	**1.2%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Note: Average only condsidered on days with 24-hours of data.

Total Study Percentile Speed Summary			Total Study Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	38.3	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	38.4	mph
85th Percentile	42.9	mph	10 mph Pace	33.3 - 43.3	mph
95th Percentile	46.4	mph	Percent in Pace	75.6	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Total Study Average
Southbound

Time	Speed Range (mph)																	Total Volume
	0 - 10	10 - 15	15 - 20	20 - 25	25 - 30	30 - 35	35 - 40	40 - 45	45 - 50	50 - 55	55 - 60	60 - 65	65 - 70	70 - 75	75 - 80	80 - 85	85 +	
12:00 AM	0	0	1	1	6	24	19	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**56**
1:00 AM	0	0	1	1	3	12	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**30**
2:00 AM	0	0	0	1	3	12	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**29**
3:00 AM	0	0	0	1	5	12	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**27**
4:00 AM	0	0	1	1	6	21	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**50**
5:00 AM	0	0	0	0	8	37	43	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**94**
6:00 AM	0	1	1	3	17	88	80	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**200**
7:00 AM	0	0	3	4	39	199	114	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**372**
8:00 AM	0	1	5	6	38	193	105	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**356**
9:00 AM	0	1	3	4	51	232	108	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**409**
10:00 AM	1	1	5	9	49	244	131	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**452**
11:00 AM	0	1	8	12	44	240	155	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**475**
12:00 PM	0	1	5	8	45	259	190	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**529**
1:00 PM	0	2	8	12	42	287	205	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**578**
2:00 PM	1	3	12	19	44	363	278	28	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**749**
3:00 PM	0	2	9	23	42	318	300	29	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**724**
4:00 PM	1	2	10	16	46	238	259	33	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**606**
5:00 PM	1	2	10	16	47	275	234	27	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**614**
6:00 PM	0	2	7	16	32	255	212	25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**550**
7:00 PM	0	1	4	7	31	191	133	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**384**
8:00 PM	0	0	4	4	30	124	80	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**252**
9:00 PM	0	1	1	3	22	90	67	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**194**
10:00 PM	0	0	1	2	14	56	37	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**119**
11:00 PM	0	0	1	1	10	38	28	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**85**
Total	**4**	**21**	**100**	**170**	**674**	**3,808**	**2,827**	**312**	**18**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7,934**
Percent	**0.1%**	**0.3%**	**1.3%**	**2.1%**	**8.5%**	**48.0%**	**35.6%**	**3.9%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Note: Average only condsidered on days with 24-hours of data.

Total Study Percentile Speed Summary			Total Study Speed Statistics		
50th Percentile (Median)	34.2	mph	Mean (Average) Speed	33.8	mph
85th Percentile	37.5	mph	10 mph Pace	29.4 - 39.4	mph
95th Percentile	39.7	mph	Percent in Pace	84.2	%

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Appendix C: Vehicle Classifications

Vehicle Classification Report Summary

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E

Count Direction: Northbound / Southbound

Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022

Site Code: 01

	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Volume
Study Total														
Northbound	239	34,238	13,947	101	6,466	152	0	99	178	139	14	9	174	55,756
Percent	0.4%	61.4%	25.0%	0.2%	11.6%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	100%
Southbound	240	42,236	8,211	60	4,313	170	0	38	155	48	0	1	89	55,561
Percent	0.4%	76.0%	14.8%	0.1%	7.8%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	100%
Total	479	76,474	22,158	161	10,779	322	0	137	333	187	14	10	263	111,317
Percent	0.4%	68.7%	19.9%	0.1%	9.7%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	100%

FHWA Vehicle Classification	
Class 1 - Motorcycles	Class 8 - Four or Fewer Axle Single-Trailer Trucks
Class 2 - Passenger Cars	Class 9 - Five-Axle Single-Trailer Trucks
Class 3 - Other Two-Axle, Four-Tire Single Unit Vehicles	Class 10 - Six or More Axle Single-Trailer Trucks
Class 4 - Buses	Class 11 - Five or fewer Axle Multi-Trailer Trucks
Class 5 - Two-Axle, Six-Tire, Single-Unit Trucks	Class 12 - Six-Axle Multi-Trailer Trucks
Class 6 - Three-Axle Single-Unit Trucks	Class 13 - Seven or More Axle Multi-Trailer Trucks
Class 7 - Four or More Axle Single-Unit Trucks	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Monday, September 19, 2022
Northbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	1	21	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**29**
1:00 AM	0	12	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**16**
2:00 AM	0	13	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**20**
3:00 AM	2	39	17	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**71**
4:00 AM	0	60	88	1	38	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	**190**
5:00 AM	0	129	250	0	142	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	**526**
6:00 AM	1	235	284	3	128	3	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	**661**
7:00 AM	0	282	261	2	114	1	0	4	4	3	0	0	2	**673**
8:00 AM	0	265	177	2	84	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	**533**
9:00 AM	1	227	137	2	64	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	**435**
10:00 AM	3	192	117	0	60	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	**379**
11:00 AM	1	246	68	0	49	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	4	**372**
12:00 PM	1	245	70	0	32	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	6	**359**
1:00 PM	3	282	74	2	46	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	**413**
2:00 PM	2	310	61	0	36	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	**412**
3:00 PM	1	389	66	2	39	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	4	**506**
4:00 PM	2	326	77	0	41	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	1	**454**
5:00 PM	0	297	81	1	29	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	**411**
6:00 PM	1	268	54	0	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**344**
7:00 PM	0	196	60	0	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	**289**
8:00 PM	4	189	63	0	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	**288**
9:00 PM	0	162	63	0	18	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**246**
10:00 PM	0	126	85	0	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	**232**
11:00 PM	1	41	32	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**80**
Total	**24**	**4,552**	**2,197**	**15**	**1,042**	**13**	**0**	**17**	**31**	**19**	**2**	**0**	**27**	**7,939**
Percent	**0.3%**	**57.3%**	**27.7%**	**0.2%**	**13.1%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.2%**	**0.4%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.3%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Monday, September 19, 2022
Southbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	1	29	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**41**
1:00 AM	0	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**16**
2:00 AM	0	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	**20**
3:00 AM	0	15	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**21**
4:00 AM	0	38	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**52**
5:00 AM	1	85	13	0	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**125**
6:00 AM	0	151	34	0	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	**208**
7:00 AM	1	289	69	0	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**379**
8:00 AM	1	309	73	0	31	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	**421**
9:00 AM	1	329	61	0	29	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	**428**
10:00 AM	0	341	71	0	45	1	0	2	2	2	0	0	1	**465**
11:00 AM	2	307	88	0	43	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	**450**
12:00 PM	2	347	88	0	52	5	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	**499**
1:00 PM	1	381	75	3	64	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**526**
2:00 PM	3	611	123	0	65	2	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	**810**
3:00 PM	4	609	109	0	70	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	**798**
4:00 PM	2	475	94	1	53	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	**628**
5:00 PM	4	532	88	0	81	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**708**
6:00 PM	1	435	82	0	44	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	**568**
7:00 PM	2	283	42	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**348**
8:00 PM	1	196	25	1	9	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	**234**
9:00 PM	0	117	20	0	5	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	**147**
10:00 PM	0	77	8	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**89**
11:00 PM	0	48	8	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**59**
Total	**27**	**6,034**	**1,195**	**5**	**694**	**31**	**0**	**12**	**19**	**12**	**0**	**1**	**10**	**8,040**
Percent	**0.3%**	**75.0%**	**14.9%**	**0.1%**	**8.6%**	**0.4%**	**0.0%**	**0.1%**	**0.2%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.1%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

idax DATA SOLUTIONS

Tuesday, September 20, 2022
Northbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	0	16	9	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**30**
1:00 AM	0	10	3	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**20**
2:00 AM	0	11	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**18**
3:00 AM	0	26	22	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**60**
4:00 AM	1	67	104	7	44	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**225**
5:00 AM	0	138	280	2	123	1	0	5	1	2	0	0	1	**553**
6:00 AM	5	280	285	2	146	9	0	1	3	2	0	1	2	**736**
7:00 AM	1	391	310	3	128	5	0	0	1	5	0	0	3	**847**
8:00 AM	7	364	242	3	96	4	0	4	5	8	1	2	6	**742**
9:00 AM	1	210	182	4	81	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	3	**489**
10:00 AM	1	260	75	0	53	7	0	1	3	0	0	0	4	**404**
11:00 AM	3	252	84	1	46	4	0	1	4	0	0	0	3	**398**
12:00 PM	2	261	72	1	45	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	**388**
1:00 PM	4	258	78	1	42	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	3	**391**
2:00 PM	2	289	90	0	31	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	2	**419**
3:00 PM	3	364	79	1	39	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	**493**
4:00 PM	0	344	63	0	45	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**454**
5:00 PM	0	302	88	0	33	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	**426**
6:00 PM	0	290	54	0	34	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**380**
7:00 PM	2	167	66	0	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**272**
8:00 PM	0	150	60	0	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**236**
9:00 PM	4	115	43	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**173**
10:00 PM	2	57	13	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**77**
11:00 PM	0	35	19	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**58**
Total	**38**	**4,657**	**2,324**	**30**	**1,087**	**39**	**0**	**21**	**29**	**23**	**2**	**3**	**36**	**8,289**
Percent	**0.5%**	**56.2%**	**28.0%**	**0.4%**	**13.1%**	**0.5%**	**0.0%**	**0.3%**	**0.3%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.4%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Tuesday, September 20, 2022
Southbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	0	28	4	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**37**
1:00 AM	0	18	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**25**
2:00 AM	0	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**16**
3:00 AM	0	17	2	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**26**
4:00 AM	1	47	9	0	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**67**
5:00 AM	2	75	22	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**115**
6:00 AM	3	192	41	0	23	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	**262**
7:00 AM	1	385	79	0	32	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	**502**
8:00 AM	1	286	74	0	33	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	**402**
9:00 AM	1	271	61	2	32	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	**374**
10:00 AM	1	243	63	2	36	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	4	**356**
11:00 AM	2	320	68	0	34	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	**427**
12:00 PM	6	312	85	2	45	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	**455**
1:00 PM	2	362	89	1	44	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	4	**506**
2:00 PM	3	526	112	1	82	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**730**
3:00 PM	7	516	138	2	77	5	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	**748**
4:00 PM	1	444	87	2	64	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	**601**
5:00 PM	5	480	87	0	75	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	**649**
6:00 PM	3	417	72	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**537**
7:00 PM	2	275	49	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**351**
8:00 PM	2	209	39	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**264**
9:00 PM	0	139	21	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**168**
10:00 PM	0	71	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**80**
11:00 PM	1	57	8	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**70**
Total	**44**	**5,704**	**1,222**	**14**	**706**	**22**	**0**	**8**	**25**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**21**	**7,768**
Percent	**0.6%**	**73.4%**	**15.7%**	**0.2%**	**9.1%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.1%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.3%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Wednesday, September 21, 2022
Northbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	0	26	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**38**
1:00 AM	0	17	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**27**
2:00 AM	0	9	8	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**20**
3:00 AM	1	41	14	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**62**
4:00 AM	0	57	117	0	47	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	**225**
5:00 AM	2	137	254	2	146	2	0	1	4	2	0	0	1	**551**
6:00 AM	2	237	296	7	165	4	0	2	2	3	1	0	1	**720**
7:00 AM	5	196	378	0	165	4	0	8	4	5	1	0	3	**769**
8:00 AM	0	189	317	1	108	1	0	6	5	3	1	0	7	**638**
9:00 AM	4	156	195	1	86	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	5	**453**
10:00 AM	0	170	107	1	52	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	1	**338**
11:00 AM	1	253	78	1	37	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	**376**
12:00 PM	2	268	73	0	40	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	**388**
1:00 PM	1	293	63	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	**411**
2:00 PM	4	307	81	0	27	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	**424**
3:00 PM	3	368	83	0	40	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	**500**
4:00 PM	5	353	74	0	47	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	**483**
5:00 PM	2	319	64	0	32	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	**420**
6:00 PM	1	263	63	0	32	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	**363**
7:00 PM	2	250	74	0	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	**367**
8:00 PM	4	218	80	0	34	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	**339**
9:00 PM	0	188	73	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**285**
10:00 PM	2	294	153	0	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**467**
11:00 PM	0	66	22	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**94**
Total	**41**	**4,675**	**2,682**	**14**	**1,208**	**22**	**0**	**26**	**26**	**26**	**5**	**0**	**33**	**8,758**
Percent	**0.5%**	**53.4%**	**30.6%**	**0.2%**	**13.8%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.3%**	**0.3%**	**0.3%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.4%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Wednesday, September 21, 2022
Southbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	0	32	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**39**
1:00 AM	0	19	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**23**
2:00 AM	0	26	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**28**
3:00 AM	1	23	1	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**32**
4:00 AM	1	44	7	0	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	**61**
5:00 AM	1	88	19	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**121**
6:00 AM	2	214	40	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**277**
7:00 AM	0	350	83	0	26	2	0	1	2	1	0	0	4	**469**
8:00 AM	0	304	61	0	32	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	2	**404**
9:00 AM	3	315	68	0	33	3	0	0	3	1	0	0	2	**428**
10:00 AM	1	339	52	1	23	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	**425**
11:00 AM	2	346	65	1	30	4	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	**454**
12:00 PM	1	367	81	0	41	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	**495**
1:00 PM	2	396	81	2	51	1	0	1	5	2	0	0	2	**543**
2:00 PM	4	612	138	2	82	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	**846**
3:00 PM	3	580	106	0	78	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	**771**
4:00 PM	1	545	95	1	61	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**706**
5:00 PM	3	442	97	1	52	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**597**
6:00 PM	2	491	94	0	50	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	**642**
7:00 PM	6	367	66	0	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**469**
8:00 PM	2	204	42	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**264**
9:00 PM	2	168	24	0	10	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**208**
10:00 PM	0	105	8	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**117**
11:00 PM	0	54	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**66**
Total	**37**	**6,431**	**1,248**	**8**	**663**	**27**	**0**	**8**	**32**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**22**	**8,485**
Percent	**0.4%**	**75.8%**	**14.7%**	**0.1%**	**7.8%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.1%**	**0.4%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.3%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Thursday, September 22, 2022
Northbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	1	29	9	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**42**
1:00 AM	0	17	1	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**23**
2:00 AM	2	13	6	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**25**
3:00 AM	0	40	12	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**63**
4:00 AM	1	88	87	0	51	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**229**
5:00 AM	1	168	222	0	141	1	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	**538**
6:00 AM	5	322	235	5	131	2	0	1	4	5	0	0	1	**711**
7:00 AM	3	352	237	8	111	1	0	1	4	4	0	0	2	**723**
8:00 AM	3	332	166	2	105	1	0	1	1	4	0	0	3	**618**
9:00 AM	2	250	118	4	65	3	0	2	3	2	0	0	4	**453**
10:00 AM	3	222	78	2	56	5	0	0	4	1	0	1	2	**374**
11:00 AM	0	263	78	0	41	3	0	2	6	0	0	1	1	**395**
12:00 PM	0	247	55	1	35	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	**343**
1:00 PM	0	271	58	0	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	**373**
2:00 PM	1	334	97	0	32	3	0	1	2	3	0	0	1	**474**
3:00 PM	3	413	97	0	42	2	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	**563**
4:00 PM	2	387	85	0	45	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	**525**
5:00 PM	6	373	84	0	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**502**
6:00 PM	0	253	63	0	19	2	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	**342**
7:00 PM	2	205	67	0	35	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	**312**
8:00 PM	0	225	74	0	34	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**335**
9:00 PM	0	222	65	0	25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**313**
10:00 PM	1	191	67	1	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**274**
11:00 PM	1	58	21	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**88**
Total	**37**	**5,275**	**2,082**	**25**	**1,086**	**28**	**0**	**13**	**36**	**30**	**1**	**4**	**21**	**8,638**
Percent	**0.4%**	**61.1%**	**24.1%**	**0.3%**	**12.6%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.2%**	**0.4%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.2%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Thursday, September 22, 2022
Southbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	2	40	7	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**55**
1:00 AM	0	15	4	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	**24**
2:00 AM	0	14	2	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**20**
3:00 AM	0	17	3	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**23**
4:00 AM	1	44	6	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**59**
5:00 AM	1	78	15	1	19	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	**118**
6:00 AM	1	190	39	0	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**253**
7:00 AM	1	367	83	0	34	1	0	0	3	2	0	0	1	**492**
8:00 AM	0	274	75	0	31	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**388**
9:00 AM	3	285	75	1	35	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	**406**
10:00 AM	2	317	74	1	45	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	**447**
11:00 AM	2	297	59	0	42	7	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	**410**
12:00 PM	1	356	65	0	52	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	**483**
1:00 PM	6	402	93	1	48	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	**557**
2:00 PM	6	575	121	0	76	4	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	**788**
3:00 PM	3	589	143	0	65	5	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	**810**
4:00 PM	0	445	93	1	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**595**
5:00 PM	3	479	83	0	54	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**621**
6:00 PM	2	511	106	0	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**667**
7:00 PM	1	353	57	0	30	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**442**
8:00 PM	2	205	40	0	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**257**
9:00 PM	1	165	22	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	**202**
10:00 PM	2	95	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**107**
11:00 PM	0	60	8	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	**72**
Total	**40**	**6,173**	**1,281**	**5**	**697**	**36**	**0**	**5**	**34**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**13**	**8,296**
Percent	**0.5%**	**74.4%**	**15.4%**	**0.1%**	**8.4%**	**0.4%**	**0.0%**	**0.1%**	**0.4%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.2%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

Friday, September 23, 2022
Northbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	1	31	14	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**49**
1:00 AM	1	17	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**25**
2:00 AM	0	21	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**29**
3:00 AM	0	39	11	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**62**
4:00 AM	3	84	65	4	45	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**203**
5:00 AM	1	181	155	4	107	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	**452**
6:00 AM	4	297	162	3	100	3	0	3	5	5	0	0	4	**586**
7:00 AM	5	363	157	3	73	3	0	0	0	5	0	0	5	**614**
8:00 AM	1	314	123	0	87	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	4	**535**
9:00 AM	3	236	121	1	70	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**437**
10:00 AM	2	211	77	1	49	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	**350**
11:00 AM	0	297	65	1	55	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	8	**434**
12:00 PM	1	278	82	0	54	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	4	**427**
1:00 PM	4	305	72	0	41	4	0	1	4	4	1	0	4	**440**
2:00 PM	1	317	74	0	49	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	4	**448**
3:00 PM	4	405	76	0	36	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	**524**
4:00 PM	2	348	64	0	30	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	**448**
5:00 PM	2	299	63	0	27	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	**394**
6:00 PM	2	265	72	0	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	**375**
7:00 PM	0	214	69	0	29	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	**315**
8:00 PM	2	230	77	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**338**
9:00 PM	0	278	91	0	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	**398**
10:00 PM	1	275	111	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**411**
11:00 PM	0	201	80	0	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**300**
Total	**40**	**5,506**	**1,891**	**17**	**1,004**	**26**	**0**	**12**	**30**	**26**	**1**	**1**	**40**	**8,594**
Percent	**0.5%**	**64.1%**	**22.0%**	**0.2%**	**11.7%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.1%**	**0.3%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.5%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Friday, September 23, 2022
Southbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	0	34	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**42**
1:00 AM	0	25	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**31**
2:00 AM	0	22	4	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**29**
3:00 AM	1	19	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**27**
4:00 AM	0	38	6	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**52**
5:00 AM	0	72	16	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**99**
6:00 AM	3	186	35	1	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	**245**
7:00 AM	0	313	89	0	30	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	**440**
8:00 AM	2	275	55	5	28	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	**374**
9:00 AM	1	308	77	0	38	6	0	0	4	1	0	0	2	**437**
10:00 AM	2	361	62	4	47	5	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	**486**
11:00 AM	0	309	85	1	60	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	**464**
12:00 PM	1	378	84	5	48	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	**524**
1:00 PM	1	465	114	3	66	5	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	**659**
2:00 PM	5	591	110	3	84	11	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	**809**
3:00 PM	4	557	117	1	72	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**753**
4:00 PM	5	490	79	1	44	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	**625**
5:00 PM	2	526	96	1	68	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**694**
6:00 PM	0	454	69	0	36	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**561**
7:00 PM	2	398	74	0	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**504**
8:00 PM	0	213	32	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**258**
9:00 PM	2	199	31	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**245**
10:00 PM	0	136	19	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	**164**
11:00 PM	0	104	13	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**120**
Total	**31**	**6,473**	**1,282**	**26**	**723**	**45**	**0**	**3**	**27**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**22**	**8,642**
Percent	**0.4%**	**74.9%**	**14.8%**	**0.3%**	**8.4%**	**0.5%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.3%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.3%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Saturday, September 24, 2022
Northbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	1	42	39	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**87**
1:00 AM	0	26	9	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**40**
2:00 AM	0	16	7	0	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**29**
3:00 AM	0	26	11	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**41**
4:00 AM	0	21	11	0	7	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**42**
5:00 AM	0	45	15	0	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**74**
6:00 AM	0	59	41	0	23	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	**128**
7:00 AM	0	60	57	0	28	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	**149**
8:00 AM	0	132	83	0	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**256**
9:00 AM	4	185	101	0	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	**337**
10:00 AM	1	233	82	0	32	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	**351**
11:00 AM	1	275	82	0	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	**411**
12:00 PM	1	328	71	0	35	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	**440**
1:00 PM	4	328	70	0	26	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	**433**
2:00 PM	5	391	72	0	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**504**
3:00 PM	2	373	64	0	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	**465**
4:00 PM	4	357	59	0	28	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	**453**
5:00 PM	1	377	92	0	33	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	**510**
6:00 PM	2	325	98	0	21	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	**451**
7:00 PM	2	331	88	0	31	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	**456**
8:00 PM	0	316	86	0	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**426**
9:00 PM	3	353	107	0	25	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	**491**
10:00 PM	1	364	104	0	21	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	**492**
11:00 PM	2	199	57	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**268**
Total	**34**	**5,162**	**1,506**	**0**	**560**	**18**	**0**	**6**	**17**	**13**	**3**	**0**	**15**	**7,334**
Percent	**0.5%**	**70.4%**	**20.5%**	**0.0%**	**7.6%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.1%**	**0.2%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.2%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Saturday, September 24, 2022
Southbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	0	62	6	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**71**
1:00 AM	0	41	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**50**
2:00 AM	0	42	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**49**
3:00 AM	0	17	4	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**25**
4:00 AM	0	26	3	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**34**
5:00 AM	0	40	5	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**52**
6:00 AM	0	66	17	0	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**92**
7:00 AM	0	157	25	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**195**
8:00 AM	0	235	55	0	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**316**
9:00 AM	2	339	62	0	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**426**
10:00 AM	3	445	77	0	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**545**
11:00 AM	2	499	76	0	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**620**
12:00 PM	3	502	110	0	53	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**669**
1:00 PM	2	516	94	0	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**651**
2:00 PM	4	502	102	1	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	**639**
3:00 PM	4	546	85	0	42	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**678**
4:00 PM	3	460	77	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**569**
5:00 PM	3	470	55	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**562**
6:00 PM	0	346	73	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**442**
7:00 PM	2	260	40	0	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**315**
8:00 PM	2	215	40	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**271**
9:00 PM	0	170	25	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**209**
10:00 PM	2	136	23	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**170**
11:00 PM	0	117	16	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**140**
Total	**32**	**6,209**	**1,082**	**1**	**448**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**12**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**7,790**
Percent	**0.4%**	**79.7%**	**13.9%**	**0.0%**	**5.8%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Sunday, September 25, 2022
Northbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	1	54	29	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**89**
1:00 AM	0	30	16	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**51**
2:00 AM	0	24	7	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**35**
3:00 AM	0	17	12	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**34**
4:00 AM	0	33	10	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**50**
5:00 AM	0	29	18	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**50**
6:00 AM	0	35	21	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**64**
7:00 AM	2	60	40	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**117**
8:00 AM	1	126	54	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**208**
9:00 AM	2	134	109	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**279**
10:00 AM	0	165	83	0	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**296**
11:00 AM	1	245	75	0	33	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**357**
12:00 PM	1	267	72	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	**367**
1:00 PM	2	322	69	0	31	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**425**
2:00 PM	3	288	56	0	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**371**
3:00 PM	5	329	59	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**420**
4:00 PM	1	336	60	0	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	**428**
5:00 PM	2	324	70	0	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**425**
6:00 PM	3	326	73	0	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**423**
7:00 PM	0	270	82	0	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**386**
8:00 PM	0	280	69	0	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**377**
9:00 PM	1	332	67	0	13	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	**416**
10:00 PM	0	299	80	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**402**
11:00 PM	0	86	34	0	10	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	**134**
Total	**25**	**4,411**	**1,265**	**0**	**479**	**6**	**0**	**4**	**9**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**6,204**
Percent	**0.4%**	**71.1%**	**20.4%**	**0.0%**	**7.7%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.1%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Sunday, September 25, 2022
Southbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	1	87	10	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**101**
1:00 AM	0	35	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**41**
2:00 AM	0	41	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**44**
3:00 AM	0	19	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**27**
4:00 AM	0	19	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**24**
5:00 AM	0	30	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**43**
6:00 AM	0	43	16	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**64**
7:00 AM	0	104	17	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**127**
8:00 AM	0	151	35	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**197**
9:00 AM	1	297	42	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**356**
10:00 AM	1	345	67	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**432**
11:00 AM	1	398	77	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**507**
12:00 PM	0	462	89	0	31	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**584**
1:00 PM	1	467	87	1	37	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	**596**
2:00 PM	1	493	91	0	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**621**
3:00 PM	2	397	88	0	35	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**524**
4:00 PM	5	402	65	0	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**523**
5:00 PM	3	369	57	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**462**
6:00 PM	6	355	50	0	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**437**
7:00 PM	6	207	37	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**266**
8:00 PM	0	184	20	0	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**213**
9:00 PM	1	159	16	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**182**
10:00 PM	0	90	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**98**
11:00 PM	0	58	8	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**71**
Total	**29**	**5,212**	**901**	**1**	**382**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6,540**
Percent	**0.4%**	**79.7%**	**13.8%**	**0.0%**	**5.8%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Total Study Average
Northbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	1	31	16	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**51**
1:00 AM	0	18	6	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**28**
2:00 AM	0	15	6	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**24**
3:00 AM	0	33	14	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**55**
4:00 AM	1	59	69	2	34	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**167**
5:00 AM	1	118	171	1	96	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	**392**
6:00 AM	2	209	189	3	100	3	0	2	3	3	0	0	1	**515**
7:00 AM	2	243	206	2	91	2	0	2	2	3	0	0	2	**555**
8:00 AM	2	246	166	1	78	1	0	2	2	3	0	0	3	**504**
9:00 AM	2	200	138	2	63	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	**412**
10:00 AM	1	208	88	1	50	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	**355**
11:00 AM	1	262	76	0	44	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	3	**392**
12:00 PM	1	271	71	0	38	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	**387**
1:00 PM	3	294	69	0	39	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	**412**
2:00 PM	3	319	76	0	33	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	**435**
3:00 PM	3	377	75	0	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	**494**
4:00 PM	2	350	69	0	38	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	**464**
5:00 PM	2	327	77	0	31	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	**440**
6:00 PM	1	284	68	0	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**381**
7:00 PM	1	233	72	0	33	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**341**
8:00 PM	1	230	73	0	29	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**334**
9:00 PM	1	236	73	0	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**331**
10:00 PM	1	229	88	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**336**
11:00 PM	1	98	38	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**146**
Total	**33**	**4,890**	**1,994**	**12**	**921**	**20**	**0**	**13**	**25**	**18**	**1**	**0**	**24**	**7,951**
Percent	**0.4%**	**61.5%**	**25.1%**	**0.2%**	**11.6%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.2%**	**0.3%**	**0.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.3%**	

Note: Average only condsidered on days with 24-hours of data.

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

Total Study Average
Southbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	1	45	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**56**
1:00 AM	0	24	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**30**
2:00 AM	0	25	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**30**
3:00 AM	0	18	3	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**26**
4:00 AM	0	37	6	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**50**
5:00 AM	1	67	14	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**96**
6:00 AM	1	149	32	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**199**
7:00 AM	0	281	64	0	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	**372**
8:00 AM	1	262	61	1	27	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	**358**
9:00 AM	2	306	64	0	29	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	**408**
10:00 AM	1	342	67	1	33	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	**451**
11:00 AM	2	354	74	0	40	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	**476**
12:00 PM	2	389	86	1	46	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	**530**
1:00 PM	2	427	90	2	50	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	**578**
2:00 PM	4	559	114	1	65	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	**750**
3:00 PM	4	542	112	0	63	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**726**
4:00 PM	2	466	84	1	51	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**606**
5:00 PM	3	471	80	0	57	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**612**
6:00 PM	2	430	78	0	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**549**
7:00 PM	3	306	52	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**384**
8:00 PM	1	204	34	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**250**
9:00 PM	1	160	23	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**194**
10:00 PM	1	101	11	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**117**
11:00 PM	0	71	10	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**85**
Total	**34**	**6,036**	**1,173**	**7**	**617**	**24**	**0**	**4**	**21**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**12**	**7,933**
Percent	**0.4%**	**76.1%**	**14.8%**	**0.1%**	**7.8%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.1%**	**0.3%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.2%**	

Note: Average only condsidered on days with 24-hours of data.

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

3-Day (Tuesday - Thursday) Average
Northbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	0	24	9	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**36**
1:00 AM	0	15	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**24**
2:00 AM	1	11	6	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**21**
3:00 AM	0	36	16	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**61**
4:00 AM	1	71	103	2	47	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**226**
5:00 AM	1	148	252	1	137	1	0	2	3	2	0	0	1	**548**
6:00 AM	4	280	272	5	147	5	0	1	3	3	0	0	1	**721**
7:00 AM	3	313	308	4	135	3	0	3	3	5	0	0	3	**780**
8:00 AM	3	295	242	2	103	2	0	4	4	5	1	1	5	**667**
9:00 AM	2	205	165	3	77	1	0	2	3	2	0	0	4	**464**
10:00 AM	1	217	87	1	54	4	0	1	3	1	0	0	2	**371**
11:00 AM	1	256	80	1	41	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	2	**389**
12:00 PM	1	259	67	1	40	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	**374**
1:00 PM	2	274	66	0	44	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	**391**
2:00 PM	2	310	89	0	30	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	**437**
3:00 PM	3	382	86	0	40	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	3	**518**
4:00 PM	2	361	74	0	46	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**486**
5:00 PM	3	331	79	0	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**448**
6:00 PM	0	269	60	0	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**360**
7:00 PM	2	207	69	0	37	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**317**
8:00 PM	1	198	71	0	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**304**
9:00 PM	1	175	60	0	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**257**
10:00 PM	2	181	78	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**273**
11:00 PM	0	53	21	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**80**
Total	**36**	**4,871**	**2,363**	**23**	**1,127**	**28**	**0**	**18**	**30**	**25**	**2**	**1**	**29**	**8,553**
Percent	**0.4%**	**57.0%**	**27.6%**	**0.3%**	**13.2%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.2%**	**0.4%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.3%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Location: Meridian Ave E S-O 36th St E
Date Range: 9/19/2022 to 9/25/2022
Site Code: 01

DATA SOLUTIONS

3-Day (Tuesday - Thursday) Average
Southbound

Time	FHWA Vehicle Classification													Total Volume
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
12:00 AM	1	33	6	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**44**
1:00 AM	0	17	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**23**
2:00 AM	0	18	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**21**
3:00 AM	0	19	2	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**27**
4:00 AM	1	45	7	0	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**62**
5:00 AM	1	80	19	1	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	**118**
6:00 AM	2	199	40	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**263**
7:00 AM	1	367	82	0	31	1	0	1	3	1	0	0	2	**489**
8:00 AM	0	288	70	0	32	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	**398**
9:00 AM	2	290	68	1	33	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	**402**
10:00 AM	1	300	63	1	35	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	**409**
11:00 AM	2	321	64	0	35	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	**429**
12:00 PM	3	345	77	1	46	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	**479**
1:00 PM	3	387	88	1	48	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	3	**535**
2:00 PM	4	571	124	1	80	4	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	**788**
3:00 PM	4	562	129	1	73	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	**776**
4:00 PM	1	478	92	1	60	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**634**
5:00 PM	4	467	89	0	60	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**621**
6:00 PM	2	473	91	0	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**615**
7:00 PM	3	332	57	0	28	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**421**
8:00 PM	2	206	40	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**261**
9:00 PM	1	157	22	0	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	**192**
10:00 PM	1	90	8	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**101**
11:00 PM	0	57	9	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**69**
Total	**39**	**6,102**	**1,252**	**8**	**688**	**26**	**0**	**7**	**30**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**19**	**8,177**
Percent	**0.5%**	**74.6%**	**15.3%**	**0.1%**	**8.4%**	**0.3%**	**0.0%**	**0.1%**	**0.4%**	**0.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.2%**	

Mark Skaggs:425-250-0777
mark.skaggs@idaxdata.com

Appendix D: Level of Service (LOS) Definitions

Highway Capacity Manual 2010/6th Edition

Signalized intersection level of service (LOS) is defined in terms of a weighted average control delay for the entire intersection. Control delay quantifies the increase in travel time that a vehicle experiences due to the traffic signal control as well as provides a surrogate measure for driver discomfort and fuel consumption. Signalized intersection LOS is stated in terms of average control delay per vehicle (in seconds) during a specified time period (e.g., weekday PM peak hour). Control delay is a complex measure based on many variables, including signal phasing and coordination (i.e., progression of movements through the intersection and along the corridor), signal cycle length, and traffic volumes with respect to intersection capacity and resulting queues. Table 1 summarizes the LOS criteria for signalized intersections, as described in the *Highway Capacity Manual 2010* and 6th Edition (Transportation Research Board, 2010 and 2016, respectively).

Table 1. Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections

Level of Service	Average Control Delay (seconds/vehicle)	General Description
A	≤10	Free Flow
B	>10 – 20	Stable Flow (slight delays)
C	>20 – 35	Stable flow (acceptable delays)
D	>35 – 55	Approaching unstable flow (tolerable delay, occasionally wait through more than one signal cycle before proceeding)
E	>55 – 80	Unstable flow (intolerable delay)
F[1]	>80	Forced flow (congested and queues fail to clear)

Source: *Highway Capacity Manual 2010 and 6th Edition*, Transportation Research Board, 2010 and 2016, respectively.

1. If the volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio for a lane group exceeds 1.0 LOS F is assigned to the individual lane group. LOS for overall approach or intersection is determined solely by the control delay.

Unsignalized intersection LOS criteria can be further reduced into two intersection types: all-way stop and two-way stop control. All-way stop control intersection LOS is expressed in terms of the weighted average control delay of the overall intersection or by approach. Two-way stop-controlled intersection LOS is defined in terms of the average control delay for each minor-street movement (or shared movement) as well as major-street left-turns. This approach is because major-street through vehicles are assumed to experience zero delay, a weighted average of all movements results in very low overall average delay, and this calculated low delay could mask deficiencies of minor movements. Table 2 shows LOS criteria for unsignalized intersections.

Table 2. Level of Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections

Level of Service	Average Control Delay (seconds/vehicle)
A	0 – 10
B	>10 – 15
C	>15 – 25
D	>25 – 35
E	>35 – 50
F[1]	>50

Source: *Highway Capacity Manual 2010 and 6th Edition*, Transportation Research Board, 2010 and 2016, respectively.

1. If the volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio exceeds 1.0, LOS F is assigned an individual lane group for all unsignalized intersections, or minor street approach at two-way stop-controlled intersections. Overall intersection LOS is determined solely by control delay.

Appendix E: Level of Service (LOS) Calculation Worksheets

Appendix E: Existing (2022) Conditions

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.1

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	5	5	1265	470	5
Future Vol, veh/h	5	5	5	1265	470	5
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	1	1	1	0	0	1
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	0	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	94	94	94	94	94	94
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	5	5	6	6
Mvmt Flow	5	5	5	1346	500	5

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1188	255	506	0	-	0
Stage 1	504	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	684	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	4.2	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	2.25	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	184	750	1034	-	-	-
Stage 1	578	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	468	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	183	749	1033	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	318	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	575	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	468	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	13.3	0	0
HCM LOS	B		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	1033	-	446	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.005	-	0.024	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.5	-	13.3	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	0.1	-	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	1.2

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	20	85	1175	20	15	470
Future Vol, veh/h	20	85	1175	20	15	470
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	1	1	0	1	1	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	132	0	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	0	-	-	0
Grade, %	0	-	0	-	-	0
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	3	3	5	5	6	6
Mvmt Flow	22	92	1277	22	16	511

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1578	652	0	0	1300	0
Stage 1	1289	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	289	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.86	6.96	-	-	4.22	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.86	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.86	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.53	3.33	-	-	2.26	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	99	408	-	-	508	-
Stage 1	220	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	732	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %			-	-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	94	407	-	-	508	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	181	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	220	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	699	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	18.5	0	0.4
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	NBR	WBLn1	WBLn2	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	-	181	407	508	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	0.12	0.227	0.032	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	-	27.6	16.4	12.3	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	-	D	C	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	-	0.4	0.9	0.1	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.1

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	5	1215	5	5	455
Future Vol, veh/h	5	5	1215	5	5	455
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	1	1	0	1	1	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	250	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	0	-	-	0
Grade, %	0	-	0	-	-	0
Peak Hour Factor	94	94	94	94	94	94
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	5	5	4	4
Mvmt Flow	5	5	1293	5	5	484

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1550	651	0	0	1299	0
Stage 1	1297	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	253	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	-	-	4.18	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	2.24	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	107	416	-	-	519	-
Stage 1	224	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	772	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %			-	-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	106	415	-	-	519	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	188	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	224	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	764	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	19.5	0	0.1
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	-	259	519	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	0.041	0.01	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	-	19.5	12	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	-	C	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	-	0.1	0	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	85	50	60	50	110	90	55	1065	45	35	405	40
Future Volume (veh/h)	85	50	60	50	110	90	55	1065	45	35	405	40
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1841	1841	1841
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	91	54	65	54	118	97	59	1145	48	38	435	43
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Percent Heavy Veh, %	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4
Cap, veh/h	114	114	138	69	117	96	76	2138	90	60	1997	197
Arrive On Green	0.07	0.15	0.15	0.04	0.13	0.13	0.04	0.63	0.63	0.03	0.62	0.62
Sat Flow, veh/h	1739	753	906	1739	925	760	1739	3393	142	1753	3216	316
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	91	0	119	54	0	215	59	585	608	38	236	242
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1739	0	1659	1739	0	1685	1739	1735	1800	1753	1749	1783
Q Serve(g_s), s	6.7	0.0	8.5	4.0	0.0	16.4	4.4	24.5	24.5	2.8	7.7	7.7
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	6.7	0.0	8.5	4.0	0.0	16.4	4.4	24.5	24.5	2.8	7.7	7.7
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.55	1.00		0.45	1.00		0.08	1.00		0.18
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	114	0	252	69	0	213	76	1093	1135	60	1086	1108
V/C Ratio(X)	0.80	0.00	0.47	0.78	0.00	1.01	0.78	0.54	0.54	0.63	0.22	0.22
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	225	0	344	83	0	213	198	1093	1135	165	1086	1108
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	59.9	0.0	50.4	61.9	0.0	56.8	61.6	13.4	13.4	61.9	10.8	10.8
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	12.2	0.0	1.4	32.3	0.0	64.7	15.7	1.9	1.8	10.3	0.5	0.5
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	3.3	0.0	3.6	2.4	0.0	10.7	2.2	9.6	10.0	1.4	3.0	3.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	72.1	0.0	51.8	94.1	0.0	121.5	77.2	15.3	15.2	72.2	11.2	11.2
LnGrp LOS	E	A	D	F	A	F	E	B	B	E	B	B
Approach Vol, veh/h		210			269			1252			516	
Approach Delay, s/veh		60.6			116.0			18.2			15.7	
Approach LOS		E			F			B			B	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	10.3	85.7	13.1	21.0	9.1	86.8	9.7	24.3
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	14.8	63.3	16.8	16.4	12.2	65.9	6.2	27.0
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	6.4	9.7	8.7	18.4	4.8	26.5	6.0	10.5
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.1	3.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.5

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay	33.3
HCM 6th LOS	C

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.7

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	0	5	5	0	10	5	1140	5	5	535	10
Future Vol, veh/h	5	0	5	5	0	10	5	1140	5	5	535	10
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	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	150	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
Heavy Vehicles, %	11	11	11	23	23	23	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mvmt Flow	5	0	5	5	0	11	5	1200	5	5	563	11

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	1797	1794	569	1794	-	1203	574	0	0	1205	0	0
Stage 1	579	579	-	1213	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	1218	1215	-	581	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.21	6.61	6.31	7.33	-	6.43	4.15	-	-	4.15	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.21	5.61	-	6.33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.21	5.61	-	6.33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.599	4.099	3.399	3.707	-	3.507	2.245	-	-	2.245	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	59	76	505	55	0	203	984	-	-	569	-	-
Stage 1	485	487	-	202	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	212	244	-	465	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	55	74	505	53	-	203	984	-	-	569	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	55	74	-	53	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	478	483	-	199	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	198	240	-	456	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	45.6	45.7	0	0.1
HCM LOS	E	E		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	984	-	-	99	104	569	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.005	-	-	0.106	0.152	0.009	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.7	-	-	45.6	45.7	11.4	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	E	E	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	0.3	0.5	0	-	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	2.5

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↔			↔		↰	↱		↰	↱	
Traffic Vol, veh/h	15	5	10	15	0	15	5	1140	25	20	505	5
Future Vol, veh/h	15	5	10	15	0	15	5	1140	25	20	505	5
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	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	-	-	50	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96
Heavy Vehicles, %	4	4	4	13	13	13	4	4	4	5	5	5
Mvmt Flow	16	5	10	16	0	16	5	1188	26	21	526	5

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	1790	1795	529	1789	1784	1201	531	0	0	1214	0	0
Stage 1	571	571	-	1211	1211	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	1219	1224	-	578	573	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.14	6.54	6.24	7.23	6.63	6.33	4.14	-	-	4.15	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.14	5.54	-	6.23	5.63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.14	5.54	-	6.23	5.63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.536	4.036	3.336	3.617	4.117	3.417	2.236	-	-	2.245	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	62	79	546	59	77	214	1026	-	-	564	-	-
Stage 1	502	502	-	212	243	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	218	249	-	483	487	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	56	76	546	53	74	214	1026	-	-	564	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	56	76	-	53	74	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	499	483	-	211	242	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	201	248	-	451	469	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	70.2	70.2	0	0.4
HCM LOS	F	F		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	1026	-	-	85	85	564	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.005	-	-	0.368	0.368	0.037	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.5	-	-	70.2	70.2	11.6	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	F	F	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	1.4	1.4	0.1	-	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	25	0	15	20	0	55	5	880	15	70	450	20
Future Volume (veh/h)	25	0	15	20	0	55	5	880	15	70	450	20
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1752	1752	1752	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1811	1811	1811
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	27	0	16	22	0	59	5	946	16	75	484	22
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Percent Heavy Veh, %	10	10	10	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6
Cap, veh/h	113	11	40	66	8	79	9	2579	44	98	1358	62
Arrive On Green	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.74	0.74	0.06	0.79	0.79
Sat Flow, veh/h	813	164	579	314	109	1134	1739	3491	59	1725	1719	78
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	43	0	0	81	0	0	5	470	492	75	0	506
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1555	0	0	1557	0	0	1739	1735	1815	1725	0	1797
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.3	10.1	10.1	4.5	0.0	8.5
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	2.6	0.0	0.0	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.3	10.1	10.1	4.5	0.0	8.5
Prop In Lane	0.63		0.37	0.27		0.73	1.00		0.03	1.00		0.04
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	165	0	0	153	0	0	9	1282	1341	98	0	1420
V/C Ratio(X)	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.56	0.37	0.37	0.77	0.00	0.36
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	321	0	0	327	0	0	75	1282	1341	785	0	1420
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	46.2	0.0	0.0	47.3	0.0	0.0	51.6	4.9	4.9	48.3	0.0	3.2
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.8	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	44.3	0.8	0.8	11.8	0.0	0.7
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	1.1	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	3.1	3.3	2.2	0.0	2.3
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	47.0	0.0	0.0	50.2	0.0	0.0	95.8	5.7	5.6	60.1	0.0	3.9
LnGrp LOS	D	A	A	D	A	A	F	A	A	E	A	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		43			81			967			581	
Approach Delay, s/veh		47.0			50.2			6.1			11.1	
Approach LOS		D			D			A			B	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2		4	5	6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	5.0	87.0		11.9	10.4	81.7		11.9				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.9		4.6	4.5	4.9		4.6				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	4.5	82.1		19.4	47.3	39.3		19.4				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	2.3	10.5		7.2	6.5	12.1		4.6				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	3.6		0.2	0.2	6.7		0.1				

Intersection Summary			
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay		11.0	
HCM 6th LOS		B	

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	890	5	5	485	5	10
Future Vol, veh/h	890	5	5	485	5	10
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	93	93	93	93	93	93
Heavy Vehicles, %	5	5	6	6	7	7
Mvmt Flow	957	5	5	522	5	11

Major/Minor	Major1		Major2		Minor1	
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	962	0	1492	481
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	960	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	532	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.19	-	6.705	7.005
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.905	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.505	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.257	-	3.5665	3.3665
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	693	-	120	521
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	324	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	576	-
Platoon blocked, %	-	-		-		
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	693	-	119	521
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	119	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	324	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	570	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	0.1	20.7
HCM LOS			C

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	245	-	-	693	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.066	-	-	0.008	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	20.7	-	-	10.2	0
HCM Lane LOS	C	-	-	B	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.2	-	-	0	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.2

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	5	895	0	0	485
Future Vol, veh/h	5	5	895	0	0	485
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	90	90	90	90	90	90
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	4	4	6	6
Mvmt Flow	6	6	994	0	0	539

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1533	994	0	-	-	-
Stage 1	994	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	539	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.4	6.2	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.4	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.4	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	130	300	-	0	0	-
Stage 1	361	-	-	0	0	-
Stage 2	589	-	-	0	0	-
Platoon blocked, %			-			-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	130	300	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	130	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	361	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	589	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	26.2	0	0
HCM LOS	D		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	WBLn1	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	181	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.061	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	26.2	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	D	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	0.2	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	2.4

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	0	15	25	0	10	80	880	25	10	475	5
Future Vol, veh/h	0	0	15	25	0	10	80	880	25	10	475	5
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	-	-	100	-	-	0	-	-	30	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	13	13	13	4	4	4	5	5	5
Mvmt Flow	0	0	16	27	0	11	87	957	27	11	516	5

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	1691	1699	519	1694	1688	971	521	0	0	984	0	0
Stage 1	541	541	-	1145	1145	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	1150	1158	-	549	543	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.23	6.63	6.33	4.14	-	-	4.15	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.1	5.5	-	6.23	5.63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.1	5.5	-	6.23	5.63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	4	3.3	3.617	4.117	3.417	2.236	-	-	2.245	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	75	93	561	69	88	292	1035	-	-	690	-	-
Stage 1	529	524	-	231	262	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	243	273	-	501	502	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	67	84	561	62	79	292	1035	-	-	690	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	67	84	-	62	79	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	485	516	-	212	240	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	214	250	-	479	494	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	11.6	78.2	0.7	0.2
HCM LOS	B	F		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	EBLn2	WBLn1	WBLn2	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	1035	-	-	-	561	62	292	690	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.084	-	-	-	0.029	0.438	0.037	0.016	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.8	-	-	0	11.6	102.3	17.8	10.3	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	A	B	F	C	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.3	-	-	-	0.1	1.7	0.1	0	-	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	10	10	5	750	1185	10
Future Vol, veh/h	10	10	5	750	1185	10
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	2	2	2	0	0	2
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	0	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	90	90	90	90	90	90
Heavy Vehicles, %	6	6	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	11	11	6	833	1317	11

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1756	668	1330	0	-	0
Stage 1	1325	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	431	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.92	7.02	4.14	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.92	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.92	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.56	3.36	2.22	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	73	391	515	-	-	-
Stage 1	205	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	611	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	72	390	514	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	161	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	202	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	610	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	22.5	0.1	0
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	514	-	228	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.011	-	0.097	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	12.1	-	22.5	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	B	-	C	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	0.3	-	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	1.1

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	20	60	690	30	95	1105
Future Vol, veh/h	20	60	690	30	95	1105
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	9	10	0	9	10	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	132	0	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	0	-	-	0
Grade, %	0	-	0	-	-	0
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	1	1	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	22	65	750	33	103	1201

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1593	412	0	0	793	0
Stage 1	777	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	816	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.82	6.92	-	-	4.14	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.82	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.82	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.51	3.31	-	-	2.22	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	99	592	-	-	824	-
Stage 1	417	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	398	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %			-	-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	61	582	-	-	817	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	166	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	414	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	245	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	16.5	0	0.8
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	NBR	WBLn1	WBLn2	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	-	166	582	817	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	0.131	0.112	0.126	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	-	29.9	12	10	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	-	D	B	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	-	0.4	0.4	0.4	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.2

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	10	690	5	15	1165
Future Vol, veh/h	5	10	690	5	15	1165
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	5	8	0	5	8	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	250	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	0	-	-	0
Grade, %	0	-	0	-	-	0
Peak Hour Factor	88	88	88	88	88	88
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	3	3	3	3
Mvmt Flow	6	11	784	6	17	1324

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1496	411	0	0	798	0
Stage 1	795	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	701	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	-	-	4.16	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	2.23	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	116	596	-	-	814	-
Stage 1	410	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	459	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %			-	-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	112	588	-	-	809	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	246	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	407	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	448	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	14.4	0	0.1
HCM LOS	B		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	-	402	809	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	0.042	0.021	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	-	14.4	9.5	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	-	B	A	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	-	0.1	0.1	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	115	60	85	50	75	30	85	525	25	55	975	125
Future Volume (veh/h)	115	60	85	50	75	30	85	525	25	55	975	125
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		0.99	1.00		0.99	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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1856	1856	1856	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1856	1856	1856
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	128	67	94	56	83	33	94	583	28	61	1083	139
Peak Hour Factor	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90
Percent Heavy Veh, %	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3
Cap, veh/h	153	93	130	72	110	44	117	2202	106	78	1937	248
Arrive On Green	0.09	0.13	0.13	0.04	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.64	0.64	0.04	0.62	0.62
Sat Flow, veh/h	1767	695	975	1781	1267	504	1781	3451	166	1767	3142	403
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	128	0	161	56	0	116	94	300	311	61	607	615
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1767	0	1670	1781	0	1771	1781	1777	1840	1767	1763	1782
Q Serve(g_s), s	9.3	0.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	8.3	6.8	9.6	9.6	4.4	26.2	26.3
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	9.3	0.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	8.3	6.8	9.6	9.6	4.4	26.2	26.3
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.58	1.00		0.28	1.00		0.09	1.00		0.23
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	153	0	223	72	0	154	117	1134	1174	78	1087	1099
V/C Ratio(X)	0.83	0.00	0.72	0.78	0.00	0.75	0.80	0.26	0.27	0.78	0.56	0.56
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	228	0	347	85	0	223	203	1134	1174	166	1087	1099
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	58.4	0.0	54.0	61.8	0.0	58.0	59.9	10.2	10.2	61.5	14.6	14.6
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	15.2	0.0	4.4	31.2	0.0	8.2	11.8	0.6	0.6	15.1	2.1	2.1
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	4.8	0.0	5.3	2.4	0.0	4.1	3.4	3.8	3.9	2.3	10.6	10.7
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	73.7	0.0	58.4	93.0	0.0	66.2	71.7	10.8	10.8	76.6	16.6	16.7
LnGrp LOS	E	A	E	F	A	E	E	B	B	E	B	B
Approach Vol, veh/h		289			172			705			1283	
Approach Delay, s/veh		65.2			74.9			18.9			19.5	
Approach LOS		E			E			B			B	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	13.2	85.1	15.9	15.9	10.4	87.8	9.8	21.9
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	14.8	63.3	16.8	16.4	12.2	65.9	6.2	27.0
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	8.8	28.3	11.3	10.3	6.4	11.6	6.0	14.0
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.1	10.2	0.1	0.2	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.6

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay	28.6
HCM 6th LOS	C

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	1

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	10	0	5	5	0	5	5	585	10	5	1065	20
Future Vol, veh/h	10	0	5	5	0	5	5	585	10	5	1065	20
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	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	150	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	11	0	6	6	0	6	6	657	11	6	1197	22

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	1898	1900	1208	1898	-	663	1219	0	0	668	0	0
Stage 1	1220	1220	-	675	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	678	680	-	1223	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	-	6.2	4.12	-	-	4.12	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.1	5.5	-	6.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.1	5.5	-	6.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	4	3.3	3.5	-	3.3	2.218	-	-	2.218	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	53	70	225	53	0	465	572	-	-	922	-	-
Stage 1	222	255	-	447	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	445	454	-	221	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	51	68	225	51	-	465	572	-	-	922	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	51	68	-	51	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	218	253	-	439	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	432	446	-	214	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	73.3	49.5	0.1	0
HCM LOS	F	E		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	572	-	-	69	92	922	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.01	-	-	0.244	0.122	0.006	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	11.4	-	-	73.3	49.5	8.9	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	B	-	-	F	E	A	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	0.9	0.4	0	-	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	3

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↕			↕		↰	↑		↰	↑	
Traffic Vol, veh/h	10	5	5	15	5	20	5	555	20	30	1020	15
Future Vol, veh/h	10	5	5	15	5	20	5	555	20	30	1020	15
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	-	-	50	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	11	6	6	17	6	22	6	624	22	34	1146	17

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	1886	1884	1158	1880	1881	638	1164	0	0	648	0	0
Stage 1	1224	1224	-	649	649	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	662	660	-	1231	1232	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.13	6.53	6.23	4.12	-	-	4.12	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.1	5.5	-	6.13	5.53	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.1	5.5	-	6.13	5.53	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	4	3.3	3.527	4.027	3.327	2.218	-	-	2.218	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	54	72	241	54	71	475	600	-	-	938	-	-
Stage 1	221	254	-	457	464	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	454	463	-	216	248	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	46	68	240	48	68	474	600	-	-	936	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	46	68	-	48	68	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	219	245	-	452	458	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	423	457	-	198	239	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	89	75.6	0.1	0.3
HCM LOS	F	F		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	600	-	-	64	93	936	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.009	-	-	0.351	0.483	0.036	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	11.1	-	-	89	75.6	9	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	B	-	-	F	F	A	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	1.3	2.1	0.1	-	-

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	15	5	10	20	5	60	10	430	25	405	605	25
Future Volume (veh/h)	15	5	10	20	5	60	10	430	25	405	605	25
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	0.98		0.93	0.96		0.97	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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1841	1841	1841	1856	1856	1856	1856	1856	1856	1856	1856	1856
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	15	5	10	21	5	62	10	443	26	418	624	26
Peak Hour Factor	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97
Percent Heavy Veh, %	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Cap, veh/h	99	36	45	58	18	94	17	1826	107	454	1392	58
Arrive On Green	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.01	0.54	0.54	0.26	0.79	0.79
Sat Flow, veh/h	622	417	519	245	207	1077	1767	3384	198	1767	1768	74
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	30	0	0	88	0	0	10	230	239	418	0	650
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1558	0	0	1529	0	0	1767	1763	1819	1767	0	1842
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.7	8.3	8.3	27.6	0.0	13.9
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	2.0	0.0	0.0	6.6	0.0	0.0	0.7	8.3	8.3	27.6	0.0	13.9
Prop In Lane	0.50		0.33	0.24		0.70	1.00		0.11	1.00		0.04
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	180	0	0	170	0	0	17	951	982	454	0	1450
V/C Ratio(X)	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.60	0.24	0.24	0.92	0.00	0.45
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	286	0	0	281	0	0	66	951	982	697	0	1450
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	50.9	0.0	0.0	53.0	0.0	0.0	59.2	14.6	14.6	43.4	0.0	4.2
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.4	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	29.8	0.6	0.6	12.7	0.0	1.0
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.9	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.4	3.4	3.5	13.5	0.0	4.4
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	51.4	0.0	0.0	55.4	0.0	0.0	89.0	15.2	15.2	56.0	0.0	5.2
LnGrp LOS	D	A	A	E	A	A	F	B	B	E	A	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		30			88			479			1068	
Approach Delay, s/veh		51.4			55.4			16.8			25.1	
Approach LOS		D			E			B			C	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2		4	5	6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	5.6	99.3		15.0	35.3	69.6		15.0				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.9		4.6	4.5	4.9		4.6				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	4.5	82.1		19.4	47.3	39.3		19.4				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	2.7	15.9		8.6	29.6	10.3		4.0				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	5.1		0.3	1.2	2.8		0.1				

Intersection Summary			
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay		24.8	
HCM 6th LOS		C	

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.4

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	445	5	10	640	5	10
Future Vol, veh/h	445	5	10	640	5	10
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	63	63	63	63	63	63
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	3	3	0	0
Mvmt Flow	706	8	16	1016	8	16

Major/Minor	Major1		Major2		Minor1	
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	714	0	1758	357
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	710	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	1048	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.145	-	6.6	6.9
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.8	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.4	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.2285	-	3.5	3.3
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	878	-	86	645
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	454	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	341	-
Platoon blocked, %	-	-		-		
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	878	-	82	645
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	82	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	454	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	327	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	0.1	25.9
HCM LOS			D

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	196	-	-	878	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.121	-	-	0.018	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	25.9	-	-	9.2	0
HCM Lane LOS	D	-	-	A	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.4	-	-	0.1	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.1

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	5	475	0	0	630
Future Vol, veh/h	0	5	475	0	0	630
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	94	94	94	94	94	94
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	1	1	3	3
Mvmt Flow	0	5	505	0	0	670

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1175	505	0	-	-	-
Stage 1	505	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	670	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.4	6.2	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.4	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.4	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	214	571	-	0	0	-
Stage 1	610	-	-	0	0	-
Stage 2	512	-	-	0	0	-
Platoon blocked, %			-			-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	214	571	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	214	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	610	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	512	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	11.4	0	0
HCM LOS	B		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	WBLn1	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	571	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.009	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	11.4	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	0	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	1

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	0	20	15	0	10	10	455	35	5	625	5
Future Vol, veh/h	5	0	20	15	0	10	10	455	35	5	625	5
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	3	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None
Storage Length	100	-	-	100	-	-	0	-	-	30	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3
Mvmt Flow	5	0	21	16	0	11	11	479	37	5	658	5

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	1202	1212	667	1204	1196	501	666	0	0	516	0	0
Stage 1	674	674	-	520	520	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	528	538	-	684	676	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	4.11	-	-	4.13	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.1	5.5	-	6.1	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.1	5.5	-	6.1	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	4	3.3	3.5	4	3.3	2.209	-	-	2.227	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	163	184	462	162	188	574	928	-	-	1045	-	-
Stage 1	448	457	-	543	535	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	538	526	-	442	456	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	157	181	460	152	184	573	926	-	-	1045	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	157	181	-	152	184	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	442	454	-	536	529	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	521	520	-	419	453	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	16.3	23.4	0.2	0.1
HCM LOS	C	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	EBLn2	WBLn1	WBLn2	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	926	-	-	157	460	152	573	1045	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.011	-	-	0.034	0.046	0.104	0.018	0.005	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.9	-	-	28.7	13.2	31.4	11.4	8.5	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	D	B	D	B	A	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0	-	-

Appendix E: Future (2035) No Build Conditions

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	25	5	5	1575	610	15
Future Vol, veh/h	25	5	5	1575	610	15
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	1	1	1	0	0	1
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	0	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	94	94	94	94	94	94
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	5	5	6	6
Mvmt Flow	27	5	5	1676	649	16

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1507	335	666	0	-	0
Stage 1	658	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	849	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	4.2	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	2.25	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	114	667	899	-	-	-
Stage 1	482	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	385	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	113	666	898	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	246	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	479	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	385	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	19.8	0	0
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	898	-	275	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.006	-	0.116	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	9	-	19.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	C	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	0.4	-	-

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/20th St E - AM Peak Hour - Future 2035 Baseline (Site Folder: General)]

Future (2035) PM Peak Hour

Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3u	U	1	5.0	1	5.0	0.696	13.6	LOS B	6.4	166.3	0.54	0.51	0.54	36.9
3	L2	60	5.0	65	5.0	0.696	11.1	LOS B	6.4	166.3	0.54	0.51	0.54	36.0
8	T1	1400	5.0	1522	5.0	0.696	5.2	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.53	0.50	0.53	36.0
18	R2	65	5.0	71	5.0	0.696	5.3	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.53	0.49	0.53	34.9
Approach		1526	5.0	1659	5.0	0.696	5.5	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.53	0.50	0.53	36.0
East: 20th St E														
1u	U	1	3.0	1	3.0	0.418	19.6	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	33.7
1	L2	80	3.0	87	3.0	0.418	17.1	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	32.9
6	T1	10	3.0	11	3.0	0.418	11.3	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	32.8
16	R2	85	3.0	92	3.0	0.418	11.1	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	31.9
Approach		176	3.0	191	3.0	0.418	13.9	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	32.4
North: Meridian Ave E														
7u	U	1	6.0	1	6.0	0.296	13.2	LOS B	1.5	39.8	0.36	0.47	0.36	37.7
7	L2	15	6.0	16	6.0	0.296	10.7	LOS B	1.5	39.8	0.36	0.47	0.36	36.7
4	T1	545	6.0	592	6.0	0.296	4.9	LOS A	1.5	40.0	0.35	0.47	0.35	36.7
14	R2	60	6.0	65	6.0	0.296	4.9	LOS A	1.5	40.0	0.35	0.46	0.35	35.5
Approach		621	6.0	675	6.0	0.296	5.0	LOS A	1.5	40.0	0.35	0.47	0.35	36.6
West: 20th St E														
5u	U	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.195	14.5	LOS B	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	35.9
5	L2	90	0.0	98	0.0	0.195	12.0	LOS B	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	35.0
2	T1	10	0.0	11	0.0	0.195	6.2	LOS A	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	34.9
12	R2	45	0.0	49	0.0	0.195	6.1	LOS A	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	33.9
Approach		146	0.0	159	0.0	0.195	9.8	LOS A	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	34.7
All Vehicles		2469	4.8	2684	4.8	0.696	6.2	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.51	0.54	0.52	35.7

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.2

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	10	1515	5	10	660
Future Vol, veh/h	5	10	1515	5	10	660
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	1	1	0	1	1	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	250	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	0	-	-	0
Grade, %	0	-	0	-	-	0
Peak Hour Factor	94	94	94	94	94	94
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	5	5	4	4
Mvmt Flow	5	11	1612	5	11	702

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1990	811	0	0	1618	0
Stage 1	1616	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	374	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	-	-	4.18	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	2.24	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	54	327	-	-	390	-
Stage 1	151	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	672	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %			-	-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	52	326	-	-	390	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	125	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	151	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	653	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	23.4	0	0.2
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	-	212	390	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	0.075	0.027	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	-	23.4	14.5	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	-	C	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	-	0.2	0.1	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	210	85	130	100	165	120	115	1195	35	55	525	70
Future Volume (veh/h)	210	85	130	100	165	120	115	1195	35	55	525	70
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1841	1841	1841
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	226	91	140	108	177	129	124	1285	38	59	565	75
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Percent Heavy Veh, %	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4
Cap, veh/h	225	134	207	83	124	90	148	1918	57	76	1600	212
Arrive On Green	0.13	0.21	0.21	0.05	0.13	0.13	0.09	0.56	0.56	0.04	0.52	0.52
Sat Flow, veh/h	1739	647	996	1739	980	714	1739	3440	102	1753	3104	411
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	226	0	231	108	0	306	124	647	676	59	318	322
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1739	0	1643	1739	0	1693	1739	1735	1807	1753	1749	1766
Q Serve(g_s), s	16.8	0.0	16.8	6.2	0.0	16.4	9.1	34.3	34.3	4.3	14.0	14.1
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	16.8	0.0	16.8	6.2	0.0	16.4	9.1	34.3	34.3	4.3	14.0	14.1
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.61	1.00		0.42	1.00		0.06	1.00		0.23
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	225	0	341	83	0	214	148	967	1008	76	901	910
V/C Ratio(X)	1.01	0.00	0.68	1.30	0.00	1.43	0.84	0.67	0.67	0.78	0.35	0.35
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	225	0	341	83	0	214	198	967	1008	165	901	910
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	56.6	0.0	47.5	61.9	0.0	56.8	58.6	20.3	20.3	61.6	18.6	18.7
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	61.5	0.0	5.3	199.7	0.0	219.3	20.1	3.7	3.5	15.6	1.1	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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	11.1	0.0	7.4	7.3	0.0	20.0	4.8	14.3	14.9	2.2	5.8	5.9
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	118.1	0.0	52.7	261.6	0.0	276.1	78.7	24.0	23.9	77.2	19.7	19.7
LnGrp LOS	F	A	D	F	A	F	E	C	C	E	B	B
Approach Vol, veh/h		457			414			1447			699	
Approach Delay, s/veh		85.1			272.3			28.6			24.6	
Approach LOS		F			F			C			C	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	15.7	71.9	21.4	21.0	10.2	77.4	10.8	31.6
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	14.8	63.3	16.8	16.4	12.2	65.9	6.2	27.0
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	11.1	16.1	18.8	18.4	6.3	36.3	8.2	18.8
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.1	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.8	0.0	0.8

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay	69.7
HCM 6th LOS	E

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	1.6

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	0	5	5	0	25	5	1315	5	10	770	10
Future Vol, veh/h	5	0	5	5	0	25	5	1315	5	10	770	10
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	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	150	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
Heavy Vehicles, %	11	11	11	23	23	23	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mvmt Flow	5	0	5	5	0	26	5	1384	5	11	811	11

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	2249	2238	817	2238	-	1387	822	0	0	1389	0	0
Stage 1	839	839	-	1397	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	1410	1399	-	841	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.21	6.61	6.31	7.33	-	6.43	4.15	-	-	4.15	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.21	5.61	-	6.33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.21	5.61	-	6.33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.599	4.099	3.399	3.707	-	3.507	2.245	-	-	2.245	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	28	40	363	26	0	157	795	-	-	483	-	-
Stage 1	348	369	-	157	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	164	198	-	331	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	22	38	363	25	-	157	795	-	-	483	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	22	38	-	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	338	361	-	153	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	133	192	-	319	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	120.8	71.7	0	0.2
HCM LOS	F	F		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	795	-	-	41	84	483	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.007	-	-	0.257	0.376	0.022	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	9.6	-	-	120.8	71.7	12.6	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	F	F	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	0.8	1.5	0.1	-	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.7

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↕			↕		↰	↑		↰	↑	
Traffic Vol, veh/h	35	50	10	20	45	15	70	1320	40	70	695	20
Future Vol, veh/h	35	50	10	20	45	15	70	1320	40	70	695	20
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	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	-	-	50	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96
Heavy Vehicles, %	4	4	4	13	13	13	4	4	4	5	5	5
Mvmt Flow	36	52	10	21	47	16	73	1375	42	73	724	21

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	2455	2444	735	2454	2433	1396	745	0	0	1417	0	0
Stage 1	881	881	-	1542	1542	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	1574	1563	-	912	891	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.14	6.54	6.24	7.23	6.63	6.33	4.14	-	-	4.15	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.14	5.54	-	6.23	5.63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.14	5.54	-	6.23	5.63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.536	4.036	3.336	3.617	4.117	3.417	2.236	-	-	2.245	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	~ 21	~ 31	416	~ 19	~ 29	163	854	-	-	472	-	-
Stage 1	339	362	-	136	167	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	137	171	-	314	346	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	~ 24	416	-	~ 22	163	854	-	-	472	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	~ 24	-	-	~ 22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	310	306	-	124	153	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	79	156	-	215	292	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s			0.5	1.2
HCM LOS	-	-		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	854	-	-	-	-	472	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.085	-	-	-	-	0.154	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	9.6	-	-	-	-	14	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	-	-	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.3	-	-	-	-	0.5	-	-

Notes			
~: Volume exceeds capacity	$: Delay exceeds 300s	+: Computation Not Defined	*: All major volume in platoon



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	50	0	45	80	0	305	35	1070	100	105	595	25
Future Volume (veh/h)	50	0	45	80	0	305	35	1070	100	105	595	25
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1752	1752	1752	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1811	1811	1811
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	54	0	48	86	0	328	38	1151	108	113	640	27
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Percent Heavy Veh, %	10	10	10	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6
Cap, veh/h	109	13	67	85	5	202	48	2042	191	141	1193	50
Arrive On Green	0.16	0.00	0.16	0.16	0.00	0.16	0.03	0.64	0.64	0.08	0.69	0.69
Sat Flow, veh/h	382	78	409	295	29	1236	1739	3206	300	1725	1725	73
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	102	0	0	414	0	0	38	622	637	113	0	667
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	870	0	0	1561	0	0	1739	1735	1772	1725	0	1798
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.0	2.6	24.1	24.2	7.6	0.0	21.6
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	12.5	0.0	0.0	19.4	0.0	0.0	2.6	24.1	24.2	7.6	0.0	21.6
Prop In Lane	0.53		0.47	0.21		0.79	1.00		0.17	1.00		0.04
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	188	0	0	291	0	0	48	1105	1129	141	0	1243
V/C Ratio(X)	0.54	0.00	0.00	1.42	0.00	0.00	0.79	0.56	0.56	0.80	0.00	0.54
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	188	0	0	291	0	0	66	1105	1129	687	0	1243
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	46.2	0.0	0.0	50.8	0.0	0.0	57.4	12.2	12.2	53.6	0.0	9.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	3.1	0.0	0.0	208.1	0.0	0.0	35.2	2.1	2.0	10.0	0.0	1.7
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	3.0	0.0	0.0	25.6	0.0	0.0	1.6	9.2	9.5	3.7	0.0	8.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	49.3	0.0	0.0	258.9	0.0	0.0	92.6	14.3	14.3	63.6	0.0	10.7
LnGrp LOS	D	A	A	F	A	A	F	B	B	E	A	B
Approach Vol, veh/h		102			414			1297			780	
Approach Delay, s/veh		49.3			258.9			16.6			18.3	
Approach LOS		D			F			B			B	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2		4	5	6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	7.8	87.0		24.0	14.2	80.6		24.0				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.9		4.6	4.5	4.9		4.6				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	4.5	82.1		19.4	47.3	39.3		19.4				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	4.6	23.6		21.4	9.6	26.2		14.5				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	5.3		0.0	0.3	6.8		0.2				

Intersection Summary			
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay		57.1	
HCM 6th LOS		E	

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	1195	5	5	725	5	10
Future Vol, veh/h	1195	5	5	725	5	10
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	93	93	93	93	93	93
Heavy Vehicles, %	5	5	6	6	7	7
Mvmt Flow	1285	5	5	780	5	11

Major/Minor	Major1		Major2		Minor1	
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	1290	0	2078	645
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	1288	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	790	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.19	-	6.705	7.005
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.905	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.505	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.257	-	3.5665	3.3665
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	518	-	50	406
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	216	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	435	-
Platoon blocked, %	-	-		-		
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	518	-	49	406
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	49	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	216	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	428	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	0.1	40.3
HCM LOS			E

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	118	-	-	518	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.137	-	-	0.01	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	40.3	-	-	12	0
HCM Lane LOS	E	-	-	B	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.5	-	-	0	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	5	1220	0	0	725
Future Vol, veh/h	5	5	1220	0	0	725
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	90	90	90	90	90	90
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	4	4	6	6
Mvmt Flow	6	6	1356	0	0	806

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	2162	1356	0	-	-	-
Stage 1	1356	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	806	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.4	6.2	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.4	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.4	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	53	184	-	0	0	-
Stage 1	242	-	-	0	0	-
Stage 2	443	-	-	0	0	-
Platoon blocked, %			-			-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	53	184	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	53	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	242	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	443	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	55.7	0	0
HCM LOS	F		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	WBLn1	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	82	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.136	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	55.7	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	F	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	0.4	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	7

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	0	15	25	0	10	80	1210	25	10	710	5
Future Vol, veh/h	0	0	15	25	0	10	80	1210	25	10	710	5
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	-	-	100	-	-	0	-	-	30	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	13	13	13	4	4	4	5	5	5
Mvmt Flow	0	0	16	27	0	11	87	1315	27	11	772	5

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	2305	2313	775	2308	2302	1329	777	0	0	1342	0	0
Stage 1	797	797	-	1503	1503	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	1508	1516	-	805	799	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.23	6.63	6.33	4.14	-	-	4.15	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.1	5.5	-	6.23	5.63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.1	5.5	-	6.23	5.63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	4	3.3	3.617	4.117	3.417	2.236	-	-	2.245	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	27	38	401	~ 25	36	179	831	-	-	504	-	-
Stage 1	383	401	-	143	175	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	152	184	-	360	382	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	23	33	401	~ 22	32	179	831	-	-	504	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	23	33	-	~ 22	32	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	343	392	-	128	157	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	128	165	-	338	374	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	14.4	$ 384.5	0.6	0.2
HCM LOS	B	F		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	EBLn2	WBLn1	WBLn2	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	831	-	-	-	401	22	179	504	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.105	-	-	-	0.041	1.235	0.061	0.022	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	9.8	-	-	0	14.4	$ 527.7	26.4	12.3	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	A	B	F	D	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.3	-	-	-	0.1	3.5	0.2	0.1	-	-

Notes			
~: Volume exceeds capacity	$: Delay exceeds 300s	+: Computation Not Defined	*: All major volume in platoon

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	10	10	5	905	1535	30
Future Vol, veh/h	10	10	5	905	1535	30
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	2	2	2	0	0	2
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	0	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	90	90	90	90	90	90
Heavy Vehicles, %	6	6	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	11	11	6	1006	1706	33

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	2242	874	1741	0	-	0
Stage 1	1725	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	517	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.92	7.02	4.14	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.92	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.92	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.56	3.36	2.22	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	34	285	357	-	-	-
Stage 1	124	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	552	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	33	284	356	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	99	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	122	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	551	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	33.8	0.1	0
HCM LOS	D		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	356	-	147	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.016	-	0.151	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	15.3	-	33.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	C	-	D	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	0.5	-	-

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/20th St E - PM Peak Hour - Future 2035 Baseline (Site Folder: General)]

Future (2035) PM Peak Hour

Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3u	U	1	2.0	1	2.0	0.427	13.4	LOS B	2.5	62.4	0.41	0.50	0.41	37.4
3	L2	50	2.0	54	2.0	0.427	10.9	LOS B	2.5	62.4	0.41	0.50	0.41	36.5
8	T1	775	2.0	842	2.0	0.427	5.0	LOS A	2.5	62.8	0.41	0.50	0.41	36.5
18	R2	100	2.0	109	2.0	0.427	5.1	LOS A	2.5	62.8	0.41	0.49	0.41	35.4
Approach		926	2.0	1007	2.0	0.427	5.4	LOS A	2.5	62.8	0.41	0.49	0.41	36.4
East: 20th St E														
1u	U	1	1.0	1	1.0	0.208	15.2	LOS B	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	35.9
1	L2	70	1.0	76	1.0	0.208	12.7	LOS B	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	35.0
6	T1	5	1.0	5	1.0	0.208	6.9	LOS A	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	34.9
16	R2	60	1.0	65	1.0	0.208	6.8	LOS A	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	33.8
Approach		136	1.0	148	1.0	0.208	9.9	LOS A	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	34.5
North: Meridian Ave E														
7u	U	1	2.0	1	2.0	0.689	13.5	LOS B	6.1	153.9	0.53	0.52	0.53	37.0
7	L2	95	2.0	103	2.0	0.689	11.0	LOS B	6.1	153.9	0.53	0.52	0.53	36.0
4	T1	1355	2.0	1473	2.0	0.689	5.2	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.53	0.51	0.53	36.1
14	R2	100	2.0	109	2.0	0.689	5.2	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.52	0.49	0.52	35.0
Approach		1551	2.0	1686	2.0	0.689	5.6	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.53	0.51	0.53	36.0
West: 20th St E														
5u	U	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.330	18.0	LOS B	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	34.6
5	L2	70	0.0	76	0.0	0.330	15.5	LOS B	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	33.7
2	T1	10	0.0	11	0.0	0.330	9.7	LOS A	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	33.6
12	R2	70	0.0	76	0.0	0.330	9.6	LOS A	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	32.6
Approach		151	0.0	164	0.0	0.330	12.4	LOS B	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	33.2
All Vehicles		2764	1.8	3004	1.8	0.689	6.1	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.50	0.54	0.51	35.9

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.2

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	15	835	5	20	1465
Future Vol, veh/h	5	15	835	5	20	1465
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	9	10	0	9	10	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	250	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	0	-	-	0
Grade, %	0	-	0	-	-	0
Peak Hour Factor	88	88	88	88	88	88
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	3	3	3	3
Mvmt Flow	6	17	949	6	23	1665

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1850	498	0	0	965	0
Stage 1	962	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	888	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	-	-	4.16	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	2.23	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	67	523	-	-	703	-
Stage 1	336	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	367	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %			-	-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	64	514	-	-	697	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	185	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	333	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	352	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	15.8	0	0.1
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	-	356	697	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	0.064	0.033	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	-	15.8	10.3	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	-	C	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	-	0.2	0.1	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	170	120	135	40	140	50	140	630	50	115	1110	255
Future Volume (veh/h)	170	120	135	40	140	50	140	630	50	115	1110	255
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		0.99	1.00		0.99	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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1856	1856	1856	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1856	1856	1856
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	189	133	150	44	156	56	156	700	56	128	1233	283
Peak Hour Factor	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90
Percent Heavy Veh, %	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3
Cap, veh/h	214	167	188	65	165	59	181	1742	139	152	1447	328
Arrive On Green	0.12	0.21	0.21	0.04	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.52	0.52	0.09	0.51	0.51
Sat Flow, veh/h	1767	793	895	1781	1310	470	1781	3332	266	1767	2852	647
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	189	0	283	44	0	212	156	373	383	128	756	760
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1767	0	1688	1781	0	1780	1781	1777	1821	1767	1763	1736
Q Serve(g_s), s	13.7	0.0	20.7	3.2	0.0	15.4	11.2	16.5	16.5	9.3	48.1	49.9
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	13.7	0.0	20.7	3.2	0.0	15.4	11.2	16.5	16.5	9.3	48.1	49.9
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.53	1.00		0.26	1.00		0.15	1.00		0.37
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	214	0	355	65	0	225	181	929	952	152	894	881
V/C Ratio(X)	0.88	0.00	0.80	0.67	0.00	0.94	0.86	0.40	0.40	0.84	0.85	0.86
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	228	0	355	85	0	225	203	929	952	166	894	881
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	56.2	0.0	48.7	61.8	0.0	56.3	57.5	18.7	18.7	58.5	27.6	28.1
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	29.8	0.0	12.0	12.7	0.0	44.5	27.4	1.3	1.3	28.7	9.7	10.9
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	7.8	0.0	9.8	1.7	0.0	9.6	6.4	7.0	7.2	5.3	21.8	22.5
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	86.1	0.0	60.7	74.5	0.0	100.9	84.8	20.0	20.0	87.3	37.3	39.0
LnGrp LOS	F	A	E	E	A	F	F	C	B	F	D	D
Approach Vol, veh/h		472			256			912			1644	
Approach Delay, s/veh		70.8			96.3			31.1			42.0	
Approach LOS		E			F			C			D	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	17.8	70.9	20.3	21.0	15.8	72.9	9.4	32.0
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	14.8	63.3	16.8	16.4	12.2	65.9	6.2	27.0
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	13.2	51.9	15.7	17.4	11.3	18.5	5.2	22.7
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.1	7.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.6

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay	47.3
HCM 6th LOS	D

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	2.3

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	10	0	5	5	0	10	5	820	10	20	1240	20
Future Vol, veh/h	10	0	5	5	0	10	5	820	10	20	1240	20
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	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	150	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	11	0	6	6	0	11	6	921	11	22	1393	22

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	2392	2392	1404	2390	-	927	1415	0	0	932	0	0
Stage 1	1448	1448	-	939	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	944	944	-	1451	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	-	6.2	4.12	-	-	4.12	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.1	5.5	-	6.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.1	5.5	-	6.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	4	3.3	3.5	-	3.3	2.218	-	-	2.218	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	24	34	173	24	0	328	482	-	-	734	-	-
Stage 1	165	198	-	320	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	317	344	-	164	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	22	32	173	22	-	328	482	-	-	734	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	22	32	-	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	161	192	-	312	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	298	335	-	154	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	215.8	90.7	0.1	0.2
HCM LOS	F	F		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	482	-	-	31	58	734	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.012	-	-	0.544	0.291	0.031	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	12.6	-	-	215.8	90.7	10.1	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	B	-	-	F	F	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	1.8	1	0.1	-	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	92.1

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	25	50	70	30	10	70	5	740	25	30	1195	35
Future Vol, veh/h	25	50	70	30	10	70	5	740	25	30	1195	35
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	-	-	50	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	28	56	79	34	11	79	6	831	28	34	1343	39

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	2335	2305	1366	2359	2310	848	1383	0	0	861	0	0
Stage 1	1432	1432	-	859	859	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	903	873	-	1500	1451	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.13	6.53	6.23	4.12	-	-	4.12	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.1	5.5	-	6.13	5.53	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.1	5.5	-	6.13	5.53	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	4	3.3	3.527	4.027	3.327	2.218	-	-	2.218	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	~ 26	~ 39	182	~ 24	38	360	495	-	-	781	-	-
Stage 1	168	202	-	350	372	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	335	370	-	151	195	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	~ 15	~ 37	182	-	36	359	495	-	-	780	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	~ 15	~ 37	-	-	36	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	166	193	-	345	367	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	250	365	-	58	186	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, $	1448.7		0.1	0.2
HCM LOS	F	-		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	495	-	-	43	-	780	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.011	-	-	3.789	-	0.043	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	12.4	-	-	$ 1448.7	-	9.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	B	-	-	F	-	A	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	18.3	-	0.1	-	-

Notes			
~: Volume exceeds capacity	$: Delay exceeds 300s	+: Computation Not Defined	*: All major volume in platoon



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	20	5	40	95	5	180	25	570	30	465	790	50
Future Volume (veh/h)	20	5	40	95	5	180	25	570	30	465	790	50
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		0.97	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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1841	1841	1841	1856	1856	1856	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	22	5	43	102	5	194	27	613	32	500	849	54
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Percent Heavy Veh, %	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	90	34	134	121	9	162	35	1446	75	536	1221	78
Arrive On Green	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.02	0.42	0.42	0.30	0.70	0.70
Sat Flow, veh/h	311	208	828	499	56	1005	1781	3435	179	1781	1740	111
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	70	0	0	301	0	0	27	317	328	500	0	903
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1347	0	0	1559	0	0	1781	1777	1838	1781	0	1850
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.8	0.0	0.0	1.8	15.1	15.1	32.7	0.0	34.1
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	4.6	0.0	0.0	19.4	0.0	0.0	1.8	15.1	15.1	32.7	0.0	34.1
Prop In Lane	0.31		0.61	0.34		0.64	1.00		0.10	1.00		0.06
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	257	0	0	292	0	0	35	748	773	536	0	1299
V/C Ratio(X)	0.27	0.00	0.00	1.03	0.00	0.00	0.77	0.42	0.42	0.93	0.00	0.70
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	257	0	0	292	0	0	67	748	773	702	0	1299
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	44.1	0.0	0.0	51.4	0.0	0.0	58.5	24.5	24.5	40.8	0.0	10.4
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.6	0.0	0.0	60.6	0.0	0.0	28.5	1.8	1.7	16.6	0.0	3.1
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	1.9	0.0	0.0	13.7	0.0	0.0	1.1	6.6	6.8	16.5	0.0	13.2
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	44.6	0.0	0.0	111.9	0.0	0.0	87.0	26.2	26.2	57.4	0.0	13.5
LnGrp LOS	D	A	A	F	A	A	F	C	C	E	A	B
Approach Vol, veh/h		70			301			672			1403	
Approach Delay, s/veh		44.6			111.9			28.7			29.1	
Approach LOS		D			F			C			C	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2		4	5	6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	6.9	89.1		24.0	40.6	55.4		24.0				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.9		4.6	4.5	4.9		4.6				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	4.5	82.1		19.4	47.3	39.3		19.4				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	3.8	36.1		21.4	34.7	17.1		6.6				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	8.7		0.0	1.4	3.9		0.2				

Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			39.6									
HCM 6th LOS			D									

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.9

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	620	5	10	925	5	10
Future Vol, veh/h	620	5	10	925	5	10
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	63	63	63	63	63	63
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	3	3	0	0
Mvmt Flow	984	8	16	1468	8	16

Major/Minor	Major1		Major2		Minor1	
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	992	0	2488	496
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	988	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	1500	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.145	-	6.6	6.9
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.8	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.4	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.2285	-	3.5	3.3
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	690	-	29	525
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	326	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	206	-
Platoon blocked, %	-	-		-		
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	690	-	25	525
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	25	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	326	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	180	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	0.1	84.1
HCM LOS			F

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	68	-	-	690	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.35	-	-	0.023	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	84.1	-	-	10.3	0
HCM Lane LOS	F	-	-	B	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	1.3	-	-	0.1	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	5	620	0	0	930
Future Vol, veh/h	0	5	620	0	0	930
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	94	94	94	94	94	94
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	2	2	3	3
Mvmt Flow	0	5	660	0	0	989

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1649	660	0	-	-	-
Stage 1	660	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	989	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.4	6.2	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.4	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.4	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	110	467	-	0	0	-
Stage 1	518	-	-	0	0	-
Stage 2	363	-	-	0	0	-
Platoon blocked, %			-			-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	110	467	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	110	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	518	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	363	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	12.8	0	0
HCM LOS	B		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	WBLn1	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	467	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.011	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	12.8	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	0	-

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	1.2

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	0	20	15	0	10	10	605	35	5	920	5
Future Vol, veh/h	5	0	20	15	0	10	10	605	35	5	920	5
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	3	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None
Storage Length	100	-	-	100	-	-	0	-	-	30	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3
Mvmt Flow	5	0	21	16	0	11	11	637	37	5	968	5

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	1670	1680	977	1672	1664	659	976	0	0	674	0	0
Stage 1	984	984	-	678	678	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	686	696	-	994	986	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	4.11	-	-	4.13	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.1	5.5	-	6.1	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.1	5.5	-	6.1	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	4	3.3	3.5	4	3.3	2.209	-	-	2.227	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	77	96	307	77	98	467	711	-	-	912	-	-
Stage 1	302	329	-	445	455	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	441	446	-	298	328	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	74	94	305	70	96	466	709	-	-	912	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	74	94	-	70	96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	297	327	-	438	448	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	423	439	-	275	326	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	25.6	47.6	0.2	0
HCM LOS	D	E		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	EBLn2	WBLn1	WBLn2	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	709	-	-	74	305	70	466	912	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.015	-	-	0.071	0.069	0.226	0.023	0.006	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	10.2	-	-	57.3	17.7	70.8	12.9	9	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	B	-	-	F	C	F	B	A	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.1	0	-	-

Appendix E: Future (2035) Build Conditions – Alternative A

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	25	5	5	1575	610	15
Future Vol, veh/h	25	5	5	1575	610	15
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	1	1	1	0	0	1
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	175	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	94	94	94	94	94	94
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	5	5	6	6
Mvmt Flow	27	5	5	1676	649	16

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1507	335	666	0	-	0
Stage 1	658	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	849	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	4.2	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	2.25	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	114	667	899	-	-	-
Stage 1	482	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	385	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	113	666	898	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	246	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	479	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	385	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	19.8	0	0
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	898	-	275	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.006	-	0.116	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	9	-	19.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	C	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	0	-	0.4	-	-

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/20th St E - AM Peak Hour - Future 2035 Baseline (Site Folder: General)]

Future (2035) PM Peak Hour

Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3u	U	1	5.0	1	5.0	0.696	13.6	LOS B	6.4	166.3	0.54	0.51	0.54	36.9
3	L2	60	5.0	65	5.0	0.696	11.1	LOS B	6.4	166.3	0.54	0.51	0.54	36.0
8	T1	1400	5.0	1522	5.0	0.696	5.2	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.53	0.50	0.53	36.0
18	R2	65	5.0	71	5.0	0.696	5.3	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.53	0.49	0.53	34.9
Approach		1526	5.0	1659	5.0	0.696	5.5	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.53	0.50	0.53	36.0
East: 20th St E														
1u	U	1	3.0	1	3.0	0.418	19.6	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	33.7
1	L2	80	3.0	87	3.0	0.418	17.1	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	32.9
6	T1	10	3.0	11	3.0	0.418	11.3	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	32.8
16	R2	85	3.0	92	3.0	0.418	11.1	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	31.9
Approach		176	3.0	191	3.0	0.418	13.9	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	32.4
North: Meridian Ave E														
7u	U	1	6.0	1	6.0	0.296	13.2	LOS B	1.5	39.8	0.36	0.47	0.36	37.7
7	L2	15	6.0	16	6.0	0.296	10.7	LOS B	1.5	39.8	0.36	0.47	0.36	36.7
4	T1	545	6.0	592	6.0	0.296	4.9	LOS A	1.5	40.0	0.35	0.47	0.35	36.7
14	R2	60	6.0	65	6.0	0.296	4.9	LOS A	1.5	40.0	0.35	0.46	0.35	35.5
Approach		621	6.0	675	6.0	0.296	5.0	LOS A	1.5	40.0	0.35	0.47	0.35	36.6
West: 20th St E														
5u	U	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.195	14.5	LOS B	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	35.9
5	L2	90	0.0	98	0.0	0.195	12.0	LOS B	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	35.0
2	T1	10	0.0	11	0.0	0.195	6.2	LOS A	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	34.9
12	R2	45	0.0	49	0.0	0.195	6.1	LOS A	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	33.9
Approach		146	0.0	159	0.0	0.195	9.8	LOS A	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	34.7
All Vehicles		2469	4.8	2684	4.8	0.696	6.2	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.51	0.54	0.52	35.7

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.2

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	10	1515	5	10	660
Future Vol, veh/h	5	10	1515	5	10	660
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	1	1	0	1	1	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	250	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	0	-	-	0
Grade, %	0	-	0	-	-	0
Peak Hour Factor	94	94	94	94	94	94
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	5	5	4	4
Mvmt Flow	5	11	1612	5	11	702

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1990	811	0	0	1618	0
Stage 1	1616	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	374	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	-	-	4.18	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	2.24	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	54	327	-	-	390	-
Stage 1	151	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	672	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %			-	-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	52	326	-	-	390	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	125	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	151	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	653	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	23.4	0	0.2
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	-	212	390	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	0.075	0.027	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	-	-	23.4	14.5	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	-	C	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	-	-	0.2	0.1	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	210	85	130	100	165	120	115	1195	35	55	525	70
Future Volume (veh/h)	210	85	130	100	165	120	115	1195	35	55	525	70
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1841	1841	1841
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	226	91	140	108	177	129	124	1285	38	59	565	75
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Percent Heavy Veh, %	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4
Cap, veh/h	225	134	207	83	124	90	148	1918	57	76	1600	212
Arrive On Green	0.13	0.21	0.21	0.05	0.13	0.13	0.09	0.56	0.56	0.04	0.52	0.52
Sat Flow, veh/h	1739	647	996	1739	980	714	1739	3440	102	1753	3104	411
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	226	0	231	108	0	306	124	647	676	59	318	322
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1739	0	1643	1739	0	1693	1739	1735	1807	1753	1749	1766
Q Serve(g_s), s	16.8	0.0	16.8	6.2	0.0	16.4	9.1	34.3	34.3	4.3	14.0	14.1
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	16.8	0.0	16.8	6.2	0.0	16.4	9.1	34.3	34.3	4.3	14.0	14.1
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.61	1.00		0.42	1.00		0.06	1.00		0.23
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	225	0	341	83	0	214	148	967	1008	76	901	910
V/C Ratio(X)	1.01	0.00	0.68	1.30	0.00	1.43	0.84	0.67	0.67	0.78	0.35	0.35
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	225	0	341	83	0	214	198	967	1008	165	901	910
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	56.6	0.0	47.5	61.9	0.0	56.8	58.6	20.3	20.3	61.6	18.6	18.7
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	61.5	0.0	5.3	199.7	0.0	219.3	20.1	3.7	3.5	15.6	1.1	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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	11.1	0.0	7.4	7.3	0.0	20.0	4.8	14.3	14.9	2.2	5.8	5.9
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	118.1	0.0	52.7	261.6	0.0	276.1	78.7	24.0	23.9	77.2	19.7	19.7
LnGrp LOS	F		D	F		F	E	C	C	E	B	B
Approach Vol, veh/h		457			414			1447			699	
Approach Delay, s/veh		85.1			272.3			28.6			24.6	
Approach LOS		F			F			C			C	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	15.7	71.9	21.4	21.0	10.2	77.4	10.8	31.6
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	14.8	63.3	16.8	16.4	12.2	65.9	6.2	27.0
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	11.1	16.1	18.8	18.4	6.3	36.3	8.2	18.8
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.1	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.8	0.0	0.8

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	69.7
HCM 6th LOS	E

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.8

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	0	5	5	0	25	5	1315	5	10	770	10
Future Vol, veh/h	5	0	5	5	0	25	5	1315	5	10	770	10
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	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	170	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
Heavy Vehicles, %	11	11	11	23	23	23	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mvmt Flow	5	0	5	5	0	26	5	1384	5	11	811	11

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	1541	2238	411	1825	-	695	822	0	0	1389	0	0
Stage 1	839	839	-	1397	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	702	1399	-	428	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.72	6.72	7.12	7.96	-	7.36	4.2	-	-	4.2	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.72	5.72	-	6.96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.72	5.72	-	6.96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.61	4.11	3.41	3.73	-	3.53	2.25	-	-	2.25	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	72	37	565	38	0	340	784	-	-	473	-	-
Stage 1	308	359	-	123	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	375	190	-	522	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	64	35	565	36	-	340	784	-	-	473	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	64	35	-	36	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	299	351	-	120	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	336	185	-	505	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	39.4	37.8	0	0.2
HCM LOS	E	E		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	784	-	-	115	141	473	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.007	-	-	0.092	0.224	0.022	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	9.6	-	-	39.4	37.8	12.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	E	E	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	0	-	-	0.3	0.8	0.1	-	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	35	50	10	20	45	15	70	1320	40	70	695	20
Future Volume (veh/h)	35	50	10	20	45	15	70	1320	40	70	695	20
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1841	1841	1841	1707	1707	1707	1841	1841	1841	1826	1826	1826
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	36	52	10	21	47	16	73	1375	42	73	724	21
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	0.96
Percent Heavy Veh, %	4	4	4	13	13	13	4	4	4	5	5	5
Cap, veh/h	135	127	24	136	103	35	94	2516	77	94	2501	73
Arrive On Green	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.73	0.73	0.05	0.73	0.73
Sat Flow, veh/h	1318	1500	289	1223	1218	415	1753	3465	106	1739	3443	100
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	36	0	62	21	0	63	73	693	724	73	365	380
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1318	0	1789	1223	0	1633	1753	1749	1822	1739	1735	1808
Q Serve(g_s), s	2.7	0.0	3.3	1.7	0.0	3.7	4.1	18.0	18.0	4.1	7.3	7.3
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	6.3	0.0	3.3	4.9	0.0	3.7	4.1	18.0	18.0	4.1	7.3	7.3
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.16	1.00		0.25	1.00		0.06	1.00		0.06
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	135	0	152	136	0	139	94	1270	1323	94	1260	1314
V/C Ratio(X)	0.27	0.00	0.41	0.15	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.55	0.55	0.78	0.29	0.29
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	241	0	295	234	0	269	191	1270	1323	190	1260	1314
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	46.6	0.0	43.4	45.7	0.0	43.6	46.7	6.2	6.2	46.7	4.7	4.7
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	1.0	0.0	1.8	0.5	0.0	2.3	12.9	1.7	1.6	13.0	0.6	0.6
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.9	0.0	1.5	0.5	0.0	1.6	2.1	5.8	6.0	2.1	2.3	2.4
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	47.6	0.0	45.1	46.2	0.0	45.9	59.6	7.9	7.8	59.8	5.3	5.3
LnGrp LOS	D		D	D		D	E	A	A	E	A	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		98			84			1490			818	
Approach Delay, s/veh		46.0			46.0			10.4			10.2	
Approach LOS		D			D			B			B	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2		4	5	6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	9.9	77.1		13.0	9.9	77.2		13.0				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.5		4.5	4.5	4.5		4.5				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	10.9	59.1		16.5	10.9	59.1		16.5				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	6.1	20.0		8.3	6.1	9.3		6.9				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	13.2		0.2	0.0	5.2		0.2				

Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh			12.9									
HCM 6th LOS			B									

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	50	0	45	80	0	305	35	1070	100	105	595	25
Future Volume (veh/h)	50	0	45	80	0	305	35	1070	100	105	595	25
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1752	1752	1752	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1811	1811	1811
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	54	0	48	86	0	328	38	1151	108	113	640	27
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Percent Heavy Veh, %	10	10	10	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6
Cap, veh/h	113	0	364	363	0	379	47	1726	162	141	1994	84
Arrive On Green	0.25	0.00	0.25	0.25	0.00	0.25	0.03	0.54	0.54	0.08	0.59	0.59
Sat Flow, veh/h	985	0	1485	1325	0	1547	1739	3206	300	1725	3364	142
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	54	0	48	86	0	328	38	622	637	113	327	340
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	985	0	1485	1325	0	1547	1739	1735	1772	1725	1721	1786
Q Serve(g_s), s	4.2	0.0	2.5	5.4	0.0	20.3	2.2	25.8	25.9	6.4	9.6	9.6
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	24.5	0.0	2.5	7.9	0.0	20.3	2.2	25.8	25.9	6.4	9.6	9.6
Prop In Lane	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		0.17	1.00		0.08
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	113	0	364	363	0	379	47	934	954	141	1020	1058
V/C Ratio(X)	0.48	0.00	0.13	0.24	0.00	0.87	0.80	0.67	0.67	0.80	0.32	0.32
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	113	0	364	363	0	379	123	934	954	216	1020	1058
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	48.4	0.0	29.5	32.6	0.0	36.2	48.4	16.6	16.6	45.1	10.2	10.2
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	3.1	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.0	18.4	25.7	3.7	3.7	11.7	0.8	0.8
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	1.4	0.0	0.9	1.7	0.0	9.4	1.3	10.4	10.6	3.2	3.6	3.7
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	51.5	0.0	29.6	32.9	0.0	54.6	74.0	20.4	20.3	56.9	11.1	11.0
LnGrp LOS	D		C	C		D	E	C	C	E	B	B
Approach Vol, veh/h		102			414			1297			780	
Approach Delay, s/veh		41.2			50.1			21.9			17.7	
Approach LOS		D			D			C			B	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2		4	5	6		8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	7.2	63.8		29.0	12.7	58.3		29.0
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.5		4.5	4.5	4.5		4.5
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	7.1	54.9		24.5	12.5	49.5		24.5
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	4.2	11.6		22.3	8.4	27.9		26.5
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	4.5		0.5	0.1	8.9		0.0

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	25.9
HCM 6th LOS	C

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	1195	5	5	725	5	10
Future Vol, veh/h	1195	5	5	725	5	10
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	93	93	93	93	93	93
Heavy Vehicles, %	5	5	6	6	7	7
Mvmt Flow	1285	5	5	780	5	11

Major/Minor	Major1		Major2		Minor1	
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	1290	0	2078	645
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	1288	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	790	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.19	-	6.705	7.005
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.905	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.505	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.257	-	3.5665	3.3665
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	518	-	50	406
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	216	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	435	-
Platoon blocked, %	-	-		-		
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	518	-	49	406
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	49	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	216	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	428	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	0	0.1	40.3
HCM LOS			E

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	118	-	-	518	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.137	-	-	0.01	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	40.3	-	-	12	0
HCM Lane LOS	E	-	-	B	A
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	0.5	-	-	0	-

Movement	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SWL	SWR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	1220	0	0	725	5	5
Future Volume (veh/h)	1220	0	0	725	5	5
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach	No			No	No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1841	1841	1811	1811	1900	1900
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	1356	0	0	806	6	6
Peak Hour Factor	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90
Percent Heavy Veh, %	4	4	6	6	0	0
Cap, veh/h	2989	0	0	1548	22	19
Arrive On Green	0.85	0.00	0.00	0.85	0.01	0.01
Sat Flow, veh/h	3681	0	0	1811	1810	1610
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	1356	0	0	806	6	6
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1749	0	0	1811	1810	1610
Q Serve(g_s), s	5.5	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.2	0.2
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	5.5	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.2	0.2
Prop In Lane		0.00	0.00		1.00	1.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	2989	0	0	1548	22	19
V/C Ratio(X)	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.52	0.27	0.31
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	2989	0	0	1548	483	429
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	29.4	29.4
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.3	6.6	8.7
Initial Q Delay(d3), s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.1	0.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh						
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	1.5	0.0	0.0	2.4	36.0	38.1
LnGrp LOS	A			A	D	D
Approach Vol, veh/h	1356			806	12	
Approach Delay, s/veh	1.5			2.4	37.0	
Approach LOS	A			A	D	

Timer - Assigned Phs	2				6	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	55.3				55.3	4.7
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.0				4.0	4.0
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	36.0				36.0	16.0
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	7.5				9.0	2.2
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	12.6				6.8	0.0

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	2.1
HCM 6th LOS	A

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	0	0	15	25	0	10	80	1210	25	10	710	5
Future Volume (veh/h)	0	0	15	25	0	10	80	1210	25	10	710	5
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1900	1900	1900	1707	1707	1707	1841	1841	1841	1826	1826	1826
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	0	0	16	27	0	11	87	1315	27	11	772	5
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	0	0	0	13	13	13	4	4	4	5	5	5
Cap, veh/h	111	0	62	148	0	56	583	1479	30	246	1491	10
Arrive On Green	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82
Sat Flow, veh/h	1426	0	1610	1275	0	1447	683	1797	37	397	1812	12
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	0	0	16	27	0	11	87	0	1342	11	0	777
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1426	0	1610	1275	0	1447	683	0	1834	397	0	1824
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.4	0.0	0.5	2.9	0.0	31.4	1.2	0.0	8.6
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	0.0	0.0	0.6	2.0	0.0	0.5	11.5	0.0	31.4	32.6	0.0	8.6
Prop In Lane	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		0.02	1.00		0.01
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	111	0	62	148	0	56	583	0	1509	246	0	1501
V/C Ratio(X)	0.00	0.00	0.26	0.18	0.00	0.20	0.15	0.00	0.89	0.04	0.00	0.52
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	406	0	396	412	0	356	583	0	1509	246	0	1501
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	0.0	0.0	30.3	31.3	0.0	30.3	3.6	0.0	3.8	14.6	0.0	1.8
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.6	0.0	1.7	0.5	0.0	8.2	0.3	0.0	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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.0	5.1	0.1	0.0	1.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	0.0	0.0	32.5	31.9	0.0	31.9	4.1	0.0	12.0	14.9	0.0	3.1
LnGrp LOS			C	C		C	A		B	B		A
Approach Vol, veh/h		16			38			1429			788	
Approach Delay, s/veh		32.5			31.9			11.5			3.2	
Approach LOS		C			C			B			A	

Timer - Assigned Phs	2	4	6	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	58.0	7.0	58.0	7.0
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	40.0	16.0	40.0	16.0
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	33.4	2.6	34.6	4.0
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	5.5	0.0	2.6	0.1

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	9.1
HCM 6th LOS	A

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	10	10	5	905	1535	30
Future Vol, veh/h	10	10	5	905	1535	30
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	2	2	2	0	0	2
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	175	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	90	90	90	90	90	90
Heavy Vehicles, %	6	6	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	11	11	6	1006	1706	33

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	2242	874	1741	0	-	0
Stage 1	1725	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	517	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.92	7.02	4.14	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.92	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.92	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.56	3.36	2.22	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	34	285	357	-	-	-
Stage 1	124	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	552	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	33	284	356	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	99	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	122	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	551	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	33.8	0.1	0
HCM LOS	D		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	356	-	147	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.016	-	0.151	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	15.3	-	33.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	C	-	D	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	0	-	0.5	-	-

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/20th St E - PM Peak Hour - Future 2035 Baseline (Site Folder: General)]

Future (2035) PM Peak Hour

Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3u	U	1	2.0	1	2.0	0.427	13.4	LOS B	2.5	62.4	0.41	0.50	0.41	37.4
3	L2	50	2.0	54	2.0	0.427	10.9	LOS B	2.5	62.4	0.41	0.50	0.41	36.5
8	T1	775	2.0	842	2.0	0.427	5.0	LOS A	2.5	62.8	0.41	0.50	0.41	36.5
18	R2	100	2.0	109	2.0	0.427	5.1	LOS A	2.5	62.8	0.41	0.49	0.41	35.4
Approach		926	2.0	1007	2.0	0.427	5.4	LOS A	2.5	62.8	0.41	0.49	0.41	36.4
East: 20th St E														
1u	U	1	1.0	1	1.0	0.208	15.2	LOS B	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	35.9
1	L2	70	1.0	76	1.0	0.208	12.7	LOS B	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	35.0
6	T1	5	1.0	5	1.0	0.208	6.9	LOS A	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	34.9
16	R2	60	1.0	65	1.0	0.208	6.8	LOS A	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	33.8
Approach		136	1.0	148	1.0	0.208	9.9	LOS A	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	34.5
North: Meridian Ave E														
7u	U	1	2.0	1	2.0	0.689	13.5	LOS B	6.1	153.9	0.53	0.52	0.53	37.0
7	L2	95	2.0	103	2.0	0.689	11.0	LOS B	6.1	153.9	0.53	0.52	0.53	36.0
4	T1	1355	2.0	1473	2.0	0.689	5.2	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.53	0.51	0.53	36.1
14	R2	100	2.0	109	2.0	0.689	5.2	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.52	0.49	0.52	35.0
Approach		1551	2.0	1686	2.0	0.689	5.6	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.53	0.51	0.53	36.0
West: 20th St E														
5u	U	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.330	18.0	LOS B	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	34.6
5	L2	70	0.0	76	0.0	0.330	15.5	LOS B	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	33.7
2	T1	10	0.0	11	0.0	0.330	9.7	LOS A	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	33.6
12	R2	70	0.0	76	0.0	0.330	9.6	LOS A	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	32.6
Approach		151	0.0	164	0.0	0.330	12.4	LOS B	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	33.2
All Vehicles		2764	1.8	3004	1.8	0.689	6.1	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.50	0.54	0.51	35.9

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.2

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	15	835	5	20	1465
Future Vol, veh/h	5	15	835	5	20	1465
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	9	10	0	9	10	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	250	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	0	-	-	0
Grade, %	0	-	0	-	-	0
Peak Hour Factor	88	88	88	88	88	88
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	3	3	3	3
Mvmt Flow	6	17	949	6	23	1665

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1850	498	0	0	965	0
Stage 1	962	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	888	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	-	-	4.16	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	2.23	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	67	523	-	-	703	-
Stage 1	336	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	367	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %			-	-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	64	515	-	-	697	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	185	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	333	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	352	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	15.8	0	0.1
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	-	356	697	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	0.064	0.033	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	-	-	15.8	10.3	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	-	C	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	-	-	0.2	0.1	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	170	120	135	40	140	50	140	630	50	115	1110	255
Future Volume (veh/h)	170	120	135	40	140	50	140	630	50	115	1110	255
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		0.99	1.00		0.99	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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1856	1856	1856	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1856	1856	1856
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	189	133	150	44	156	56	156	700	56	128	1233	283
Peak Hour Factor	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90
Percent Heavy Veh, %	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3
Cap, veh/h	214	167	188	65	165	59	181	1742	139	152	1447	328
Arrive On Green	0.12	0.21	0.21	0.04	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.52	0.52	0.09	0.51	0.51
Sat Flow, veh/h	1767	793	895	1781	1310	470	1781	3332	266	1767	2852	647
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	189	0	283	44	0	212	156	373	383	128	756	760
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1767	0	1688	1781	0	1780	1781	1777	1821	1767	1763	1736
Q Serve(g_s), s	13.7	0.0	20.7	3.2	0.0	15.4	11.2	16.5	16.5	9.3	48.1	49.9
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	13.7	0.0	20.7	3.2	0.0	15.4	11.2	16.5	16.5	9.3	48.1	49.9
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.53	1.00		0.26	1.00		0.15	1.00		0.37
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	214	0	355	65	0	225	181	929	952	152	894	881
V/C Ratio(X)	0.88	0.00	0.80	0.67	0.00	0.94	0.86	0.40	0.40	0.84	0.85	0.86
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	228	0	355	85	0	225	203	929	952	166	894	881
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	56.2	0.0	48.7	61.8	0.0	56.3	57.5	18.7	18.7	58.5	27.6	28.1
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	29.8	0.0	12.0	12.7	0.0	44.5	27.4	1.3	1.3	28.7	9.7	10.9
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	7.8	0.0	9.8	1.7	0.0	9.6	6.4	7.0	7.2	5.3	21.8	22.5
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	86.1	0.0	60.7	74.5	0.0	100.9	84.8	20.0	20.0	87.3	37.3	39.0
LnGrp LOS	F		E	E		F	F	C	B	F	D	D
Approach Vol, veh/h		472			256			912			1644	
Approach Delay, s/veh		70.8			96.3			31.1			42.0	
Approach LOS		E			F			C			D	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	17.8	70.9	20.3	21.0	15.8	72.9	9.4	32.0
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	14.8	63.3	16.8	16.4	12.2	65.9	6.2	27.0
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	13.2	51.9	15.7	17.4	11.3	18.5	5.2	22.7
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.1	7.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.6

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	47.3
HCM 6th LOS	D

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	1.1

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	10	0	5	5	0	10	5	820	10	20	1240	20
Future Vol, veh/h	10	0	5	5	0	10	5	820	10	20	1240	20
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	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	170	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	11	0	6	6	0	11	6	921	11	22	1393	22

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	1921	2392	708	1680	-	466	1415	0	0	932	0	0
Stage 1	1448	1448	-	939	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	473	944	-	741	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.5	6.5	6.9	7.5	-	6.9	4.14	-	-	4.14	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.5	5.5	-	6.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.5	5.5	-	6.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	4	3.3	3.5	-	3.3	2.22	-	-	2.22	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	42	34	382	63	0	549	478	-	-	730	-	-
Stage 1	140	198	-	288	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	546	344	-	379	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	39	32	382	59	-	549	478	-	-	730	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	39	32	-	59	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	136	192	-	281	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	521	335	-	362	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	94.9	32.9	0.1	0.2
HCM LOS	F	D		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	478	-	-	56	146	730	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.012	-	-	0.301	0.115	0.031	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	12.6	-	-	94.9	32.9	10.1	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	B	-	-	F	D	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	0	-	-	1.1	0.4	0.1	-	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	25	50	70	30	10	70	5	740	25	30	1195	35
Future Volume (veh/h)	25	50	70	30	10	70	5	740	25	30	1195	35
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		0.98
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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1900	1900	1900	1856	1856	1856	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	28	56	79	34	11	79	6	831	28	34	1343	39
Peak Hour Factor	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89
Percent Heavy Veh, %	0	0	0	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	169	89	126	135	24	175	11	2509	85	44	2585	75
Arrive On Green	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.01	0.72	0.72	0.02	0.73	0.73
Sat Flow, veh/h	1323	712	1004	1243	195	1400	1781	3508	118	1781	3524	102
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	28	0	135	34	0	90	6	421	438	34	676	706
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1323	0	1716	1243	0	1595	1781	1777	1849	1781	1777	1849
Q Serve(g_s), s	2.0	0.0	7.5	2.7	0.0	5.2	0.3	8.8	8.8	1.9	16.4	16.4
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	7.2	0.0	7.5	10.1	0.0	5.2	0.3	8.8	8.8	1.9	16.4	16.4
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.59	1.00		0.88	1.00		0.06	1.00		0.06
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	169	0	215	135	0	200	11	1271	1322	44	1303	1357
V/C Ratio(X)	0.17	0.00	0.63	0.25	0.00	0.45	0.55	0.33	0.33	0.78	0.52	0.52
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	248	0	318	209	0	295	80	1271	1322	134	1303	1357
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	43.9	0.0	41.5	46.3	0.0	40.5	49.6	5.3	5.3	48.5	5.7	5.7
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.5	0.0	3.0	1.0	0.0	1.6	36.6	0.7	0.7	25.3	1.5	1.4
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.7	0.0	3.3	0.8	0.0	2.1	0.3	2.9	3.0	1.1	5.2	5.4
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	44.4	0.0	44.5	47.3	0.0	42.1	86.2	6.0	6.0	73.8	7.2	7.2
LnGrp LOS	D		D	D		D	F	A	A	E	A	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		163			124			865			1416	
Approach Delay, s/veh		44.5			43.5			6.6			8.8	
Approach LOS		D			D			A			A	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2		4	5	6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	6.9	76.0		17.0	5.1	77.9		17.0				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.5		4.5	4.5	4.5		4.5				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	7.5	60.5		18.5	4.5	63.5		18.5				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	3.9	10.8		9.5	2.3	18.4		12.1				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	6.2		0.5	0.0	13.1		0.2				

Intersection Summary			
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh		12.0	
HCM 6th LOS		B	

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	20	5	40	95	5	180	25	570	30	465	790	50
Future Volume (veh/h)	20	5	40	95	5	180	25	570	30	465	790	50
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		0.98	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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1841	1841	1841	1856	1856	1856	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	22	5	43	102	5	194	27	613	32	500	849	54
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Percent Heavy Veh, %	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	117	26	224	251	6	246	38	1373	72	544	2320	148
Arrive On Green	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.02	0.40	0.40	0.31	0.68	0.68
Sat Flow, veh/h	1164	163	1399	1344	40	1536	1781	3435	179	1781	3392	216
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	22	0	48	102	0	199	27	317	328	500	445	458
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1164	0	1561	1344	0	1576	1781	1777	1838	1781	1777	1831
Q Serve(g_s), s	1.9	0.0	2.7	7.1	0.0	12.1	1.5	13.0	13.1	27.1	10.6	10.6
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	14.0	0.0	2.7	9.8	0.0	12.1	1.5	13.0	13.1	27.1	10.6	10.6
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.90	1.00		0.97	1.00		0.10	1.00		0.12
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	117	0	250	251	0	252	38	710	735	544	1215	1252
V/C Ratio(X)	0.19	0.00	0.19	0.41	0.00	0.79	0.72	0.45	0.45	0.92	0.37	0.37
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	118	0	251	253	0	254	109	710	735	768	1215	1252
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	47.1	0.0	36.4	40.6	0.0	40.4	48.6	21.9	21.9	33.6	6.7	6.7
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.8	0.0	0.4	1.1	0.0	15.3	22.4	2.0	2.0	12.7	0.9	0.8
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.6	0.0	1.0	2.4	0.0	5.7	0.9	5.6	5.8	13.2	3.7	3.8
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	47.9	0.0	36.8	41.7	0.0	55.7	71.1	23.9	23.9	46.3	7.5	7.5
LnGrp LOS	D		D	D		E	E	C	C	D	A	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		70			301			672			1403	
Approach Delay, s/veh		40.3			50.9			25.8			21.3	
Approach LOS		D			D			C			C	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2		4	5	6		8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	6.6	72.9		20.5	35.0	44.5		20.5
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.5		4.5	4.5	4.5		4.5
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	6.1	64.3		16.1	43.1	27.3		16.1
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	3.5	12.6		14.1	29.1	15.1		16.0
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	6.7		0.3	1.4	3.0		0.0

Intersection Summary		
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh		26.7
HCM 6th LOS		C

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.9

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	620	5	10	925	5	10
Future Vol, veh/h	620	5	10	925	5	10
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	63	63	63	63	63	63
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	3	3	0	0
Mvmt Flow	984	8	16	1468	8	16

Major/Minor	Major1		Major2		Minor1	
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	992	0	2488	496
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	988	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	1500	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.145	-	6.6	6.9
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.8	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.4	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.2285	-	3.5	3.3
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	690	-	29	525
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	326	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	206	-
Platoon blocked, %	-	-		-		
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	690	-	25	525
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	25	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	326	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	180	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	0	0.1	84.1
HCM LOS			F

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	68	-	-	690	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.35	-	-	0.023	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	84.1	-	-	10.3	0
HCM Lane LOS	F	-	-	B	A
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	1.3	-	-	0.1	-

Movement	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SWL	SWR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	620	0	0	930	0	5
Future Volume (veh/h)	620	0	0	930	0	5
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach	No			No	No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1856	1856	1900	1900
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	660	0	0	989	0	5
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	3	3	0	0
Cap, veh/h	3097	0	0	1617	10	9
Arrive On Green	0.87	0.00	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.01
Sat Flow, veh/h	3741	0	0	1856	1810	1610
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	660	0	0	989	0	5
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1777	0	0	1856	1810	1610
Q Serve(g_s), s	1.9	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.2
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	1.9	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.2
Prop In Lane		0.00	0.00		1.00	1.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	3097	0	0	1617	10	9
V/C Ratio(X)	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.61	0.00	0.58
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	3097	0	0	1617	445	396
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	0.7	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	32.3
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	50.4
Initial Q Delay(d3), s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.2
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh						
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	0.8	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	82.6
LnGrp LOS	A			A		F
Approach Vol, veh/h	660			989	5	
Approach Delay, s/veh	0.8			2.9	82.6	
Approach LOS	A			A	F	

Timer - Assigned Phs	2				6	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	60.7				60.7	4.3
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.0				4.0	4.0
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	41.0				41.0	16.0
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	3.9				11.5	2.2
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	5.2				9.8	0.0

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	2.3
HCM 6th LOS	A

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	5	0	20	15	0	10	10	605	35	5	920	5
Future Volume (veh/h)	5	0	20	15	0	10	10	605	35	5	920	5
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		0.98	0.97		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1885	1885	1885	1856	1856	1856
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	5	0	21	16	0	11	11	637	37	5	968	5
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Percent Heavy Veh, %	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3
Cap, veh/h	175	0	71	164	0	72	464	1420	83	647	1485	8
Arrive On Green	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81
Sat Flow, veh/h	1426	0	1574	1374	0	1610	582	1764	102	758	1844	10
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	5	0	21	16	0	11	11	0	674	5	0	973
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1426	0	1574	1374	0	1610	582	0	1867	758	0	1854
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.2	0.0	0.8	0.7	0.0	0.4	0.5	0.0	6.6	0.1	0.0	12.9
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	0.6	0.0	0.8	1.5	0.0	0.4	13.4	0.0	6.6	6.7	0.0	12.9
Prop In Lane	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		0.05	1.00		0.01
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	175	0	71	164	0	72	464	0	1503	647	0	1493
V/C Ratio(X)	0.03	0.00	0.30	0.10	0.00	0.15	0.02	0.00	0.45	0.01	0.00	0.65
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	493	0	422	471	0	432	464	0	1503	647	0	1493
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	27.8	0.0	27.7	28.4	0.0	27.6	5.1	0.0	1.8	2.8	0.0	2.4
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.1	0.0	2.3	0.3	0.0	1.0	0.1	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.7
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	27.9	0.0	30.1	28.7	0.0	28.5	5.2	0.0	2.8	2.8	0.0	4.6
LnGrp LOS	C		C	C		C	A		A	A		A
Approach Vol, veh/h		26			27			685			978	
Approach Delay, s/veh		29.6			28.6			2.8			4.6	
Approach LOS		C			C			A			A	

Timer - Assigned Phs	2	4	6	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	52.8	7.2	52.8	7.2
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	34.9	16.1	34.9	16.1
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	15.4	2.8	14.9	3.5
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	4.8	0.0	8.1	0.0

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	4.6
HCM 6th LOS	A

Appendix E: Future (2035) Build Conditions – Alternative B

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	25	5	5	1575	610	15
Future Vol, veh/h	25	5	5	1575	610	15
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	1	1	1	0	0	1
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	175	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	94	94	94	94	94	94
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	5	5	6	6
Mvmt Flow	27	5	5	1676	649	16

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1507	335	666	0	-	0
Stage 1	658	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	849	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	4.2	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	2.25	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	114	667	899	-	-	-
Stage 1	482	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	385	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	113	666	898	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	246	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	479	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	385	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	19.8	0	0
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	898	-	275	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.006	-	0.116	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	9	-	19.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	C	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	0	-	0.4	-	-

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/20th St E - AM Peak Hour - Future 2035 Baseline (Site Folder: General)]

Future (2035) PM Peak Hour

Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3u	U	1	5.0	1	5.0	0.696	13.6	LOS B	6.4	166.3	0.54	0.51	0.54	36.9
3	L2	60	5.0	65	5.0	0.696	11.1	LOS B	6.4	166.3	0.54	0.51	0.54	36.0
8	T1	1400	5.0	1522	5.0	0.696	5.2	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.53	0.50	0.53	36.0
18	R2	65	5.0	71	5.0	0.696	5.3	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.53	0.49	0.53	34.9
Approach		1526	5.0	1659	5.0	0.696	5.5	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.53	0.50	0.53	36.0
East: 20th St E														
1u	U	1	3.0	1	3.0	0.418	19.6	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	33.7
1	L2	80	3.0	87	3.0	0.418	17.1	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	32.9
6	T1	10	3.0	11	3.0	0.418	11.3	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	32.8
16	R2	85	3.0	92	3.0	0.418	11.1	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	31.9
Approach		176	3.0	191	3.0	0.418	13.9	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	32.4
North: Meridian Ave E														
7u	U	1	6.0	1	6.0	0.296	13.2	LOS B	1.5	39.8	0.36	0.47	0.36	37.7
7	L2	15	6.0	16	6.0	0.296	10.7	LOS B	1.5	39.8	0.36	0.47	0.36	36.7
4	T1	545	6.0	592	6.0	0.296	4.9	LOS A	1.5	40.0	0.35	0.47	0.35	36.7
14	R2	60	6.0	65	6.0	0.296	4.9	LOS A	1.5	40.0	0.35	0.46	0.35	35.5
Approach		621	6.0	675	6.0	0.296	5.0	LOS A	1.5	40.0	0.35	0.47	0.35	36.6
West: 20th St E														
5u	U	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.195	14.5	LOS B	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	35.9
5	L2	90	0.0	98	0.0	0.195	12.0	LOS B	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	35.0
2	T1	10	0.0	11	0.0	0.195	6.2	LOS A	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	34.9
12	R2	45	0.0	49	0.0	0.195	6.1	LOS A	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	33.9
Approach		146	0.0	159	0.0	0.195	9.8	LOS A	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	34.7
All Vehicles		2469	4.8	2684	4.8	0.696	6.2	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.51	0.54	0.52	35.7

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.2

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	10	1515	5	10	660
Future Vol, veh/h	5	10	1515	5	10	660
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	1	1	0	1	1	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	250	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	0	-	-	0
Grade, %	0	-	0	-	-	0
Peak Hour Factor	94	94	94	94	94	94
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	5	5	4	4
Mvmt Flow	5	11	1612	5	11	702

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1990	811	0	0	1618	0
Stage 1	1616	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	374	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	-	-	4.18	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	2.24	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	54	327	-	-	390	-
Stage 1	151	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	672	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %			-	-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	52	326	-	-	390	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	125	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	151	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	653	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	23.4	0	0.2
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	-	212	390	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	0.075	0.027	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	-	-	23.4	14.5	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	-	C	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	-	-	0.2	0.1	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	210	85	130	100	165	120	115	1195	35	55	525	70
Future Volume (veh/h)	210	85	130	100	165	120	115	1195	35	55	525	70
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1841	1841	1841
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	226	91	140	108	177	129	124	1285	38	59	565	75
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Percent Heavy Veh, %	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4
Cap, veh/h	251	170	261	132	190	138	149	1636	48	75	1343	178
Arrive On Green	0.14	0.26	0.26	0.08	0.19	0.19	0.09	0.48	0.48	0.04	0.43	0.43
Sat Flow, veh/h	1739	648	996	1739	980	714	1739	3440	102	1753	3104	411
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	226	0	231	108	0	306	124	647	676	59	318	322
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1739	0	1644	1739	0	1695	1739	1735	1807	1753	1749	1766
Q Serve(g_s), s	16.6	0.0	15.7	8.0	0.0	23.1	9.1	40.6	40.7	4.3	16.4	16.5
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	16.6	0.0	15.7	8.0	0.0	23.1	9.1	40.6	40.7	4.3	16.4	16.5
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.61	1.00		0.42	1.00		0.06	1.00		0.23
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	251	0	430	132	0	328	149	825	860	75	757	764
V/C Ratio(X)	0.90	0.00	0.54	0.82	0.00	0.93	0.83	0.78	0.79	0.78	0.42	0.42
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	273	0	430	214	0	331	238	825	860	90	757	764
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	54.7	0.0	41.2	59.2	0.0	51.6	58.5	28.5	28.5	61.6	25.6	25.6
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	29.1	0.0	1.3	12.0	0.0	32.4	12.7	7.4	7.2	30.1	1.7	1.7
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	9.2	0.0	6.5	3.9	0.0	12.7	4.5	18.0	18.8	2.6	7.1	7.2
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	83.8	0.0	42.5	71.2	0.0	84.0	71.2	35.9	35.7	91.7	27.3	27.3
LnGrp LOS	F		D	E		F	E	D	D	F	C	C
Approach Vol, veh/h		457			414			1447			699	
Approach Delay, s/veh		63.0			80.7			38.8			32.7	
Approach LOS		E			F			D			C	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	15.7	61.2	23.3	29.8	10.2	66.7	14.5	38.6
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	17.8	47.7	20.4	25.4	6.7	58.8	16.0	29.8
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	11.1	18.5	18.6	25.1	6.3	42.7	10.0	17.7
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.1	4.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	8.1	0.1	1.0

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	46.8
HCM 6th LOS	D

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	0	10	0	0	30	0	1320	15	0	780	15
Future Vol, veh/h	0	0	10	0	0	30	0	1320	15	0	780	15
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	-	-	Yield	-	-	Yield	-	-	Free	-	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
Heavy Vehicles, %	11	11	1	1	23	23	1	1	1	5	1	5
Mvmt Flow	0	0	11	0	0	32	0	1389	16	0	821	16

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	-	-	419	-	-	695	-	0	-	-	-	0
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	6.92	-	-	7.36	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	3.31	-	-	3.53	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	0	0	586	0	0	340	0	-	0	0	-	-
Stage 1	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	-
Stage 2	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-			-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	586	-	-	340	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	11.3	16.7	0	0
HCM LOS	B	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	-	586	340	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.018	0.093	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	-	11.3	16.7	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	B	C	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	-	0.1	0.3	-	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	35	50	10	20	45	15	70	1320	40	85	695	20
Future Volume (veh/h)	35	50	10	20	45	15	70	1320	40	85	695	20
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1885	1841	1841	1707	1707	1885	1841	1885	1841	1885	1885	1885
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	37	52	10	21	47	16	73	1389	42	89	732	21
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.96	0.95	0.96	0.95	0.95	0.95
Percent Heavy Veh, %	1	4	4	13	13	1	4	1	4	1	1	1
Cap, veh/h	137	128	25	136	104	35	94	2928	88	340	2583	74
Arrive On Green	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.82	0.82	0.73	0.73	0.73
Sat Flow, veh/h	1350	1500	289	1223	1218	415	1753	3550	107	377	3556	102
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	37	0	62	21	0	63	73	700	731	89	369	384
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1350	0	1789	1223	0	1633	1753	1791	1866	377	1791	1867
Q Serve(g_s), s	2.7	0.0	3.3	1.7	0.0	3.7	4.1	11.2	11.3	8.9	7.1	7.1
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	6.4	0.0	3.3	4.9	0.0	3.7	4.1	11.2	11.3	10.3	7.1	7.1
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.16	1.00		0.25	1.00		0.06	1.00		0.05
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	137	0	152	136	0	139	94	1478	1539	340	1301	1356
V/C Ratio(X)	0.27	0.00	0.41	0.15	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.47	0.47	0.26	0.28	0.28
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	245	0	295	234	0	269	184	1478	1539	340	1301	1356
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	46.6	0.0	43.4	45.7	0.0	43.5	46.7	2.5	2.5	5.4	4.7	4.7
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	1.0	0.0	1.7	0.5	0.0	2.3	12.9	1.1	1.1	1.9	0.5	0.5
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.9	0.0	1.5	0.5	0.0	1.6	2.1	2.5	2.6	0.8	2.4	2.5
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	47.6	0.0	45.1	46.2	0.0	45.8	59.7	3.6	3.6	7.3	5.3	5.2
LnGrp LOS	D		D	D		D	E	A	A	A	A	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		99			84			1504			842	
Approach Delay, s/veh		46.0			45.9			6.3			5.5	
Approach LOS		D			D			A			A	

Timer - Assigned Phs		2		4	5	6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s		87.0		13.0	9.8	77.2		13.0				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s		4.5		4.5	4.5	4.5		4.5				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s		74.5		16.5	10.5	59.5		16.5				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s		13.3		8.4	6.1	12.3		6.9				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s		14.7		0.2	0.0	7.9		0.2				

Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh			8.9									
HCM 6th LOS			A									

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	50	0	45	80	0	305	40	1070	100	105	595	25
Future Volume (veh/h)	50	0	45	80	0	305	40	1070	100	105	595	25
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1752	1752	1752	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1811	1811	1811
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	54	0	48	86	0	328	43	1151	108	113	640	27
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Percent Heavy Veh, %	10	10	10	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6
Cap, veh/h	126	0	379	377	0	395	54	1694	159	141	1947	82
Arrive On Green	0.25	0.00	0.25	0.25	0.00	0.25	0.03	0.53	0.53	0.08	0.58	0.58
Sat Flow, veh/h	985	0	1485	1325	0	1547	1739	3206	300	1725	3364	142
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	54	0	48	86	0	328	43	622	637	113	327	340
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	985	0	1485	1325	0	1547	1739	1735	1772	1725	1721	1786
Q Serve(g_s), s	5.5	0.0	2.5	5.3	0.0	20.0	2.5	26.4	26.5	6.4	9.9	9.9
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	25.5	0.0	2.5	7.8	0.0	20.0	2.5	26.4	26.5	6.4	9.9	9.9
Prop In Lane	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		0.17	1.00		0.08
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	126	0	379	377	0	395	54	917	936	141	996	1034
V/C Ratio(X)	0.43	0.00	0.13	0.23	0.00	0.83	0.79	0.68	0.68	0.80	0.33	0.33
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	126	0	379	377	0	395	120	917	936	216	996	1034
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	47.3	0.0	28.7	31.7	0.0	35.2	48.1	17.3	17.4	45.1	10.9	11.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	2.3	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.0	14.0	22.3	4.0	4.0	11.7	0.9	0.9
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	1.4	0.0	0.9	1.7	0.0	8.8	1.4	10.7	11.0	3.2	3.7	3.9
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	49.6	0.0	28.8	32.0	0.0	49.2	70.4	21.4	21.3	56.9	11.8	11.8
LnGrp LOS	D		C	C		D	E	C	C	E	B	B
Approach Vol, veh/h		102			414			1302			780	
Approach Delay, s/veh		39.8			45.6			23.0			18.3	
Approach LOS		D			D			C			B	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2		4	5	6		8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	7.6	62.4		30.0	12.7	57.3		30.0
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.5		4.5	4.5	4.5		4.5
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	6.9	54.1		25.5	12.5	48.5		25.5
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	4.5	11.9		22.0	8.4	28.5		27.5
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	4.5		0.8	0.1	8.6		0.0

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	25.9
HCM 6th LOS	C

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.1

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	1195	10	0	730	0	10
Future Vol, veh/h	1195	10	0	730	0	10
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	93	93	93	93	93	93
Heavy Vehicles, %	5	5	6	6	7	7
Mvmt Flow	1285	11	0	785	0	11

Major/Minor	Major1		Major2		Minor1	
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	-	-	-	648
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	-	-	-	7.04
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	-	-	-	3.37
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	0	-	0	401
Stage 1	-	-	0	-	0	-
Stage 2	-	-	0	-	0	-
Platoon blocked, %	-	-		-		
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-	401
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	0	0	14.2
HCM LOS			B

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	401	-	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.027	-	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	14.2	-	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	B	-	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	0.1	-	-	-

Movement	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SWL	SWR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	1220	0	5	725	5	5
Future Volume (veh/h)	1220	0	5	725	5	5
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach	No			No	No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1841	1841	1811	1811	1900	1900
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	1356	0	6	806	6	6
Peak Hour Factor	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90
Percent Heavy Veh, %	4	4	6	6	0	0
Cap, veh/h	2989	0	65	2867	22	19
Arrive On Green	0.85	0.00	0.85	0.85	0.01	0.01
Sat Flow, veh/h	3681	0	5	3438	1810	1610
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	1356	0	434	378	6	6
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1749	0	1794	1566	1810	1610
Q Serve(g_s), s	5.5	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.2	0.2
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	5.5	0.0	2.7	2.8	0.2	0.2
Prop In Lane		0.00	0.01		1.00	1.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	2989	0	1594	1338	22	19
V/C Ratio(X)	0.45	0.00	0.27	0.28	0.27	0.31
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	2989	0	1594	1338	483	429
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	1.0	0.0	0.8	0.8	29.4	29.4
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.5	6.6	8.7
Initial Q Delay(d3), s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh						
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	1.5	0.0	1.3	1.4	36.0	38.1
LnGrp LOS	A		A	A	D	D
Approach Vol, veh/h	1356			812	12	
Approach Delay, s/veh	1.5			1.3	37.0	
Approach LOS	A			A	D	

Timer - Assigned Phs	2				6	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	55.3				55.3	4.7
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.0				4.0	4.0
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	36.0				36.0	16.0
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	7.5				4.8	2.2
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	12.6				6.0	0.0

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	1.6
HCM 6th LOS	A

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	0	0	15	25	0	10	80	1210	25	10	710	5
Future Volume (veh/h)	0	0	15	25	0	10	80	1210	25	10	710	5
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1900	1900	1900	1707	1707	1707	1841	1841	1841	1826	1826	1826
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	0	0	16	27	0	11	87	1315	27	11	772	5
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	0	0	0	13	13	13	4	4	4	5	5	5
Cap, veh/h	120	0	64	158	0	57	638	2840	58	397	2864	19
Arrive On Green	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81
Sat Flow, veh/h	1426	0	1610	1275	0	1447	683	3505	72	397	3534	23
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	0	0	16	27	0	11	87	656	686	11	379	398
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1426	0	1610	1275	0	1447	683	1749	1828	397	1735	1822
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.3	0.0	0.4	2.1	6.8	6.8	0.5	3.2	3.2
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.8	0.0	0.4	5.3	6.8	6.8	7.4	3.2	3.2
Prop In Lane	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		0.04	1.00		0.01
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	120	0	64	158	0	57	638	1417	1481	397	1406	1476
V/C Ratio(X)	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.17	0.00	0.19	0.14	0.46	0.46	0.03	0.27	0.27
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	444	0	429	448	0	386	638	1417	1481	397	1406	1476
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	0.0	0.0	28.0	28.8	0.0	27.9	2.0	1.7	1.7	2.8	1.4	1.4
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.5	0.0	1.6	0.4	1.1	1.0	0.1	0.5	0.4
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.3	0.3
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	0.0	0.0	30.0	29.3	0.0	29.5	2.5	2.8	2.8	3.0	1.9	1.8
LnGrp LOS			C	C		C	A	A	A	A	A	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		16			38			1429			788	
Approach Delay, s/veh		30.0			29.4			2.8			1.9	
Approach LOS		C			C			A			A	

Timer - Assigned Phs	2	4	6	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	53.1	6.9	53.1	6.9
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	35.0	16.0	35.0	16.0
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	8.8	2.6	9.4	3.8
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	12.0	0.0	5.5	0.1

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	3.1
HCM 6th LOS	A

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	10	10	5	905	1535	30
Future Vol, veh/h	10	10	5	905	1535	30
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	2	2	2	0	0	2
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	175	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	90	90	90	90	90	90
Heavy Vehicles, %	6	6	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	11	11	6	1006	1706	33

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	2242	874	1741	0	-	0
Stage 1	1725	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	517	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.92	7.02	4.14	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.92	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.92	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.56	3.36	2.22	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	34	285	357	-	-	-
Stage 1	124	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	552	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	33	284	356	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	99	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	122	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	551	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	33.8	0.1	0
HCM LOS	D		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	356	-	147	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.016	-	0.151	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	15.3	-	33.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	C	-	D	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	0	-	0.5	-	-

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/20th St E - PM Peak Hour - Future 2035 Baseline (Site Folder: General)]

Future (2035) PM Peak Hour

Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3u	U	1	2.0	1	2.0	0.427	13.4	LOS B	2.5	62.4	0.41	0.50	0.41	37.4
3	L2	50	2.0	54	2.0	0.427	10.9	LOS B	2.5	62.4	0.41	0.50	0.41	36.5
8	T1	775	2.0	842	2.0	0.427	5.0	LOS A	2.5	62.8	0.41	0.50	0.41	36.5
18	R2	100	2.0	109	2.0	0.427	5.1	LOS A	2.5	62.8	0.41	0.49	0.41	35.4
Approach		926	2.0	1007	2.0	0.427	5.4	LOS A	2.5	62.8	0.41	0.49	0.41	36.4
East: 20th St E														
1u	U	1	1.0	1	1.0	0.208	15.2	LOS B	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	35.9
1	L2	70	1.0	76	1.0	0.208	12.7	LOS B	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	35.0
6	T1	5	1.0	5	1.0	0.208	6.9	LOS A	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	34.9
16	R2	60	1.0	65	1.0	0.208	6.8	LOS A	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	33.8
Approach		136	1.0	148	1.0	0.208	9.9	LOS A	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	34.5
North: Meridian Ave E														
7u	U	1	2.0	1	2.0	0.689	13.5	LOS B	6.1	153.9	0.53	0.52	0.53	37.0
7	L2	95	2.0	103	2.0	0.689	11.0	LOS B	6.1	153.9	0.53	0.52	0.53	36.0
4	T1	1355	2.0	1473	2.0	0.689	5.2	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.53	0.51	0.53	36.1
14	R2	100	2.0	109	2.0	0.689	5.2	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.52	0.49	0.52	35.0
Approach		1551	2.0	1686	2.0	0.689	5.6	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.53	0.51	0.53	36.0
West: 20th St E														
5u	U	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.330	18.0	LOS B	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	34.6
5	L2	70	0.0	76	0.0	0.330	15.5	LOS B	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	33.7
2	T1	10	0.0	11	0.0	0.330	9.7	LOS A	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	33.6
12	R2	70	0.0	76	0.0	0.330	9.6	LOS A	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	32.6
Approach		151	0.0	164	0.0	0.330	12.4	LOS B	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	33.2
All Vehicles		2764	1.8	3004	1.8	0.689	6.1	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.50	0.54	0.51	35.9

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.2

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	15	835	5	20	1465
Future Vol, veh/h	5	15	835	5	20	1465
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	9	10	0	9	10	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	250	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	0	-	-	0
Grade, %	0	-	0	-	-	0
Peak Hour Factor	88	88	88	88	88	88
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	3	3	3	3
Mvmt Flow	6	17	949	6	23	1665

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1850	498	0	0	965	0
Stage 1	962	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	888	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	-	-	4.16	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	2.23	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	67	523	-	-	703	-
Stage 1	336	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	367	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %			-	-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	64	515	-	-	697	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	185	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	333	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	352	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	15.8	0	0.1
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	-	356	697	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	0.064	0.033	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	-	-	15.8	10.3	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	-	C	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	-	-	0.2	0.1	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	170	120	135	40	140	50	150	630	50	115	1110	255
Future Volume (veh/h)	170	120	135	40	140	50	150	630	50	115	1110	255
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		0.99	1.00		0.99	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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1856	1856	1856	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1856	1856	1856
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	189	133	150	44	156	56	167	700	56	128	1233	283
Peak Hour Factor	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90
Percent Heavy Veh, %	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3
Cap, veh/h	214	167	188	65	165	59	192	1740	139	154	1431	324
Arrive On Green	0.12	0.21	0.21	0.04	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.52	0.52	0.09	0.50	0.50
Sat Flow, veh/h	1767	793	895	1781	1310	470	1781	3332	266	1767	2852	647
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	189	0	283	44	0	212	167	373	383	128	756	760
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1767	0	1688	1781	0	1780	1781	1777	1821	1767	1763	1736
Q Serve(g_s), s	13.7	0.0	20.7	3.2	0.0	15.4	12.0	16.5	16.5	9.3	48.7	50.4
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	13.7	0.0	20.7	3.2	0.0	15.4	12.0	16.5	16.5	9.3	48.7	50.4
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.53	1.00		0.26	1.00		0.15	1.00		0.37
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	214	0	355	65	0	225	192	928	951	154	884	871
V/C Ratio(X)	0.89	0.00	0.80	0.67	0.00	0.94	0.87	0.40	0.40	0.83	0.86	0.87
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	223	0	355	85	0	225	200	928	951	250	884	871
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	56.3	0.0	48.7	61.8	0.0	56.3	57.1	18.8	18.8	58.4	28.3	28.7
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	30.9	0.0	12.0	12.7	0.0	44.5	30.7	1.3	1.3	11.8	10.4	11.8
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	7.9	0.0	9.8	1.7	0.0	9.6	7.0	7.0	7.2	4.6	22.3	23.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	87.2	0.0	60.7	74.5	0.0	100.9	87.8	20.1	20.1	70.2	38.7	40.5
LnGrp LOS	F		E	E		F	F	C	C	E	D	D
Approach Vol, veh/h		472			256			923			1644	
Approach Delay, s/veh		71.3			96.3			32.3			42.0	
Approach LOS		E			F			C			D	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	18.6	70.1	20.3	21.0	15.9	72.8	9.4	31.9
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	14.6	63.9	16.4	16.4	18.4	60.1	6.2	26.6
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	14.0	52.4	15.7	17.4	11.3	18.5	5.2	22.7
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.2	5.2	0.0	0.6

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	47.7
HCM 6th LOS	D

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.2

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	0	15	0	0	15	0	825	30	0	1260	25
Future Vol, veh/h	0	0	15	0	0	15	0	825	30	0	1260	25
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	-	-	Yield	-	-	Yield	-	-	Free	-	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	89	89	95	95	89	89	95	95	95	89	95	89
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	2
Mvmt Flow	0	0	16	0	0	17	0	868	32	0	1326	28

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	-	-	677	-	-	434	-	0	-	-	-	0
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	6.92	-	-	6.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	3.31	-	-	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	0	0	398	0	0	576	0	-	0	0	-	-
Stage 1	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	-
Stage 2	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-			-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	398	-	-	576	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	14.4	11.4	0	0
HCM LOS	B	B		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	-	398	576	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.04	0.029	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	-	14.4	11.4	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	B	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	-	0.1	0.1	-	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	25	50	70	30	10	70	5	740	25	60	1195	35
Future Volume (veh/h)	25	50	70	30	10	70	5	740	25	60	1195	35
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1885	1900	1900	1856	1856	1885	1870	1885	1870	1885	1885	1885
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	26	56	79	34	11	74	6	779	28	63	1258	37
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.95	0.89	0.95	0.89	0.95	0.95	0.95
Percent Heavy Veh, %	1	0	0	3	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	1
Cap, veh/h	173	89	126	135	26	175	11	2446	88	82	2605	77
Arrive On Green	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.01	0.69	0.69	0.05	0.73	0.73
Sat Flow, veh/h	1319	712	1004	1243	207	1391	1781	3526	127	1795	3553	104
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	26	0	135	34	0	85	6	396	411	63	634	661
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1319	0	1716	1243	0	1597	1781	1791	1862	1795	1791	1866
Q Serve(g_s), s	1.9	0.0	7.5	2.7	0.0	4.9	0.3	8.7	8.7	3.5	14.6	14.6
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	6.8	0.0	7.5	10.1	0.0	4.9	0.3	8.7	8.7	3.5	14.6	14.6
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.59	1.00		0.87	1.00		0.07	1.00		0.06
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	173	0	216	135	0	201	11	1242	1292	82	1313	1369
V/C Ratio(X)	0.15	0.00	0.63	0.25	0.00	0.42	0.55	0.32	0.32	0.77	0.48	0.48
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	277	0	352	234	0	327	98	1242	1292	224	1313	1369
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	43.5	0.0	41.5	46.3	0.0	40.4	49.6	6.0	6.0	47.2	5.5	5.5
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.4	0.0	3.0	1.0	0.0	1.4	36.6	0.7	0.6	13.9	1.3	1.2
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.6	0.0	3.3	0.8	0.0	2.0	0.3	3.0	3.1	1.9	4.9	5.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	43.9	0.0	44.5	47.3	0.0	41.8	86.2	6.7	6.7	61.1	6.8	6.7
LnGrp LOS	D		D	D		D	F	A	A	E	A	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		161			119			813			1358	
Approach Delay, s/veh		44.4			43.4			7.3			9.3	
Approach LOS		D			D			A			A	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2		4	5	6		8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	9.1	73.9		17.1	5.1	77.8		17.1				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.5		4.5	4.5	4.5		4.5				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	12.5	53.5		20.5	5.5	60.5		20.5				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	5.5	10.7		9.5	2.3	16.6		12.1				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.1	5.7		0.6	0.0	12.3		0.3				

Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh			12.6									
HCM 6th LOS			B									

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	20	5	40	95	5	180	30	570	30	465	790	50
Future Volume (veh/h)	20	5	40	95	5	180	30	570	30	465	790	50
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		0.98	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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1841	1841	1841	1856	1856	1856	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	22	5	43	102	5	194	32	613	32	500	849	54
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Percent Heavy Veh, %	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	117	26	224	251	6	246	42	1374	72	543	2312	147
Arrive On Green	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.02	0.40	0.40	0.30	0.68	0.68
Sat Flow, veh/h	1164	163	1399	1344	40	1536	1781	3435	179	1781	3392	216
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	22	0	48	102	0	199	32	317	328	500	445	458
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1164	0	1561	1344	0	1576	1781	1777	1838	1781	1777	1831
Q Serve(g_s), s	1.9	0.0	2.7	7.1	0.0	12.1	1.8	13.0	13.0	27.1	10.6	10.6
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	14.0	0.0	2.7	9.8	0.0	12.1	1.8	13.0	13.0	27.1	10.6	10.6
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.90	1.00		0.97	1.00		0.10	1.00		0.12
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	117	0	250	251	0	252	42	711	735	543	1211	1248
V/C Ratio(X)	0.19	0.00	0.19	0.41	0.00	0.79	0.76	0.45	0.45	0.92	0.37	0.37
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	120	0	254	255	0	257	109	711	735	750	1211	1248
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	47.1	0.0	36.4	40.6	0.0	40.4	48.5	21.9	21.9	33.6	6.8	6.8
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.8	0.0	0.4	1.1	0.0	15.0	24.3	2.0	2.0	13.3	0.9	0.8
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.6	0.0	1.0	2.4	0.0	5.7	1.1	5.6	5.8	13.3	3.7	3.8
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	47.9	0.0	36.8	41.7	0.0	55.3	72.8	23.9	23.9	46.9	7.6	7.6
LnGrp LOS	D		D	D		E	E	C	C	D	A	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		70			301			677			1403	
Approach Delay, s/veh		40.3			50.7			26.2			21.6	
Approach LOS		D			D			C			C	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2		4	5	6		8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	6.9	72.6		20.5	35.0	44.5		20.5
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.5		4.5	4.5	4.5		4.5
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	6.1	64.1		16.3	42.1	28.1		16.3
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	3.8	12.6		14.1	29.1	15.0		16.0
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	6.7		0.3	1.4	3.1		0.0

Intersection Summary		
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh		27.0
HCM 6th LOS		C

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.1

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	620	15	0	930	0	10
Future Vol, veh/h	620	15	0	930	0	10
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	63	63	63	63	63	63
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	3	3	0	0
Mvmt Flow	984	24	0	1476	0	16

Major/Minor	Major1		Major2		Minor1	
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	-	-	-	504
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	-	-	-	6.9
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	-	-	-	3.3
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	0	-	0	518
Stage 1	-	-	0	-	0	-
Stage 2	-	-	0	-	0	-
Platoon blocked, %	-	-		-		
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-	518
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	0	0	12.2
HCM LOS			B

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	518	-	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.031	-	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	12.2	-	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	B	-	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	0.1	-	-	-

Movement	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SWL	SWR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	620	0	10	930	0	5
Future Volume (veh/h)	620	0	10	930	0	5
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach	No			No	No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1856	1856	1900	1900
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	660	0	11	989	0	5
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	3	3	0	0
Cap, veh/h	3061	0	70	2959	10	9
Arrive On Green	0.86	0.00	0.86	0.86	0.00	0.01
Sat Flow, veh/h	3741	0	10	3520	1810	1610
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	660	0	535	465	0	5
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1777	0	1841	1604	1810	1610
Q Serve(g_s), s	1.9	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.2
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	1.9	0.0	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.2
Prop In Lane		0.00	0.02		1.00	1.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	3061	0	1647	1382	10	9
V/C Ratio(X)	0.22	0.00	0.32	0.34	0.00	0.58
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	3061	0	1647	1382	483	429
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	0.7	0.0	0.8	0.8	0.0	29.8
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.7	0.0	50.0
Initial Q Delay(d3), s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.2
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh						
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	0.9	0.0	1.3	1.5	0.0	79.7
LnGrp LOS	A		A	A		E
Approach Vol, veh/h	660			1000	5	
Approach Delay, s/veh	0.9			1.4	79.7	
Approach LOS	A			A	E	

Timer - Assigned Phs	2				6	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	55.7				55.7	4.3
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.0				4.0	4.0
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	36.0				36.0	16.0
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	3.9				5.4	2.2
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	5.1				7.7	0.0

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	1.4
HCM 6th LOS	A

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	5	0	20	15	0	10	10	605	35	5	920	5
Future Volume (veh/h)	5	0	20	15	0	10	10	605	35	5	920	5
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		0.99	0.98		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1885	1885	1885	1856	1856	1856
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	5	0	21	16	0	11	11	637	37	5	968	5
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Percent Heavy Veh, %	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3
Cap, veh/h	175	0	71	165	0	72	547	2770	161	697	2896	15
Arrive On Green	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81
Sat Flow, veh/h	1426	0	1588	1389	0	1610	582	3440	200	758	3596	19
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	5	0	21	16	0	11	11	331	343	5	474	499
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1426	0	1588	1389	0	1610	582	1791	1849	758	1763	1852
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.2	0.0	0.8	0.7	0.0	0.4	0.3	2.7	2.7	0.1	4.3	4.3
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	0.6	0.0	0.8	1.4	0.0	0.4	4.6	2.7	2.7	2.8	4.3	4.3
Prop In Lane	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		0.11	1.00		0.01
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	175	0	71	165	0	72	547	1442	1489	697	1419	1491
V/C Ratio(X)	0.03	0.00	0.29	0.10	0.00	0.15	0.02	0.23	0.23	0.01	0.33	0.33
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	503	0	437	484	0	443	547	1442	1489	697	1419	1491
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	27.8	0.0	27.7	28.4	0.0	27.6	2.2	1.4	1.4	1.7	1.6	1.6
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.1	0.0	2.3	0.3	0.0	1.0	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.6	0.6
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.5
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	27.9	0.0	30.0	28.7	0.0	28.5	2.2	1.8	1.8	1.7	2.2	2.2
LnGrp LOS	C		C	C		C	A	A	A	A	A	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		26			27			685			978	
Approach Delay, s/veh		29.6			28.6			1.8			2.2	
Approach LOS		C			C			A			A	

Timer - Assigned Phs	2	4	6	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	52.8	7.2	52.8	7.2
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	34.5	16.5	34.5	16.5
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	6.6	2.8	6.3	3.4
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	4.6	0.0	7.3	0.0

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	2.8
HCM 6th LOS	A

Appendix E: Future (2035) Build Conditions – Alternative C

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	25	5	5	1575	610	15
Future Vol, veh/h	25	5	5	1575	610	15
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	1	1	1	0	0	1
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	175	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	94	94	94	94	94	94
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	5	5	6	6
Mvmt Flow	27	5	5	1676	649	16

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1507	335	666	0	-	0
Stage 1	658	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	849	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	4.2	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	2.25	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	114	667	899	-	-	-
Stage 1	482	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	385	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	113	666	898	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	246	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	479	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	385	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	19.8	0	0
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	898	-	275	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.006	-	0.116	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	9	-	19.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	C	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	0	-	0.4	-	-

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/20th St E - AM Peak Hour - Future 2035 Baseline (Site Folder: General)]

Future (2035) PM Peak Hour

Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3u	U	1	5.0	1	5.0	0.696	13.6	LOS B	6.4	166.3	0.54	0.51	0.54	36.9
3	L2	60	5.0	65	5.0	0.696	11.1	LOS B	6.4	166.3	0.54	0.51	0.54	36.0
8	T1	1400	5.0	1522	5.0	0.696	5.2	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.53	0.50	0.53	36.0
18	R2	65	5.0	71	5.0	0.696	5.3	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.53	0.49	0.53	34.9
Approach		1526	5.0	1659	5.0	0.696	5.5	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.53	0.50	0.53	36.0
East: 20th St E														
1u	U	1	3.0	1	3.0	0.418	19.6	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	33.7
1	L2	80	3.0	87	3.0	0.418	17.1	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	32.9
6	T1	10	3.0	11	3.0	0.418	11.3	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	32.8
16	R2	85	3.0	92	3.0	0.418	11.1	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	31.9
Approach		176	3.0	191	3.0	0.418	13.9	LOS B	2.0	51.6	0.80	0.96	0.95	32.4
North: Meridian Ave E														
7u	U	1	6.0	1	6.0	0.296	13.2	LOS B	1.5	39.8	0.36	0.47	0.36	37.7
7	L2	15	6.0	16	6.0	0.296	10.7	LOS B	1.5	39.8	0.36	0.47	0.36	36.7
4	T1	545	6.0	592	6.0	0.296	4.9	LOS A	1.5	40.0	0.35	0.47	0.35	36.7
14	R2	60	6.0	65	6.0	0.296	4.9	LOS A	1.5	40.0	0.35	0.46	0.35	35.5
Approach		621	6.0	675	6.0	0.296	5.0	LOS A	1.5	40.0	0.35	0.47	0.35	36.6
West: 20th St E														
5u	U	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.195	14.5	LOS B	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	35.9
5	L2	90	0.0	98	0.0	0.195	12.0	LOS B	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	35.0
2	T1	10	0.0	11	0.0	0.195	6.2	LOS A	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	34.9
12	R2	45	0.0	49	0.0	0.195	6.1	LOS A	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	33.9
Approach		146	0.0	159	0.0	0.195	9.8	LOS A	0.7	17.8	0.51	0.78	0.51	34.7
All Vehicles		2469	4.8	2684	4.8	0.696	6.2	LOS A	6.4	166.8	0.51	0.54	0.52	35.7

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.2

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	10	1515	5	10	660
Future Vol, veh/h	5	10	1515	5	10	660
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	1	1	0	1	1	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	250	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	0	-	-	0
Grade, %	0	-	0	-	-	0
Peak Hour Factor	94	94	94	94	94	94
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	5	5	4	4
Mvmt Flow	5	11	1612	5	11	702

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1990	811	0	0	1618	0
Stage 1	1616	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	374	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	-	-	4.18	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	2.24	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	54	327	-	-	390	-
Stage 1	151	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	672	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %			-	-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	52	326	-	-	390	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	125	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	151	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	653	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	23.4	0	0.2
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	-	212	390	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	0.075	0.027	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	-	-	23.4	14.5	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	-	C	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	-	-	0.2	0.1	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	210	85	130	100	165	120	115	1195	35	55	525	70
Future Volume (veh/h)	210	85	130	100	165	120	115	1195	35	55	525	70
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	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		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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1826	1841	1841	1841
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	226	91	140	108	177	129	124	1285	38	59	565	75
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Percent Heavy Veh, %	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4
Cap, veh/h	225	134	207	83	124	90	148	1918	57	76	1600	212
Arrive On Green	0.13	0.21	0.21	0.05	0.13	0.13	0.09	0.56	0.56	0.04	0.52	0.52
Sat Flow, veh/h	1739	647	996	1739	980	714	1739	3440	102	1753	3104	411
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	226	0	231	108	0	306	124	647	676	59	318	322
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1739	0	1643	1739	0	1693	1739	1735	1807	1753	1749	1766
Q Serve(g_s), s	16.8	0.0	16.8	6.2	0.0	16.4	9.1	34.3	34.3	4.3	14.0	14.1
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	16.8	0.0	16.8	6.2	0.0	16.4	9.1	34.3	34.3	4.3	14.0	14.1
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.61	1.00		0.42	1.00		0.06	1.00		0.23
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	225	0	341	83	0	214	148	967	1008	76	901	910
V/C Ratio(X)	1.01	0.00	0.68	1.30	0.00	1.43	0.84	0.67	0.67	0.78	0.35	0.35
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	225	0	341	83	0	214	198	967	1008	165	901	910
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	56.6	0.0	47.5	61.9	0.0	56.8	58.6	20.3	20.3	61.6	18.6	18.7
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	61.5	0.0	5.3	199.7	0.0	219.3	20.1	3.7	3.5	15.6	1.1	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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	11.1	0.0	7.4	7.3	0.0	20.0	4.8	14.3	14.9	2.2	5.8	5.9
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	118.1	0.0	52.7	261.6	0.0	276.1	78.7	24.0	23.9	77.2	19.7	19.7
LnGrp LOS	F		D	F		F	E	C	C	E	B	B
Approach Vol, veh/h		457			414			1447			699	
Approach Delay, s/veh		85.1			272.3			28.6			24.6	
Approach LOS		F			F			C			C	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	15.7	71.9	21.4	21.0	10.2	77.4	10.8	31.6
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	14.8	63.3	16.8	16.4	12.2	65.9	6.2	27.0
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	11.1	16.1	18.8	18.4	6.3	36.3	8.2	18.8
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.1	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.8	0.0	0.8

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	69.7
HCM 6th LOS	E

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	0	10	0	0	30	0	1320	15	0	780	15
Future Vol, veh/h	0	0	10	0	0	30	0	1320	15	0	780	15
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	-	-	Yield	-	-	Yield	-	-	Free	-	-	Free
Storage Length	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
Heavy Vehicles, %	11	11	1	1	23	23	1	1	1	5	1	5
Mvmt Flow	0	0	11	0	0	32	0	1389	16	0	821	16

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	-	-	411	-	-	695	-	0	-	-	-	0
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	6.92	-	-	7.36	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	3.31	-	-	3.53	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	0	0	593	0	0	340	0	-	0	0	-	0
Stage 1	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
Stage 2	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
Platoon blocked, %								-			-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	593	-	-	340	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	11.2	16.7	0	0
HCM LOS	B	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	593	340	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.018	0.093	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	-	11.2	16.7	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	B	C	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	-	0.1	0.3	-

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/32nd St E - PM Peak Hour - 2035 Multi Lane (Site Folder: General)]

Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
Future (2035) PM Peak Hour - Option C

Site Category: PM Future with Project
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3u	U	1	2.0	1	2.0	0.357	13.1	LOS B	1.9	48.8	0.34	0.45	0.34	37.3
3	L2	5	2.0	6	2.0	0.357	10.6	LOS B	1.9	48.8	0.34	0.45	0.34	36.7
8	T1	740	2.0	831	2.0	0.357	4.8	LOS A	1.9	49.0	0.34	0.45	0.34	36.6
18	R2	25	2.0	28	2.0	0.357	4.8	LOS A	1.9	49.0	0.34	0.45	0.34	34.8
Approach		771	2.0	866	2.0	0.357	4.8	LOS A	1.9	49.0	0.34	0.45	0.34	36.5
East: 32nd St E														
1u	U	1	3.0	1	3.0	0.170	15.0	LOS B	0.6	15.5	0.54	0.78	0.54	35.7
1	L2	30	3.0	34	3.0	0.170	12.5	LOS B	0.6	15.5	0.54	0.78	0.54	34.6
6	T1	10	3.0	11	3.0	0.170	6.7	LOS A	0.6	15.5	0.54	0.78	0.54	35.3
16	R2	70	3.0	79	3.0	0.170	6.5	LOS A	0.6	15.5	0.54	0.78	0.54	34.1
Approach		111	3.0	125	3.0	0.170	8.2	LOS A	0.6	15.5	0.54	0.78	0.54	34.3
North: Meridian Ave E														
7u	U	30	2.0	34	2.0	0.557	12.7	LOS B	4.3	108.8	0.28	0.43	0.28	37.9
7	L2	30	2.0	34	2.0	0.557	10.2	LOS B	4.3	108.8	0.28	0.43	0.28	36.4
4	T1	1195	2.0	1343	2.0	0.557	4.4	LOS A	4.3	108.9	0.28	0.41	0.28	36.7
14	R2	35	2.0	39	2.0	0.557	4.5	LOS A	4.3	108.9	0.28	0.40	0.28	35.9
Approach		1290	2.0	1449	2.0	0.557	4.8	LOS A	4.3	108.9	0.28	0.41	0.28	36.7
West: 32nd St E														
5u	U	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.258	16.4	LOS B	1.0	25.0	0.66	0.81	0.66	36.3
5	L2	25	0.0	28	0.0	0.258	13.9	LOS B	1.0	25.0	0.66	0.81	0.66	35.4
2	T1	50	0.0	56	0.0	0.258	8.1	LOS A	1.0	25.0	0.66	0.81	0.66	34.8
12	R2	70	0.0	79	0.0	0.258	8.0	LOS A	1.0	25.0	0.66	0.81	0.66	33.7
Approach		146	0.0	164	0.0	0.258	9.1	LOS A	1.0	25.0	0.66	0.81	0.66	34.4
All Vehicles		2318	1.9	2604	1.9	0.557	5.2	LOS A	4.3	108.9	0.34	0.47	0.34	36.4

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 9.0 | Copyright © 2000-2020 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/36th St E - AM Peak Hour - 2035 Multi Lane (Site Folder: General)]

Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
Future (2035) AM Peak Hour - Option C

Site Category: AM Future with Project
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3u	U	1	5.0	1	5.0	0.560	13.6	LOS B	3.7	96.5	0.47	0.51	0.47	37.2
3	L2	35	5.0	38	5.0	0.560	11.1	LOS B	3.7	96.5	0.47	0.51	0.47	36.3
8	T1	1070	5.0	1151	5.0	0.560	5.3	LOS A	3.7	96.9	0.46	0.51	0.46	36.0
18	R2	100	5.0	108	5.0	0.560	5.3	LOS A	3.7	96.9	0.46	0.50	0.46	35.2
Approach		1206	5.0	1297	5.0	0.560	5.5	LOS A	3.7	96.9	0.46	0.51	0.46	35.9
East: 36th St E														
1u	U	1	5.0	1	5.0	0.725	21.5	LOS C	4.8	125.5	0.84	1.06	1.28	33.4
1	L2	80	5.0	86	5.0	0.725	19.0	LOS B	4.8	125.5	0.84	1.06	1.28	32.6
6	T1	1	5.0	1	5.0	0.725	13.2	LOS B	4.8	125.5	0.84	1.06	1.28	32.5
16	R2	305	5.0	328	5.0	0.725	13.0	LOS B	4.8	125.5	0.84	1.06	1.28	31.0
Approach		387	5.0	416	5.0	0.725	14.3	LOS B	4.8	125.5	0.84	1.06	1.28	31.3
North: Meridian Ave E														
7u	U	1	6.0	1	6.0	0.334	13.1	LOS B	1.8	48.4	0.34	0.52	0.34	35.8
7	L2	105	6.0	113	6.0	0.334	10.6	LOS B	1.8	48.4	0.34	0.52	0.34	35.8
4	T1	595	6.0	640	6.0	0.334	4.7	LOS A	1.9	48.6	0.34	0.47	0.34	36.2
14	R2	25	6.0	27	6.0	0.334	4.8	LOS A	1.9	48.6	0.33	0.44	0.33	35.2
Approach		726	6.0	781	6.0	0.334	5.6	LOS A	1.9	48.6	0.34	0.48	0.34	36.1
West: 36th St E														
5u	U	1	10.0	1	10.0	0.155	15.3	LOS B	0.5	14.5	0.54	0.81	0.54	35.6
5	L2	50	10.0	54	10.0	0.155	12.8	LOS B	0.5	14.5	0.54	0.81	0.54	33.3
2	T1	1	10.0	1	10.0	0.155	7.0	LOS A	0.5	14.5	0.54	0.81	0.54	34.7
12	R2	45	10.0	48	10.0	0.155	6.8	LOS A	0.5	14.5	0.54	0.81	0.54	33.6
Approach		97	10.0	104	10.0	0.155	10.0	LOS B	0.5	14.5	0.54	0.81	0.54	33.5
All Vehicles		2416	5.5	2598	5.5	0.725	7.1	LOS A	4.8	125.5	0.49	0.60	0.56	35.0

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 9.0 | Copyright © 2000-2020 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	1195	5	5	725	5	10
Future Vol, veh/h	1195	5	5	725	5	10
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	75	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	93	93	93	93	93	93
Heavy Vehicles, %	5	5	6	6	7	7
Mvmt Flow	1285	5	5	780	5	11

Major/Minor	Major1		Major2		Minor1	
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	1290	0	1688	645
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	1288	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	400	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.22	-	6.94	7.04
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.94	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.94	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.26	-	3.57	3.37
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	512	-	80	403
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	213	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	631	-
Platoon blocked, %	-	-		-		
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	512	-	79	403
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	79	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	213	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	625	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	0	0.1	28.4
HCM LOS			D

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	170	-	-	512	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.095	-	-	0.011	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	28.4	-	-	12.1	-
HCM Lane LOS	D	-	-	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	0.3	-	-	0	-

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/Dechaux Rd E - AM Peak Hour - 2035 Multi Lane (Site Folder: General)]

Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
Future (2035) AM Peak Hour - Option C

Site Category: PM Future with Project
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
8	T1	1220	4.0	1356	4.0	0.508	4.1	LOS A	3.2	81.7	0.02	0.37	0.02	37.9
18	R2	1	4.0	1	4.0	0.508	4.1	LOS A	3.2	81.5	0.02	0.37	0.02	36.8
Approach		1221	4.0	1357	4.0	0.508	4.1	LOS A	3.2	81.7	0.02	0.37	0.02	37.9
East: Dechaux Rd E														
1	L2	5	0.0	6	0.0	0.015	12.9	LOS B	0.0	1.2	0.53	0.73	0.53	35.0
16	R2	5	0.0	6	0.0	0.015	7.0	LOS A	0.0	1.2	0.53	0.73	0.53	33.3
Approach		10	0.0	11	0.0	0.015	10.0	LOS A	0.0	1.2	0.53	0.73	0.53	34.2
North: Meridian Ave E														
7	L2	1	6.0	1	6.0	0.309	9.9	LOS A	1.7	45.2	0.05	0.37	0.05	37.8
4	T1	725	6.0	806	6.0	0.309	4.1	LOS A	1.7	45.3	0.05	0.37	0.05	37.7
Approach		726	6.0	807	6.0	0.309	4.1	LOS A	1.7	45.3	0.05	0.37	0.05	37.7
All Vehicles		1957	4.7	2174	4.7	0.508	4.1	LOS A	3.2	81.7	0.04	0.37	0.04	37.8

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/Spencer St N - AM Peak Hour - 2035 Multi Lane (Site Folder: General)]

Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
Future (2035) AM Peak Hour - Option C

Site Category: PM Future with Project
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3	L2	80	4.0	87	4.0	0.541	10.0	LOS A	3.9	99.3	0.12	0.41	0.12	37.4
8	T1	1210	4.0	1315	4.0	0.541	4.2	LOS A	3.9	99.3	0.12	0.39	0.12	37.3
18	R2	25	4.0	27	4.0	0.541	4.2	LOS A	3.8	99.3	0.11	0.37	0.11	36.4
Approach		1315	4.0	1429	4.0	0.541	4.5	LOS A	3.9	99.3	0.12	0.39	0.12	37.3
East: Spencer St N														
1	L2	25	13.0	27	13.0	0.069	14.3	LOS B	0.2	6.1	0.58	0.84	0.58	33.4
6	T1	1	13.0	1	13.0	0.069	8.4	LOS A	0.2	6.1	0.58	0.84	0.58	33.5
16	R2	10	13.0	11	13.0	0.069	8.3	LOS A	0.2	6.1	0.58	0.84	0.58	31.9
Approach		36	13.0	39	13.0	0.069	12.4	LOS B	0.2	6.1	0.58	0.84	0.58	33.0
North: Meridian Ave E														
7	L2	10	5.0	11	5.0	0.325	10.5	LOS B	1.6	41.2	0.28	0.44	0.28	36.8
4	T1	710	5.0	772	5.0	0.325	4.6	LOS A	1.6	41.2	0.28	0.43	0.28	36.7
14	R2	5	5.0	5	5.0	0.325	4.7	LOS A	1.6	41.2	0.28	0.43	0.28	35.4
Approach		725	5.0	788	5.0	0.325	4.7	LOS A	1.6	41.2	0.28	0.43	0.28	36.7
West: Spencer St N														
5	L2	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.023	11.8	LOS B	0.1	1.9	0.47	0.63	0.47	36.6
2	T1	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.023	6.0	LOS A	0.1	1.9	0.47	0.63	0.47	36.7
12	R2	15	0.0	16	0.0	0.023	5.9	LOS A	0.1	1.9	0.47	0.63	0.47	35.6
Approach		17	0.0	18	0.0	0.023	6.2	LOS A	0.1	1.9	0.47	0.63	0.47	35.7
All Vehicles		2093	4.5	2275	4.5	0.541	4.7	LOS A	3.9	99.3	0.18	0.41	0.18	37.0

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	10	10	5	905	1535	30
Future Vol, veh/h	10	10	5	905	1535	30
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	2	2	2	0	0	2
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	175	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	90	90	90	90	90	90
Heavy Vehicles, %	6	6	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	11	11	6	1006	1706	33

Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	2242	874	1741	0	-	0
Stage 1	1725	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	517	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.92	7.02	4.14	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.92	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.92	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.56	3.36	2.22	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	34	285	357	-	-	-
Stage 1	124	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	552	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	33	284	356	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	99	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	122	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	551	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	33.8	0.1	0
HCM LOS	D		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	356	-	147	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.016	-	0.151	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	15.3	-	33.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	C	-	D	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	0	-	0.5	-	-

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/20th St E - PM Peak Hour - Future 2035 Baseline (Site Folder: General)]

Future (2035) PM Peak Hour

Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3u	U	1	2.0	1	2.0	0.427	13.4	LOS B	2.5	62.4	0.41	0.50	0.41	37.4
3	L2	50	2.0	54	2.0	0.427	10.9	LOS B	2.5	62.4	0.41	0.50	0.41	36.5
8	T1	775	2.0	842	2.0	0.427	5.0	LOS A	2.5	62.8	0.41	0.50	0.41	36.5
18	R2	100	2.0	109	2.0	0.427	5.1	LOS A	2.5	62.8	0.41	0.49	0.41	35.4
Approach		926	2.0	1007	2.0	0.427	5.4	LOS A	2.5	62.8	0.41	0.49	0.41	36.4
East: 20th St E														
1u	U	1	1.0	1	1.0	0.208	15.2	LOS B	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	35.9
1	L2	70	1.0	76	1.0	0.208	12.7	LOS B	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	35.0
6	T1	5	1.0	5	1.0	0.208	6.9	LOS A	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	34.9
16	R2	60	1.0	65	1.0	0.208	6.8	LOS A	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	33.8
Approach		136	1.0	148	1.0	0.208	9.9	LOS A	0.8	20.0	0.59	0.83	0.59	34.5
North: Meridian Ave E														
7u	U	1	2.0	1	2.0	0.689	13.5	LOS B	6.1	153.9	0.53	0.52	0.53	37.0
7	L2	95	2.0	103	2.0	0.689	11.0	LOS B	6.1	153.9	0.53	0.52	0.53	36.0
4	T1	1355	2.0	1473	2.0	0.689	5.2	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.53	0.51	0.53	36.1
14	R2	100	2.0	109	2.0	0.689	5.2	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.52	0.49	0.52	35.0
Approach		1551	2.0	1686	2.0	0.689	5.6	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.53	0.51	0.53	36.0
West: 20th St E														
5u	U	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.330	18.0	LOS B	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	34.6
5	L2	70	0.0	76	0.0	0.330	15.5	LOS B	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	33.7
2	T1	10	0.0	11	0.0	0.330	9.7	LOS A	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	33.6
12	R2	70	0.0	76	0.0	0.330	9.6	LOS A	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	32.6
Approach		151	0.0	164	0.0	0.330	12.4	LOS B	1.5	37.5	0.76	0.92	0.83	33.2
All Vehicles		2764	1.8	3004	1.8	0.689	6.1	LOS A	6.1	154.4	0.50	0.54	0.51	35.9

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.2

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	5	15	835	5	20	1465
Future Vol, veh/h	5	15	835	5	20	1465
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	9	10	0	9	10	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	250	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	0	-	-	0
Grade, %	0	-	0	-	-	0
Peak Hour Factor	88	88	88	88	88	88
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	3	3	3	3
Mvmt Flow	6	17	949	6	23	1665

Major/Minor	Minor1		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	1850	498	0	0	965	0
Stage 1	962	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	888	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.8	6.9	-	-	4.16	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.8	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.3	-	-	2.23	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	67	523	-	-	703	-
Stage 1	336	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	367	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %			-	-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	64	515	-	-	697	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	185	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	333	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	352	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	15.8	0	0.1
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	-	356	697	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	0.064	0.033	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	-	-	15.8	10.3	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	-	C	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	-	-	0.2	0.1	-



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	170	120	135	40	140	50	150	630	50	115	1110	255
Future Volume (veh/h)	170	120	135	40	140	50	150	630	50	115	1110	255
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		0.99	1.00		0.99	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	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1856	1856	1856	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1856	1856	1856
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	189	133	150	44	156	56	167	700	56	128	1233	283
Peak Hour Factor	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90
Percent Heavy Veh, %	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3
Cap, veh/h	214	167	188	65	165	59	192	1740	139	154	1431	324
Arrive On Green	0.12	0.21	0.21	0.04	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.52	0.52	0.09	0.50	0.50
Sat Flow, veh/h	1767	793	895	1781	1310	470	1781	3332	266	1767	2852	647
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	189	0	283	44	0	212	167	373	383	128	756	760
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1767	0	1688	1781	0	1780	1781	1777	1821	1767	1763	1736
Q Serve(g_s), s	13.7	0.0	20.7	3.2	0.0	15.4	12.0	16.5	16.5	9.3	48.7	50.4
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	13.7	0.0	20.7	3.2	0.0	15.4	12.0	16.5	16.5	9.3	48.7	50.4
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.53	1.00		0.26	1.00		0.15	1.00		0.37
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	214	0	355	65	0	225	192	928	951	154	884	871
V/C Ratio(X)	0.89	0.00	0.80	0.67	0.00	0.94	0.87	0.40	0.40	0.83	0.86	0.87
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	223	0	355	85	0	225	200	928	951	250	884	871
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	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	56.3	0.0	48.7	61.8	0.0	56.3	57.1	18.8	18.8	58.4	28.3	28.7
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	30.9	0.0	12.0	12.7	0.0	44.5	30.7	1.3	1.3	11.8	10.4	11.8
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	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	7.9	0.0	9.8	1.7	0.0	9.6	7.0	7.0	7.2	4.6	22.3	23.0
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh	87.2	0.0	60.7	74.5	0.0	100.9	87.8	20.1	20.1	70.2	38.7	40.5
LnGrp LOS	F		E	E		F	F	C	C	E	D	D
Approach Vol, veh/h		472			256			923			1644	
Approach Delay, s/veh		71.3			96.3			32.3			42.0	
Approach LOS		E			F			C			D	

Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	18.6	70.1	20.3	21.0	15.9	72.8	9.4	31.9
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	14.6	63.9	16.4	16.4	18.4	60.1	6.2	26.6
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	14.0	52.4	15.7	17.4	11.3	18.5	5.2	22.7
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.2	5.2	0.0	0.6

Intersection Summary	
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay, s/veh	47.7
HCM 6th LOS	D

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.2

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	0	15	0	0	15	0	825	30	0	1260	25
Future Vol, veh/h	0	0	15	0	0	15	0	825	30	0	1260	25
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	-	-	Yield	-	-	Yield	-	-	Free	-	-	Free
Storage Length	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	89	89	95	95	89	89	95	95	95	89	95	89
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	2
Mvmt Flow	0	0	16	0	0	17	0	868	32	0	1326	28

Major/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	-	-	663	-	-	434	-	0	-	-	-	0
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	6.92	-	-	6.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	3.31	-	-	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	0	0	406	0	0	576	0	-	0	0	-	0
Stage 1	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
Stage 2	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
Platoon blocked, %								-			-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	406	-	-	576	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	14.2	11.4	0	0
HCM LOS	B	B		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)	-	406	576	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.039	0.029	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	-	14.2	11.4	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	B	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	-	0.1	0.1	-

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/32nd St E - AM Peak Hour - 2035 Multi Lane (Site Folder: General)]

Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
Future (2035) AM Peak Hour - Option C

Site Category: AM Future with Project
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3u	U	1	4.0	1	4.0	0.640	13.8	LOS B	4.9	125.2	0.53	0.54	0.53	35.9
3	L2	70	4.0	73	4.0	0.640	11.3	LOS B	4.9	125.2	0.53	0.54	0.53	35.6
8	T1	1320	4.0	1375	4.0	0.640	5.5	LOS A	4.9	125.8	0.53	0.52	0.53	34.4
18	R2	40	4.0	42	4.0	0.640	5.5	LOS A	4.9	125.8	0.53	0.51	0.53	34.0
Approach		1431	4.0	1491	4.0	0.640	5.8	LOS A	4.9	125.8	0.53	0.52	0.53	34.4
East: 32nd St E														
1u	U	1	13.0	1	13.0	0.189	17.5	LOS B	0.7	20.1	0.71	0.85	0.71	32.9
1	L2	20	13.0	21	13.0	0.189	15.0	LOS B	0.7	20.1	0.71	0.85	0.71	32.0
6	T1	45	13.0	47	13.0	0.189	9.2	LOS A	0.7	20.1	0.71	0.85	0.71	33.8
16	R2	15	13.0	16	13.0	0.189	9.1	LOS A	0.7	20.1	0.71	0.85	0.71	30.4
Approach		81	13.0	84	13.0	0.189	10.7	LOS B	0.7	20.1	0.71	0.85	0.71	32.8
North: Meridian Ave E														
7u	U	15	5.0	16	5.0	0.355	13.2	LOS B	1.9	49.1	0.35	0.51	0.35	35.4
7	L2	70	5.0	73	5.0	0.355	10.7	LOS B	1.9	49.1	0.35	0.51	0.35	34.5
4	T1	695	5.0	724	5.0	0.355	4.8	LOS A	1.9	49.3	0.35	0.48	0.35	35.4
14	R2	20	5.0	21	5.0	0.355	4.9	LOS A	1.9	49.3	0.34	0.45	0.34	34.7
Approach		800	5.0	833	5.0	0.355	5.5	LOS A	1.9	49.3	0.35	0.48	0.35	35.3
West: 32nd St E														
5u	U	1	4.0	1	4.0	0.136	14.8	LOS B	0.5	12.1	0.52	0.72	0.52	36.2
5	L2	35	4.0	36	4.0	0.136	12.3	LOS B	0.5	12.1	0.52	0.72	0.52	34.1
2	T1	50	4.0	52	4.0	0.136	6.5	LOS A	0.5	12.1	0.52	0.72	0.52	34.8
12	R2	10	4.0	10	4.0	0.136	6.4	LOS A	0.5	12.1	0.52	0.72	0.52	33.6
Approach		96	4.0	100	4.0	0.136	8.7	LOS A	0.5	12.1	0.52	0.72	0.52	34.5
All Vehicles		2408	4.6	2508	4.6	0.640	6.0	LOS A	4.9	125.8	0.48	0.53	0.48	34.6

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 9.0 | Copyright © 2000-2020 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/36th St E - PM Peak Hour - 2035 Multi Lane (Site Folder: General)]

Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
Future (2035) PM Peak Hour - Option C

Site Category: PM Future with Project
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3u	U	1	2.0	1	2.0	0.370	15.2	LOS B	2.1	53.7	0.64	0.67	0.64	36.6
3	L2	25	2.0	27	2.0	0.370	12.7	LOS B	2.1	53.7	0.64	0.67	0.64	35.6
8	T1	570	2.0	613	2.0	0.370	6.8	LOS A	2.2	55.2	0.64	0.65	0.64	35.3
18	R2	30	2.0	32	2.0	0.370	6.7	LOS A	2.2	55.2	0.64	0.64	0.64	34.6
Approach		626	2.0	673	2.0	0.370	7.0	LOS A	2.2	55.2	0.64	0.65	0.64	35.3
East: 36th St E														
1u	U	1	3.0	1	3.0	0.392	15.0	LOS B	1.8	45.4	0.60	0.82	0.64	36.5
1	L2	95	3.0	102	3.0	0.392	12.5	LOS B	1.8	45.4	0.60	0.82	0.64	35.6
6	T1	5	3.0	5	3.0	0.392	6.7	LOS A	1.8	45.4	0.60	0.82	0.64	35.5
16	R2	180	3.0	194	3.0	0.392	6.5	LOS A	1.8	45.4	0.60	0.82	0.64	33.9
Approach		281	3.0	302	3.0	0.392	8.6	LOS A	1.8	45.4	0.60	0.82	0.64	34.5
North: Meridian Ave E														
7u	U	1	2.0	1	2.0	0.576	13.3	LOS B	4.3	109.1	0.45	0.61	0.45	34.7
7	L2	465	2.0	500	2.0	0.576	10.8	LOS B	4.3	109.1	0.45	0.61	0.45	34.4
4	T1	790	2.0	849	2.0	0.576	5.0	LOS A	4.3	109.5	0.45	0.50	0.45	35.7
14	R2	50	2.0	54	2.0	0.576	5.0	LOS A	4.3	109.5	0.45	0.47	0.45	34.9
Approach		1306	2.0	1404	2.0	0.576	7.0	LOS A	4.3	109.5	0.45	0.54	0.45	35.2
West: 36th St E														
5u	U	1	4.0	1	4.0	0.130	16.6	LOS B	0.5	13.0	0.66	0.84	0.66	35.7
5	L2	20	4.0	22	4.0	0.130	14.1	LOS B	0.5	13.0	0.66	0.84	0.66	34.0
2	T1	5	4.0	5	4.0	0.130	8.3	LOS A	0.5	13.0	0.66	0.84	0.66	34.7
12	R2	40	4.0	43	4.0	0.130	8.1	LOS A	0.5	13.0	0.66	0.84	0.66	33.6
Approach		66	4.0	71	4.0	0.130	10.1	LOS B	0.5	13.0	0.66	0.84	0.66	33.8
All Vehicles		2279	2.2	2451	2.2	0.576	7.3	LOS A	4.3	109.5	0.53	0.61	0.53	35.1

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 9.0 | Copyright © 2000-2020 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com

Intersection	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.3

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	620	5	10	925	5	10
Future Vol, veh/h	620	5	10	925	5	10
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	75	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	63	63	63	63	63	63
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	3	3	0	0
Mvmt Flow	984	8	16	1468	8	16

Major/Minor	Major1		Major2		Minor1	
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	992	0	1754	496
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	988	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	766	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.16	-	6.8	6.9
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.8	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.8	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.23	-	3.5	3.3
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	687	-	78	525
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	326	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	425	-
Platoon blocked, %	-	-		-		
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	687	-	76	525
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	76	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	326	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	415	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s/v	0	0.1	28.5
HCM LOS			D

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	177	-	-	687	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.135	-	-	0.023	-
HCM Control Delay (s/veh)	28.5	-	-	10.4	-
HCM Lane LOS	D	-	-	B	-
HCM 95th %tile Q (veh)	0.5	-	-	0.1	-

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/Dechaux Rd E - PM Peak Hour - 2035 Multi Lane (Site Folder: General)]

Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
Future (2035) PM Peak Hour - Option C

Site Category: PM Future with Project
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
8	T1	620	2.0	660	2.0	0.243	4.1	LOS A	1.0	25.9	0.02	0.37	0.02	38.0
18	R2	1	2.0	1	2.0	0.243	4.1	LOS A	1.0	25.8	0.02	0.37	0.02	36.9
Approach		621	2.0	661	2.0	0.243	4.1	LOS A	1.0	25.9	0.02	0.37	0.02	38.0
East: Dechaux Rd E														
1	L2	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.007	11.4	LOS B	0.0	0.5	0.39	0.58	0.39	36.8
16	R2	5	0.0	5	0.0	0.007	5.4	LOS A	0.0	0.5	0.39	0.58	0.39	35.1
Approach		6	0.0	6	0.0	0.007	6.4	LOS A	0.0	0.5	0.39	0.58	0.39	35.4
North: Meridian Ave E														
7	L2	1	3.0	1	3.0	0.367	9.9	LOS A	2.1	54.3	0.02	0.37	0.02	38.1
4	T1	930	3.0	989	3.0	0.367	4.1	LOS A	2.1	54.3	0.02	0.37	0.02	38.0
Approach		931	3.0	990	3.0	0.367	4.1	LOS A	2.1	54.3	0.02	0.37	0.02	38.0
All Vehicles		1558	2.6	1657	2.6	0.367	4.1	LOS A	2.1	54.3	0.02	0.37	0.02	38.0

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 101 [Meridian Ave E/Spencer St N - PM Peak Hour - 2035 Multi Lane (Site Folder: General)]

Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
Future (2035) PM Peak Hour - Option C

Site Category: PM Future with Project
Roundabout

Vehicle Movement Performance

Mov ID	Turn	INPUT VOLUMES [Total veh/h	HV] %	DEMAND FLOWS [Total veh/h	HV] %	Deg. Satn v/c	Aver. Delay sec	Level of Service	95% BACK OF QUEUE [Veh. veh	Dist] ft	Prop. Que	Effective Stop Rate	Aver. No. Cycles	Aver. Speed mph
South: Meridian Ave E														
3	L2	10	1.0	11	1.0	0.251	9.9	LOS A	1.2	29.8	0.07	0.38	0.07	38.0
8	T1	605	1.0	637	1.0	0.251	4.1	LOS A	1.2	29.8	0.07	0.38	0.07	37.7
18	R2	35	1.0	37	1.0	0.251	4.1	LOS A	1.2	29.8	0.07	0.38	0.07	36.7
Approach		650	1.0	684	1.0	0.251	4.2	LOS A	1.2	29.8	0.07	0.38	0.07	37.7
East: Spencer St N														
1	L2	15	0.0	16	0.0	0.031	11.5	LOS B	0.1	2.3	0.41	0.68	0.41	35.5
6	T1	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.031	5.7	LOS A	0.1	2.3	0.41	0.68	0.41	35.3
16	R2	10	0.0	11	0.0	0.031	5.5	LOS A	0.1	2.3	0.41	0.68	0.41	33.8
Approach		26	0.0	27	0.0	0.031	9.0	LOS A	0.1	2.3	0.41	0.68	0.41	34.9
North: Meridian Ave E														
7	L2	5	3.0	5	3.0	0.370	10.0	LOS B	2.0	51.4	0.13	0.38	0.13	37.6
4	T1	920	3.0	968	3.0	0.370	4.2	LOS A	2.0	51.4	0.13	0.37	0.13	37.4
14	R2	5	3.0	5	3.0	0.370	4.2	LOS A	2.0	51.4	0.13	0.37	0.13	36.1
Approach		930	3.0	979	3.0	0.370	4.2	LOS A	2.0	51.4	0.13	0.37	0.13	37.4
West: Spencer St N														
5	L2	5	0.0	5	0.0	0.035	12.2	LOS B	0.1	2.7	0.49	0.69	0.49	36.1
2	T1	1	0.0	1	0.0	0.035	6.4	LOS A	0.1	2.7	0.49	0.69	0.49	36.2
12	R2	20	0.0	21	0.0	0.035	6.2	LOS A	0.1	2.7	0.49	0.69	0.49	35.1
Approach		26	0.0	27	0.0	0.035	7.4	LOS A	0.1	2.7	0.49	0.69	0.49	35.3
All Vehicles		1632	2.1	1718	2.1	0.370	4.3	LOS A	2.0	51.4	0.12	0.39	0.12	37.5

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & Degree of Saturation (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: HCM Queue Formula.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

Appendix F: Alternatives Analysis

Appendix F: Level 1 Screening

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 1
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Level 1 Screening Process

ID	Improvement Type	Project Limits	Project Description	Would the Improvement meet the project mobility goals?					Discussion of Feasibility/Effectiveness	Included in Alternative?	Reason for Inclusion/Exclusion
				Vehicular	Ped/Bike	Transit	Safety	Access			
Corridor Capacity Improvements											
1	3-lane cross section (no change)	Segment 1	Retain one travel lane in each direction with a center two-way left-turn lane (60' R/W)	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Maintaining the existing 3-lane configuration would limit right-of-way impacts, provide unrestricted access to adjacent properties, and improve pedestrian and bicycle conditions from current conditions.	No	This configuration was not selcted as it would not provide vehicular capacity improvements along the corridor and would not provide safety benefits associated with restricted turning movements along the corridor.
2	Unbalanced 3-lane cross section	Segment 1	Provide two northbound and one southbound travel lane (continuation of lane assignments south of 36th Street) [80'-90' R/W]	Partially	Yes	Partially	No	Yes	Providing two northbound and one southbound travel lanes would increase capacity in the northbound direction but would not provide benefits in the southbound direction. A center turn lane would provide unrestricted access to adjacent properties and sidewalk facilities would improve conditions for pedestrians.	No	This configuration was not selected as it would not provide operational benefits in the southbound direction and would not address the congestion issues occurring in the southbound direction during the PM peak hour.
3	4-lane cross section	Segment 1	Provide two northbound and two southbound travel lanes with a central access management median (80'-90' R/W)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Two travel lanes in each direction would improve vehicular and transit operations and a center median would eliminate some turning movement conflicts.	Yes (Alt. C)	This configuration was selected for Alternative C as the center turn lane provided in other configurations is not required due to the roundabout configurations at major intersections.
4	5-lane cross section (without access management)	Segment 1	Provide two northbound and two southbound travel lanes with minimal access management treatments (80'-90' R/W)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Two travel lanes in each direction would improve vehicular and transit operations. A center turn lane would allow for unrestricted access to adjacent business while allowing left-turn movements to queue outside of the travel lane.	Yes (Alt. A)	This configuration was selected for Alternative A as it would maintain left-turn access to all driveway locations along the corridor.
5	5-lane cross section (with access management)	Segment 1	Provide two northbound and two southbound travel lanes with access management treatments (80'-90' R/W)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Two travel lanes in each direction would improve vehicular and transit operations; access management treatments would eliminate some turning movement conflicts (but would restrict access); and a center lane would allow left-turn movements to queue outside of the travel lane.	Yes (Alt. B)	This configuration was selected for Alternatives B as it provides the widest range of operational, safety, and alternative mode benefits.
Intersection Treatments											
1	Install/Modify Signal(s)	Segment 1 (24th St, 32nd St, 36th St)	Install/modify traffic signals at major intersections	Yes	No	No	No	No	Roundabouts would limit vehicular conflict points and would improve flow along the corridor. These treatments would also slow vehicles and provide dedicated pedestrian crossing locations, improving roadway safety. Installation of a roundabout may require the elimination of existing driveways near the	Yes (Alt. A and B)	This itersection treatment was selected for Alternatives A and B to evaluate the effectiveness with which these improvements would reduce minor street delay at the study intersections. Traffic signals would have a lower installation cost compared to roundabouts.
2	Install Roundabout(s)	Segment 1 (24th St, 32nd St, 36th St)	Install roundabouts at major intersections	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Roundabouts would limit vehicular conflict points and would improve flow along the corridor. These treatments would also slow vehicles and provide dedicated pedestrian crossing locations, improving roadway safety. Installation of a roundabout may require the elimination of existing driveways near the	Yes (Alt.C)	This intersection treatment was selected for Alternative C as it provides the greatest vehicular operational improvements, while also reducing the severity of vehicular conflict points.Roundabouts would have lower ongoing maintenance costs compared to traffic signals.
3	Signal Timing/Phasing Coordination	Segment 1 (24th St, 36th St)	Update traffic signal timing/phasing and coordination along the corridor to better serve future traffic volumes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Signal timing improvements would improve vehicular flow along the corridor but would not measurably improve pedestrian/bicycle facilities or roadway safety.	Yes (Alt. A and B)	This improvement was incorpoated in Alternatives A and B to improve coordination between the signals along the corridor, given that the existing distances between signals would be
4	Adaptive Traffic Control	Segment 1 (24th St, 36th St)	Install adaptive traffic signal control equipment at signalized intersections	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Adaptive signal control would improve vehicular flow along the corridor but would not measurably improve pedestrian/bicycle facilities or roadway safety.	No	This improvement was not selected due elevated costs associated with the implementation and maintenance of an adaptive traffic control system.
Access Management/Safety Measures											
1	Consolidate Driveways	Segment 1	Consolidate driveway access points along corridor, where feasible	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Consolidating driveways would improve pedestrian safety by minimizing vehicle/pedestrian conflict points, but may reduce site accessibility.	Yes (Alt. B and C)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternatives B and C to reduce the number of the conflict points along the corridor.
2	Center Raised Median	Segment 1	Install a center raised median along the corridor to restrict left-turn movements	No	No	No	Yes	No	A center raised median would limit vehicular conflict points but would reduce site accessibility for left-turn movements.	Yes (Alt. B and C)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternatives B and C to limit the number of locations for left-turns along the corridor and reduce the number of conflict points.
3	Two-Way Left-Turn Lane	Segment 1	Install a center two-way left-turn lane to provide access/egress to/from properties along the corridor	No	No	No	No	Yes	A two-way left-turn lane would maintain left-turn access for all driveway locations, but creates additional vehicular conflict points.	Yes (Alt. A)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternative A to provide convenient left-turn access and egress to driveways along the corridor.
4	Mid-Block U-Turn Locations	Segment 1	Provide breaks in the center median to allow for mid-block U-turns	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Mid-block U-turn locations create dedicated locations for U-turn movements to provide left-turn access to driveways blocked by a center raised median.	No	This improvement was not selected as the U-turn locations would require extensive widening of the roadway which would intrude into property owned by businesses and developments along the
5	U-Turns at Intersections	Segment 1	Permit U-turn at intersections at both ends of major blocks	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Permitting U-turn movements at intersections provides access to driveways blocked by a center raised median.	Yes (Alt. B and C)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternatives A and B to improve left-turn access to driveways along the corridor which would be restricted due to the installation of a raised median.
6	Minor Street Left-Turn Restrictions	Segment 1	Restrict left-turn and through movements from minor street approaches at 4-way intersection (e.g., 29th St)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Restricting left-turn movements from minor street at intersections would reduce the number and severity of vehicle conflict points at these intersections.	No	This improvement was not incorporated into the design alternatives as it would limit access to and connectivity of the parallel roadways adjacent to the corridor.
7	Non-Linear (Meandering) Median	Segment 1	Provide a narrow center median (with corresponding edgeline buffers) which are used to shift the travel lanes back and forth along the roadway	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	A non-linear median would act as a traffic calming measure (similar to a chicane) by breaking up long, straight blocks with shifting travel lanes.	Yes (Alt. C)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternative C to serve as a traffic calming measure to slow speeds along the corridor. The lack of a center turn lane in this alternative allows for the additional roadway with to be used to shift the travel lanes.
8	Chrisella Road Realignment	Segment 1	Realign Chrisella Rd to intersect 36th St, east of Meridian Ave. Install a cul-de-sac at the end of the existing Chrisella Rd alignment to provide access to existing businesses/homes.	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Realignment of Chrisella Road reduces the number of vehicular conflict points at Meridian Avenue & 36th Street and improves traffic flow along the westbound approach.	Yes (Alt. A, B, and C)	This improvement was incorporated into all alternatives to reduce the number of legs and turning movements at this intersection.
9	Lighting Improvements	Segment 1	Install new lighting/replace existing lighting as needed to sufficiently light corridor.	No	No	No	Yes	No	Improved roadway lighting provides roadway users with better visibility during the evening and night hours.	Yes (Alt. A, B, and C)	This improvement was incorporated into all alternatives to improve visibility of vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists.

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 1
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Level 1 Screening Process

ID	Improvement Type	Project Limits	Project Description	Would the Improvement meet the project mobility goals?					Discussion of Feasibility/Effectiveness	Included in Alternative?	Reason for Inclusion/Exclusion
				Vehicular	Ped/Bike	Transit	Safety	Access			
Transit Improvements											
1	Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)/Business Access Lane (BAL)	Segment 1	Restrict the northbound and southbound curb lanes for transit and right-turn use only. May allow general purpose traffic during non-peak periods of the day.	No	No	Yes	No	No	BRT/BAL facilities would improve transit travel times, but would reduce vehicular capacity along the roadway.	No	This improvement was not selected due to low transit ridership along Pierce Transit Route 402. The reduction in vehicular capacity required for the BRT/BAL lanes is not justified by the current level of ridership. Should ridership increase in the future, the corridor design shall accommodate and not preclude the installation of BRT/BAL lanes.
2	In-Lane Bus Stops	Segment 1	Install in-lane bus stops with curb extensions that allow the transit buses to stop adjacent to the curb for passenger loading and unloading without pulling to the side of the road	No	No	Yes	No	No	In-lane bus stops will allow faster transit service times as buses do not have to pull into and out of traffic when making a stop.	Yes (Alt. A, B, and C)	This improvement was incorporated into all alternatives to improve the speed of transit service along the corridor.
Pedestrian Improvements											
1	Wide Sidewalks	Segment 1	Provide wide (6'+) sidewalks along one or both sides of the roadway	No	Yes	No	No	No	Wide sidewalks provide a more comfortable pedestrian environment along the roadway.	Yes (Alt. B)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternatives A and C to improve pedestrian comfort along the corridor.
2	Landscape Buffer	Segment 1	Provide a landscaped buffer between the sidewalk and the roadway	No	Yes	No	No	No	Landscaped buffers create additional separation between vehicles and pedestrians, leading to a more comfortable walking environment.	Yes (Alt. A and B)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternative B to improve pedestrian comfort along the corridor.
3	Median Refuge Island	Segment 1	Provide protected space in the center of the roadway to facilitate pedestrian crossings	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Median refuge island provide a safe place for pedestrians to stop in the center of the roadway when traversing long crossings.	Yes (Alt. A, B, and C)	This improvement was incorporated into all alternatives to shorten pedestrian crossing distances along the corridor.
4	Midblock Crossing Locations	Segment 1	Provide Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) or Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (PHB) improvements at mid-block crossing locations.	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Midblock crossing locations provide pedestrians with safe locations to cross the roadway between intersections, where additional signage increases visibility.	Yes (Alt. A, B, and C)	This improvement was incorporated into all alternatives to improve pedestrian visibility and shorten the distance between dedicated crossing locations.
5	Curb Ramp Improvements	Segment 1	Improve non-compliant pedestrian curb ramps within the project limits to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	ADA curb ramp improvements will improve accessibility along the corridor.	Yes (Alt. A, B, and C)	This improvement was incorporated into all alternatives to provide a continuous ADA route along the corridor.
Bicycle Improvements											
1	Class IV Buffered Bike Lanes	Segment 1	Provide an on-street 5' bike lane separated from vehicular traffic by a 2' buffer	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Class IV buffered bike lines allow for physical separation between bicyclists and vehicular traffic along the roadway	Yes (Alt. A and C)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternatives A and C to provide an on-street bicycle facility with separation from vehicle traffic.
2	Off-Street Shared Use Path	Segment 1	Provide a one-way or two-way shared-use path separated from vehicular travel (adjacent to the sidewalk).	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	An off-street shared use path provides additional safety for bicyclists, as the dedicated path is located outside of the roadway.	Yes (Alt. B)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternative B to provide an off-street bicycle facility with vertical separation from vehicle traffic.

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 2
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Level 1 Screening Process

ID	Improvement Type	Project Limits	Project Description	Would the Improvement meet the project mobility goals?					Discussion of Feasibility/Effectiveness	Included in Alternative?	Reason for Inclusion/Exclusion
				Vehicular	Ped/Bike	Transit	Safety	Access			
Corridor Capacity Improvements											
1	2-lane cross section along entire segment (lane removal)	Segment 2	Remove one of the northbound travel lanes to provide one lane in each direction along the entire segment	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Eliminating one of the northbound travel lanes would provide space for the provision of pedestrian/bicycle facilities within th existing right-of-way, but would require the elimination of the northbound truck climbing lane.	No	This configuration was not selected as it would remove the northbound truck climbing lane and result in additional delay and congestion in the northbound direction.
2	2-lane/3-lane cross section (no change)	Segment 2	Retain two northbound and one southbound travel lanes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Maintaining the existing 3-lane configuration would limit right-of-way impacts to adjacent slopes and would allow for the provision of an off-street shared-use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. This would improve pedestrian/bicycle safety but would not improve roadway operations.	No	This configuration was selected for Alternative A to allow for the provision of pedestrian/bicycle facilities along the corridor.
3	2-lane/3-lane cross section (2 SB lanes, 1 NB lanes)	Segment 2	Retain the three-lane cross-section but switch the lane assignments to provide one northbound travel lane and two southbound travel lanes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Maintaining the existing 3-lane configuration would limit right-of-way impacts to adjacent slopes and would allow for the provision of an off-street shared-use path for pedestrians and bicyclists. This would require the removal of the northbound truck climbing	No	This configuration was not selected as it would remove the northbound truck climbing lane and result in additional delay and congestion in the northbound direction.
4	3-lane cross section along entire segment	Segment 2	Extend the second northbound travel lane south to Spencer St	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Extending the second travel lane south to Spencer Street would eliminate the northbound bottleneck at the UPRR bridge crossing	Yes (Alt. A)	The extension of the second northbound travel lane was included as an additional option to consider for Alternative A as this would eliminate the bottleneck assocaited with the short segment where only one northbound lane is provided.
5	4-lane cross section	Segment 2	Provide two northbound and two southbound travel lanes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Two travel lanes in each direction would improve vehicular and transit operations but would not allow for off-street active transportation facilities. Shoulders could be incorporated into the roadway to provide space for pedestrians and bicyclists, but would not provide a comfortable non-motorized environment.	Yes (Alt. B and C)	This configuration was selected for Alternatives B and C to increase vehicular capacity along the corridor.
Intersection Treatments											
1	Install Signal(s)	Segment 2 (Dechaux Rd and Spencer St)	Install signals at major intersections	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Signals would provide improved operations for minor street approaches at these intersections, which experience long delays during the peak hours.	Yes (Alt. A and B)	This intersection treatment was selected for Alternatives A and B to evaluate how the installation of signals would affect flow along the corridor. Traffic signals would have a lower installation cost compared to roundabouts.
2	Install Roundabout(s)	Segment 2 (Dechaux Rd and Spencer St)	Install roundabouts at major intersections	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Roundabouts would limit vehicular conflict points and would improve minor street approach dealy at these intersections.	Yes (Alt. C)	This intersection treatment was selected for Alternative C to evaluate how the installation of roundabouts would affect flow along the corridor. Roundabouts would have lower ongoing maintenance costs compared to traffic signals.
Access Management/Safety Measures											
1	Chrisella Road Realignment	Segment 2	Realign Chrisella Rd to intersect 36th St, east of Meridian Ave. Install a cul-de-sac at the end of the existing Chrisella Rd alignment to provide access to existing businesses/homes.	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Realignment of Chrisella Road reduces the number of vehicular conflict points at Meridian Avenue & 36th Street and improves traffic flow along the westbound approach.	Yes (Alt. A, B, and C)	This improvement was incorporated into all alternatives to reduce the number of legs and turning movements at this intersection.
2	Dechaux Road Intersection Realignment	Segment 2	Realign Dechaux Rd to the north so that it intersects Meridian Avenue at a 90 degree angle.	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Realignment of Dechaux Road will improve visibility for vehicles turning onto Meridian Road.	Yes (Alt. A, B, and C)	This improvement was incorporated into all alternatives to improve sight distance and safety at this intersection.
3	Full-Accesss Left Turns (no change)	Segment 2 (102nd Ave)	Maintain full-access left-turn movements to and from 102nd Ave	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	This configuration would allow for convenient access to the homes along this roadway, but would require southbound left-turn movements to be made from the single southbound travel lane (may result in backups in the southbound traffic flow).	Yes (Alt. A)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternative A as it would provide full access to 102nd Ave.
4	Right-In, Right-Out Restrictions	Segment 2 (102nd Ave)	Restrict left-turn movements to and from 102nd Ave	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	This configuration would restrict access to 102nd Ave, but would eliminate potential turning movement conflicts at this intersection.	Yes (Alt. B)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternative B as it would reduce vehicular turning movement conflicts at 102nd Ave.
5	Left-Turn Acceleration/ Deceleration Lane	Segment 2 (102nd Ave)	Provide a left-turn acceleration/deceleration lane along southbound Meridian Avenue at 102nd Ave	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	This configuration would move southbound left-turn movements out of the travel lane to reduce the potential for rear end collisions.	Yes (Alt. C)	This improvement was incorporated into Alterntive C as it would maintain full access to 102nd Ave and would move southbound left-turn vehicles out of the through travel lane.
Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) Crossing Improvements											
1	Maintain Existing Crossing (2-lane bridge)	Segment 2	Maintain the existing two-lane bridge for vehicular traffic	No	No	No	No	No	This represents no improvement from the existing conditions.	No	Improvements to the existing configuration of the UPRR crossing were deemed necessary to accommodate vehicular traffic demands and pedestrian/bicycle accessibility. Therefore, the no improvement option was not selected for an Alternative.
2	Construct Pedestrian/ Bicycle Bridge	Segment 2	Construct a bridge east of the existing UPRR bridge to accommodate a bicycle/pedestrian path	No	Yes	No	No	No	Expanding the bridge to provide pedestrian access would provide a pedestrian pathway for crossing the UPRR tracks.	Yes (Alt. A and C)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternatives A and C to provide a continuous pedestrian/bicycle path of travel along Meridian Ave, which would connect to the off-street shared-use
3	Construct New 2-Lane Bridge	Segment 2	Construct a second vehicular bridge west of the existing UPRR bridge to accommodate two additional vehicular travel lanes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Expanding the bridge for both additional travel lanes would allow for better vehicular operations along the corridor and remove an existing bottleneck.	Yes (Alt. B and C)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternatives B and C to allow for installation of additional travel lanes in one or both directions.
Pedestrian/Bicycle Improvements											
1	Add Shoulders	Segment 2	Widen the roadway to provide shoulders along the corridor to accommodate pedestrians/bicyclists.	No	Yes	No	No	No	Shoulders on the roadway can provide a space for pedestrians and bicyclists when R/W is limited.	Yes (Alt. B)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternative B to provide a narrow shoulder in both directions, which could allow for pedestrian and bicycle traffic.
2	Off-Street Shared-Use Path	Segment 2	Provide a two-way shared-use path along the east side of the roadway separated from vehicular travel.	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	An off-street shared-use path provides additional safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, as the dedicated path is physically separated from vehicular traffic.	Yes (Alt. A and C)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternatives A and C to provided a dedicated, separated pathway for pedestrian and bicycle traffic.
3	Alternate Off-Street Non-Motorized Routes	Segment 2	Identify and support the installation of parallel routes for non-motorized travel (96th St [planned], 114th St [existing], 122nd [existing])	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Alternative routes, while requiring longer travel distances, would provide non-motorized connectivity along roadways with lower speeds and traffic volumes.	Yes (Alt. A, B, and C)	This improvement was accounted for in all alternatives to support the inallation of an alternative path for pedestrian and bicycle travel along a parallel roadway (along 98th Ave).
4	Curb Ramp Improvements	Segment 2	Improve non-compliant pedestrian curb ramps within the project limits to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	ADA curb ramp improvements will improve accessibility along the corridor.	Yes (Alt. A anc C)	This improvement was incorporated into Alternatives A and C to provide ADA facilities along the shared-use path to make the corridor ADA accessible.

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Design Concepts

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Design Concept: Alternative A

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.



CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY



SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP01
SHEET	1
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A.dwg, 10/31/23 02:10:06pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP02
SHEET	2
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A.dwg, 10/31/23 02:10:21pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP03
SHEET	3
OF	11

C:\Users\eric\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A.dwg, 10/31/23 02:10:51pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.



CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY



SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY



NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP04
SHEET	4
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A.dwg, 10/31/23 02:11:09pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.



CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP05
SHEET	5
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A.dwg, 10/31/23 02:11:37pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP06
SHEET	1
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A.dwg, 10/31/23 02:11:54pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP07
SHEET	7
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A.dwg, 10/31/23 02:12:15pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	2/24
Designed	KAH	2/24
Reviewed	KAH	2/24
Approved	VLS	2/24

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP08
SHEET	8
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A.dwg, 02/12/24 04:54:14pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP09
SHEET	9
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A.dwg, 10/31/23 02:12:51pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP10
SHEET	10
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A.dwg, 10/31/23 02:13:07pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP11
SHEET	11
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A.dwg, 10/31/23 02:13:21pm

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Design Concept: Alternative B

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B1
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP01
SHEET	1
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B1.dwg, 10/31/23 03:03:18pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---



LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY



SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B1
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP02
SHEET	2
OF	11

C:\Users\eric\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B1.dwg, 10/31/23 03:03:33pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B1
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP03
SHEET	3
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B1.dwg, 10/31/23 03:04:01pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.



CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY



SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY



NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B1
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP04
SHEET	4
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B1.dwg, 10/31/23 03:04:19pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.



CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

1. GENERAL NOTES:

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY



NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B1
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP05
SHEET	5
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B1.dwg, 10/31/23 03:04:50pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B1
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP06
SHEET	1
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B1.dwg, 10/31/23 03:05:08pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B1
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP07
SHEET	7
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B1.dwg, 10/31/23 03:05:29pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	2/24
Designed	KAH	2/24
Reviewed	KAH	2/24
Approved	VLS	2/24

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B1
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP08
SHEET	8
OF	11

C:\Users\eric\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B1.dwg, 02/12/24 05:06:13pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B1
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP09
SHEET	9
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B1.dwg, 10/31/23 03:06:06pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B1
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP10
SHEET	10
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B1.dwg, 10/31/23 03:06:25pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B1
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP11
SHEET	11
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B1.dwg, 10/31/23 03:06:40pm

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Design Concept: Alternative C

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION C
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP01
SHEET	1
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt C.dwg, 10/31/23 03:39:03pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION C
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP02
SHEET	2
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt C.dwg, 10/31/23 03:39:19pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION C
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP03
SHEET	3
OF	11

C:\Users\eric\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt C.dwg, 10/31/23 03:39:47pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.



CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY



SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY



NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION C
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP04
SHEET	4
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt C.dwg, 10/31/23 03:40:06pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.



CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY



SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY



NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION C
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP05
SHEET	5
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt C.dwg, 10/31/23 03:40:35pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.



CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY



SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION C
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP06
SHEET	1
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt C.dwg, 10/31/23 03:40:53pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION C
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP07
SHEET	7
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt C.dwg, 10/31/23 03:41:15pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	2/24
Designed	KAH	2/24
Reviewed	KAH	2/24
Approved	VLS	2/24

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION C
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP08
SHEET	8
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt C.dwg, 02/12/24 05:02:31pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION C
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP09
SHEET	9
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt C.dwg, 10/31/23 03:41:53pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION C
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP10
SHEET	10
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt C.dwg, 10/31/23 03:42:13pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION C
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP11
SHEET	11
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt C.dwg, 10/31/23 03:42:28pm

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Evaluation Criteria

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Evaluation Criteria

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Score		
							0 (No Benefit)	1 (Some Benefit)	2 (Higher Benefit)
Safety	Establish a safe and comfortable environment for pedestrians, bicyclists, and all roadway users	Roadway (vehicle) Safety	Baseline	Alternative reduces collisions along the corridor. Quantitative: Expected collision reduction along the corridor	3.0		Alternative does not reduce collisions along the study corridor (0-5% reduction).	Alternative minorly reduces collisions along the corridor (5-25% reduction).	Alternative reduces collisions along the corridor (> 25% reduction).
		Pedestrian Comfort / Safety	Baseline	Alternative improves pedestrian safety and comfort along the corridor. Quantitative: Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress (PLTS) along the corridor	1.0		Alternative does not improve the PLTS along the corridor.	Alternative improves PLTS (but remains at level 3 or 4); **OR** Alternative improves PLTS (level 2) but does not slow vehicular traffic.	Alternative improves PLTS (level 1 or 2); **AND** Alternative slows vehicular traffic.
		Bicycle Comfort / Safety	Baseline	Alternative improves bicycle safety and comfort along the corridor. Quantitative: Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) along the corridor	1.0		Alternative does not improve the BLTS along the corridor.	Alternative improves BLTS (but remains at level 3 or 4); **OR** Alternative improves BLTS (level 2) but does not slow vehicular traffic.	Alternative improves BLTS (level 1 or 2); **AND** Alternative slows vehicular traffic.
Mobility	Implement a systematic strategy that addresses multimodal mobility and access needs along the corridor	Intersection Operations	Baseline	Alternative reduces vehicular delay at intersections and along the corridor. Quantitative: Delay / LOS conditions at the study intersections	2.0	1st	Alternative does not reduce or provides minor reductions in delay at intersections along the study corridor.	Some intersections operate at LOS F; **OR** Alternative reduces travel speeds along the corridor.	Alternative significantly reduces delay along the study corridor (i.e., all intersections operate at LOS E or better).
		Accessibility (ADA Facilities, Crossings, etc.)	Baseline	Alternative expands ADA accessibility along the corridor. Qualitative: Connectivity of ADA accessible routes	1.5	3rd	Alternative does not expand ADA accessible facilities along the entire corridor; **AND** Alternative does not shorten pedestrian crossing distances at intersection/midblock crossings.	Alternative expands ADA accessible facilities along the entire corridor; **AND** Alternative shortens pedestrian crossing distances at intersections or midblock crossings.	Alternative expands ADA accessible facilities along the entire corridor; **AND** Alternative shortens pedestrian crossing distances at intersections and midblock crossings.
		Effective Transit	Baseline	Alternative expands accessibility to transit facilities and improves transit speed and reliability. Quantitative / Qualitative: Transit travel times along the corridor and transit accessibility to adjacent communities	1.0		Alternative does not improve access to transit or improve transit operations; **OR** Alternative potentially increases transit travel time.	Alternative improves access to transit or transit operations.	Alternative increases access to transit and improves transit speed and reliability substantially in such a way that would make transit a more attractive travel mode.

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Evaluation Criteria

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Score		
							0 (No Benefit)	1 (Some Benefit)	2 (Higher Benefit)
Land Use	Support the City's Town Center Subarea Plan and other growth along the corridor	Town Center Development	Contextual	Alternative supports adjacent land use development in line with the City's Town Center Subarea Plan. Quantitative: Longest distance between pedestrian crossings Qualitative: Infrastructure to promote mixed-use development and pedestrian connectivity	1.0		Alternative is inconsistent with the vision for Town Center Subarea transportation network.	Alternative provides some pedestrian connectivity between land uses within the Town Center Subarea., via enhanced crossings at intersections/midblock locations.	Alternative provides strong pedestrian connectivity within the Town Center Subarea, via enhanced mid-block, high-visibility crossings, and slow travel speeds.
		Effective Parallel Corridors	Contextual	Alternative improves intersection locations connecting to the City's planned Collector roadways, as part of the Parallel Road Network. Qualitative: Connectivity to the Parallel Roadway Network	1.0		Alternative does not improve intersections on the project corridor identified within the Parallel Roadway Network.	Alternative partially improves intersections on the project corridor identified within the Parallel Roadway Plan.	Alternative fully improves intersections along the project corridor in line with the Parallel Roadway Plan.
		Local Business Access / Integration	Contextual	Alternative provides safe vehicular access to businesses and residences along the corridor. Qualitative: Accessibility to developments along the corridor	2.0	2nd	Alternative implements features which restrict access to adjacent properties, and does not provide roadway design features which accommodate U-turns to aid access.	Alternative implements features which restrict access to adjacent properties, but provide roadway design features which accommodate U-turns to aid access.	Alternative implements features which maintain full-access to adjacent properties.
		Corridor Aesthetics	Contextual	Alternative provides landscaping, lighting, and / or placemaking improvements to the corridor. Qualitative: Landscaping / lighting improvements to the corridor	1.0		Alternative does not provide improvements to landscaping or lighting along the corridor.	Alternative provides landscaping and/or lighting improvements to a portion of the corridor.	Alternative provides landscaping and lighting improvements along the entire corridor.

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Evaluation Criteria

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Score		
							0 (No Benefit)	1 (Some Benefit)	2 (Higher Benefit)
Community Involvement / Community Benefit	Collaborate with WSDOT, Pierce Transit, other stakeholders, and the public to confirm and address future needs	Community Support / Acceptance (survey results)	Contextual	Alternative receives widespread support from the community. Quantitative: Survey results	2.0		Alternative received little to no community support (>10%).	Alternative received some community support (less than 50%).	Alternative was widely supported by the community (over 50%).
		Regional Mobility / Continuity / Resiliency	Contextual	Alternative aligns with stakeholder "complete street" and multimodal priorities. Qualitative: Compatible with relevant WSDOT and Pierce Transit design guidelines and corridor improvement plans	1.0		Alternative does not include multimodal infrastructure.	Alternative provides multimodal infrastructure along segments of the project corridor or along parallel routes.	Alternative provides multimodal infrastructure along the entire project corridor.
		Constructability / Extendibility	Contextual	Alternative provides a cost-effective solution to implementing project improvements along the corridor. Quantitative: Improvement costs	1.5		Alternative requires high capital and/or maintenance costs.	Alternative requires moderate capital and/or maintenance costs.	Alternative requires low capital and/or maintenance costs.
		Funding Availability / Grant Applicability	Contextual	Alternative contains features that will allow the project to apply for local / regional / national funding. Qualitative: Improvement alignment with funding priorities	1.0		Alternative does not include features which would qualify the project for grant funding. **(No grant alignment categories)**	Alternative includes some features which align with the priorities of a few grant programs. **(1-2 grant alignment categories)**	Alternative strongly aligns with the priorities of several grant programs. **(3+ grant alignment categories)**
Natural Environment	Minimize impacts to the environment	Impacts on Natural Environment	Contextual	Alternative minimizes impacts to the areas adjacent to the roadway corridor, including steep slopes and other sensitive / critical areas. Quantitative: Area of Influence / Project Footprint	1.5		Alternative requires substantial intrusion along existing steep slopes and sensitive areas adjacent to the roadway along a majority of the corridor.	Alternative requires some intrusion along existing steep slopes and sensitive areas adjacent to the roadway at some locations along the corridor.	Alternative requires minimal intrusion along existing steep slopes and sensitive areas adjacent to the roadway at few locations along the corridor.
		Stormwater Management	Contextual	Alternative improves conditions for surface water runoff, including detention and water quality treatment infrastructure. Qualitative: Addition of pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) and/or pervious surfaces	1.0		Alternative adds pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) without associated stormwater management facilities.	Alternative adds pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) with associated stormwater management facilities.	Alternative adds non-pollution generating impervious surfaces (NPGIS) and/or pervious surfaces along the roadway.

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Evaluation Metrics

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Evaluation Metrics: Segment 1

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 1
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Evaluation Metrics

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Evaluation Metrics				
							No Build	Option A (Alternative A)	Option B (Alternative B1)	Option C (Alternative C)	Final Recommendation
Safety	Establish a safe and comfortable environment for pedestrians, bicyclists, and all roadway users	Roadway (vehicle) Safety	Baseline	Alternative reduces collisions along the corridor. Quantitative: Expected collision reduction along the corridor	3.0		5-Year Intersection Collisions 67 5-Year Segment Collisions 15	5-Year Intersection Collisions 63 5-Year Segment Collisions 15 (~5% reduction)	5-Year Intersection Collisions 55 5-Year Segment Collisions 4 (~28% reduction)	5-Year Intersection Collisions 53 5-Year Segment Collisions 4 (~30% reduction)	5-Year Intersection Collisions 53 5-Year Segment Collisions 4 (~30% reduction)
		Pedestrian Comfort / Safety	Baseline	Alternative improves pedestrian safety and comfort along the corridor. Quantitative: Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress (PLTS) along the corridor	1.0		No Sidewalk Travel Lanes: 1 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 35 mph **Pedestrian LTS 4**	Sidewalk w/ Robust Barrier Travel Lanes: 2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 35 mph **Pedestrian LTS 2**	Sidewalk w/ Robust Barrier Travel Lanes: 2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 35 mph **no vertical separation between peds and bikes* **Pedestrian LTS 2**	Sidewalk w/ Robust Barrier Travel Lanes: 2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 25 mph **speed reduction associated with roundabouts* **Pedestrian LTS 2**	Sidewalk w/ Robust Barrier Travel Lanes: 2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 25 mph **speed reduction associated with roundabouts* **Pedestrian LTS 2**
		Bicycle Comfort / Safety	Baseline	Alternative improves bicycle safety and comfort along the corridor. Quantitative: Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) along the corridor	1.0		No Bike Facility Travel Lanes: 1 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 35 mph **Bicycle LTS 4**	Vertically Delineated Bike Lane Travel Lanes: 2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 35 mph **Bicycle LTS 3**	Protected Bike Lane Travel Lanes: 2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 35 mph **Bicycle LTS 2**	Vertically Delineated Bike Lane Travel Lanes: 2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 25 mph **speed reduction associated with roundabouts* **Bicycle LTS 2**	Vertically Delineated Bike Lane Travel Lanes: 2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 25 mph **speed reduction associated with roundabouts* **Bicycle LTS 2**
Mobility	Implement a systematic strategy that addresses multimodal mobility and access needs along the corridor	Intersection Operations	Baseline	Alternative reduces vehicular delay at intersections and along the corridor. Quantitative: Delay / LOS conditions at the study intersections	2.0	1st	Intersection: PM Delay (LOS) 24th St: 47 sec (D) 29th St: >200 sec (F) 32nd St: >200 sec (F) 36th St: 40 sec (D)	Intersection: PM Delay (LOS) 24th St: 47 sec (D) 29th St: 95 sec (F) 32nd St: 12 sec (B) 36th St: 27 sec (C)	Intersection: PM Delay (LOS) 24th St: 47 sec (D) 29th St: 14 sec (B) 32nd St: 13 sec (B) 36th St: 27 sec (C)	Intersection: PM Delay (LOS) 24th St: 47 sec (D) 29th St: 14 sec (B) 32nd St: 6 sec (A) 36th St: 7 sec (A) **reduced travel speeds associated with roundabouts*	Intersection: PM Delay (LOS) 24th St: 47 sec (D) 29th St: 14 sec (B) 32nd St: 6 sec (A) 36th St: 7 sec (A) **reduced travel speeds associated with roundabouts*
		Accessibility (ADA Facilities, Crossings, etc.)	Baseline	Alternative expands ADA accessibility along the corridor. Qualitative: Connectivity of ADA accessible routes	1.5	3rd	Crossing Distance Intersection: 54' Midblock: n/a Incomplete sidewalk network	Crossing Distance Intersection: 70' Midblock: 29' Sidewalks provided along entire corridor w/ ADA accessible ramps	Crossing Distance Intersection: 75' Midblock: 23' Sidewalks provided along entire corridor w/ ADA accessible ramps	Crossing Distance Intersection: 22' Midblock: 29' Sidewalks provided along entire corridor w/ ADA accessible ramps	Crossing Distance Intersection: 22' Midblock: 29' Sidewalks provided along entire corridor w/ ADA accessible ramps
		Effective Transit	Baseline	Alternative expands accessibility to transit facilities and improves transit speed and reliability. Quantitative / Qualitative: Transit travel times along the corridor and transit accessibility to adjacent communities	1.0		N/A	Reduces transit delay w/ in-line stops (no delay associated with merging into travel flow)	Reduces transit delay w/ in-line stops (no delay associated with merging into travel flow)	Reduces transit delay w/ in-line stops (no delay associated with merging into travel flow). Potential increases in travel time associated with reduced speed along corridor and travel time through roundabouts.	Reduces transit delay w/ in-line stops (no delay associated with merging into travel flow). Potential increases in travel time associated with reduced speed along corridor and travel time through roundabouts.

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 1
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Evaluation Metrics

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Evaluation Metrics				
							No Build	Option A (Alternative A)	Option B (Alternative B1)	Option C (Alternative C)	Final Recommendation
Land Use	Support the City's Town Center Subarea Plan and other growth along the corridor	Town Center Development	Contextual	Alternative supports adjacent land use development in line with the City's Town Center Subarea Plan. Quantitative: Longest distance between pedestrian crossings Qualitative: Infrastructure to promote mixed-use development and pedestrian connectivity	1.0		Longest Distance btw. Marked crossings: 3,800 ft	Longest Distance btw. Marked crossings: 1,300 ft	Longest Distance btw. Marked crossings: 1,600 ft	Longest Distance btw. Marked crossings: 1,300 ft **reduced speeds associated with roundabout will create a pedestrian-friendly environment*	Longest Distance btw. Marked crossings: 1,300 ft **reduced speeds associated with roundabout will create a pedestrian-friendly environment*
		Effective Parallel Corridors	Contextual	Alternative improves intersection locations connecting to the City's planned Collector roadways, as part of the Parallel Road Network. Qualitative: Connectivity to the Parallel Roadway Network	1.0		N/A	Project fully improves intersections at 32nd St and 36th St to reduce minor approach delay; maintains connectivity opportunities at 29th St (full-access)	Project fully improves intersections at 32nd St and 36th St to reduce minor approach delay; reduces connectivity opportunities at 29th St (right-in/right-out)	Project fully improves intersections at 32nd St and 36th St to reduce minor approach delay; reduces connectivity opportunities at 29th St (right-in/right-out)	Project fully improves intersections at 32nd St and 36th St to reduce minor approach delay; reduces connectivity opportunities at 29th St (right-in/right-out)
		Local Business Access / Integration	Contextual	Alternative provides safe vehicular access to businesses and residences along the corridor. Qualitative: Accessibility to developments along the corridor	2.0	2nd	N/A	TWLTL will allow maintain full-access to driveways and minor street approaches	Median will restrict turning movements to/from driveways but U-turns will be allowed at major intersections	Median will restrict turning movements to/from driveways but U-turns will be allowed at major intersections via roundabouts	Median will restrict turning movements to/from minor driveways but U-turns will be allowed at major intersections via roundabouts
		Corridor Aesthetics	Contextual	Alternative provides landscaping, lighting, and / or placemaking improvements to the corridor. Qualitative: Landscaping / lighting improvements to the corridor	1.0		N/A	Street and pedestrian lighting improvements along corridor; landscaping improvements along roadside	Street and pedestrian lighting improvements along corridor; landscaping improvements along roadside and within median	Street and pedestrian lighting improvements along corridor; landscaping improvements along roadside and within median	Street and pedestrian lighting improvements along corridor; landscaping improvements along roadside and within median

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 1
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Evaluation Metrics

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Evaluation Metrics				
							No Build	Option A (Alternative A)	Option B (Alternative B1)	Option C (Alternative C)	Final Recommendation
Community Involvement / Community Benefit	Collaborate with WSDOT, Pierce Transit, other stakeholders, and the public to confirm and address future needs	Community Support / Acceptance (survey results)	Contextual	Alternative receives widespread support from the community. Quantitative: Survey results	2.0		N/A	22% First Choice	70% First Choice	Aligns with Option A bicycle facilities	Aligns with Option B bicycle facilities
		Regional Mobility / Continuity / Resiliency	Contextual	Alternative aligns with stakeholder "complete street" and multimodal priorities. Qualitative: Compatible with relevant WSDOT and Pierce Transit design guidelines and corridor improvement plans	1.0		No multimodal infrastructure along corridor	Alternative provides multimodal infrastructure along the entire segment; however, in-line transit stops may interfere with continuous bicycle facilities.	Alternative provides multimodal infrastructure along the entire segment.	Alternative provides multimodal infrastructure along the entire segment; however, in-line transit stops may interfere with continuous bicycle facilities.	Alternative provides multimodal infrastructure along the entire segment.
		Constructability / Extendibility	Contextual	Alternative provides a cost-effective solution to implementing project improvements along the corridor. Quantitative: Improvement costs	1.5		N/A	Capital Costs: Widen corridor from 3-lane to 5-lane; maintain existing center turn lane; modify 36th St signal; install new signal at 32nd St Maintenance Costs: Ongoing signal operation costs	Capital Costs: Widen corridor from 3-lane to 5-lane; construct center raised median; modify 36th St signal; install new signal at 32nd St; U-turn widening at 24th St and 32nd St Maintenance Costs: Signal operation cost; median landscaping maintenance costs	Capital Costs: Widen corridor from 3-lane to 5-lane; construct center raised median; install roundabout at 32nd St and 36th St Maintenance Costs: Median landscaping maintenance costs	Capital Costs: Widen corridor from 3-lane to 5-lane; construct center raised median; install roundabout at 32nd St and 36th St Maintenance Costs: Median landscaping maintenance costs
		Funding Availability / Grant Applicability	Contextual	Alternative contains features that will allow the project to apply for local / regional / national funding. Qualitative: Improvement alignment with funding priorities	1.0		N/A	Grant alignment categories: Active Transportation (ped/bike facilities) Community Connectivity (enhanced crossings and slowing traffic)	Grant alignment categories: Safety (access control) Active Transportation (ped/bike facilities) Community Connectivity (enhanced crossings and slowing traffic)	Grant alignment categories: Safety (access control and roundabouts) Active Transportation (ped/bike facilities) Community Connectivity (enhanced crossings and slowing traffic)	Grant alignment categories: Safety (access control and roundabouts) Active Transportation (ped/bike facilities) Community Connectivity (enhanced crossings and slowing traffic)
Natural Environment	Minimize impacts to the environment	Impacts on Natural Environment	Contextual	Alternative minimizes impacts to the areas adjacent to the roadway corridor, including steep slopes and other sensitive / critical areas. Quantitative: Area of Influence / Project Footprint	1.5		N/A	Proposed ROW = 90' Improvements within the proposed ROW at intersections with minimal intrusion into adjacent businesses	Proposed ROW = 90' Improvements extend beyond proposed ROW at intersections with some intrusion into adjacent businesses (due to widening for U-turns)	Proposed ROW = 90' Improvements within the proposed ROW at intersections with minimal intrusion into adjacent businesses	Proposed ROW = 90' Improvements within the proposed ROW at intersections with minimal intrusion into adjacent businesses
		Stormwater Management	Contextual	Alternative improves conditions for surface water runoff, including detention and water quality treatment infrastructure. Qualitative: Addition of pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) and/or pervious surfaces	1.0		Minimal stormwater facilities along the corridor	Alternative adds pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) with the addition of 2 new vehicular lanes along the corridor. Stormwater facilities are required to address the new PGIS and may involve having detention and water quality facilities that are underground and/or on property adjacent to the corridor.	Alternative adds pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) with the addition of 2 new vehicular lanes along the corridor. Stormwater facilities are required to address the new PGIS and may involve having detention and water quality facilities that are underground and/or on property adjacent to the corridor. Increase in pervious surfaces with the addition of a center median.	Alternative adds pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) with the addition of 2 new vehicular lanes along the corridor. Stormwater facilities are required to address the new PGIS and may involve having detention and water quality facilities that are underground and/or on property adjacent to the corridor. Increase in pervious surfaces with the addition of a center median.	Alternative adds pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) with the addition of 2 new vehicular lanes along the corridor. Stormwater facilities are required to address the new PGIS and may involve having detention and water quality facilities that are underground and/or on property adjacent to the corridor. Center median increases pervious surfaces. Increase in pervious surfaces with the addition of a center median.

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Evaluation Metrics: Segment 2

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 2
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Evaluation Metrics

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Evaluation Metrics				
							No Build	Option A (Alternative A)	Option B (Alternative B1)	Option C (Alternative C)	Final Recommendation
Safety		Roadway (vehicle) Safety	Baseline	Alternative reduces collisions along the corridor. Quantitative: Expected collision reduction along the corridor	3.0		5-Year Intersection Collisions 53 5-Year Segment Collisions 18	5-Year Intersection Collisions 46 5-Year Segment Collisions 18 (~10% reduction)	5-Year Intersection Collisions 25 5-Year Segment Collisions 18 (~40% reduction)	5-Year Intersection Collisions 48 5-Year Segment Collisions 18 (~7% reduction)	5-Year Intersection Collisions 41 5-Year Segment Collisions 18 (~17% reduction)
		Pedestrian Comfort / Safety	Baseline	Alternative improves pedestrian safety and comfort along the corridor. Quantitative: Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress (PLTS) along the corridor	1.0		No Sidewalk Travel Lanes: 1-2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 35 mph **Pedestrian LTS 4**	Multi-use Path w/ Robust Barrier Travel Lanes: 1-2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 35 mph **no separation between peds and bikes* **Pedestrian LTS 2**	No Sidewalk Travel Lanes: 2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 35 mph **Pedestrian LTS 4**	Multi-use Path w/ Robust Barrier Travel Lanes: 2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 25 mph **no separation btwn peds & bikes* **speed reduction associated with roundabouts* **Pedestrian LTS 2**	Multi-use Path w/ Robust Barrier Travel Lanes: 1-2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 25 mph **no separation btwn peds & bikes* **speed reduction associated with roundabouts* **Pedestrian LTS 2**
		Bicycle Comfort / Safety	Baseline	Alternative improves bicycle safety and comfort along the corridor. Quantitative: Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) along the corridor	1.0		No Bike Facility Travel Lanes: 1-2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 35 mph **Bicycle LTS 4**	Multi-use Path w/ Robust Barrier Travel Lanes: 1-2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 35 mph **no separation between peds and bikes* **Bicycle LTS 2**	Painted Shoulder (4 foot) Travel Lanes: 2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 35 mph **Bicycle LTS 4**	Multi-use Path w/ Robust Barrier Travel Lanes: 1-2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 25 mph **no separation btwn peds & bikes* **speed reduction associated with roundabouts* **Bicycle LTS 2**	Multi-use Path w/ Robust Barrier Travel Lanes: 1-2 per direction AADT: ~16,700 Speed Limit: 25 mph **no separation btwn peds & bikes* **speed reduction associated with roundabouts* **Bicycle LTS 2**
Mobility	Implement a systematic strategy that addresses multimodal mobility, access, and safety needs along the corridor	Intersection Operations	Baseline	Alternative reduces vehicular delay at intersections and along the corridor. Quantitative: Delay / LOS conditions at the study intersections	2.0	1st	Intersection: PM Delay (LOS) 36th St: 40 sec (D) 102nd Ave: 84 sec (F) Dechaux Rd: 13 sec (B)	Intersection: PM Delay (LOS) 36th St: 27 sec (C) 102nd Ave: 84 sec (F) Dechaux Rd: 2 sec (A)	Intersection: PM Delay (LOS) 36th St: 27 sec (C) 102nd Ave: 12 sec (B) Dechaux Rd: 1 sec (A)	Intersection: PM Delay (LOS) 36th St: 7 sec (A) 102nd Ave: 29 sec (D) Dechaux Rd: 4 sec (A) **reduced travel speeds associated with roundabouts*	Intersection: PM Delay (LOS) 36th St: 7 sec (A) 102nd Ave: 29 sec (D) Dechaux Rd: 4 sec (A) **reduced travel speeds associated with roundabouts*
		Accessibility (ADA Facilities, Crossings, etc.)	Baseline	Alternative expands ADA accessibility along the corridor. Qualitative: Connectivity of ADA accessible routes	1.5	3rd	Crossing Dist: 40' No sidewalk	Crossing Dist: 42' Multi-use path provided along one side of the roadway	Crossing Dist: 52' No sidewalk	Crossing Dist: 23' Multi-use path provided along one side of the roadway	Crossing Dist: 23' Multi-use path provided along one side of the roadway
		Effective Transit	Baseline	Alternative expands accessibility to transit facilities and improves transit speed and reliability. Quantitative / Qualitative: Transit travel times along the corridor and transit accessibility to adjacent communities	1.0		N/A	No change in transit facilities or travel time along segment	Reduction in congested transit travel time due to removal of bottleneck with the additional travel lanes.	Reduction in congested transit travel time due to removal of bottleneck with the additional travel lane along southern portion of segment. Potential increases in travel time associated with reduced speed along corridor and travel time through roundabouts.	Reduction in congested transit travel time due to removal of bottleneck with the additional travel lane along southern portion of segment. Potential increases in travel time associated with reduced speed along corridor and travel time through roundabouts.

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 2
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Evaluation Metrics

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Evaluation Metrics				
							No Build	Option A (Alternative A)	Option B (Alternative B1)	Option C (Alternative C)	Final Recommendation
Land Use	Support the City's Town Center Subarea Plan and other growth along the corridor	Town Center Development	Contextual	Alternative supports adjacent land use development in line with the City's Town Center Subarea Plan. Quantitative: Longest distance between pedestrian crossings Qualitative: Infrastructure to promote mixed-use development and pedestrian connectivity	1.0		N/A (segment not along Town Center)	N/A (segment not within Town Center)	N/A (segment not within Town Center)	N/A (segment not within Town Center)	N/A (segment not within Town Center)
		Effective Parallel Corridors	Contextual	Alternative improves intersection locations connecting to the City's planned Collector roadways, as part of the Parallel Road Network. Qualitative: Connectivity to the Parallel Roadway Network	1.0		N/A (segment not along Parallel Corridor network)	N/A (segment not along Parallel Corridor network)	N/A (segment not along Parallel Corridor network)	N/A (segment not along Parallel Corridor network)	N/A (segment not along Parallel Corridor network)
		Local Business Access / Integration	Contextual	Alternative provides safe vehicular access to businesses and residences along the corridor. Qualitative: Accessibility to developments along the corridor	2.0	2nd	N/A	No changes to access at 102 Ave (full access with no left-turn pocket); reduces minor-street approach delay	Left turn access restriction at 102nd Ave (coupled with U-turn access at Dechaux Rd); reduces minor-street approach delay but requires additional travel distance for left-turns at 102nd Ave	SB left acceleration/deceleration lane provided at 102nd Ave (full-access); reduces minor-street approach delay	SB left acceleration/deceleration lane provided at 102nd Ave (full-access); reduces minor-street approach delay
		Corridor Aesthetics	Contextual	Alternative provides landscaping, lighting, and / or placemaking improvements to the corridor. Qualitative: Landscaping / lighting improvements to the corridor	1.0		N/A	Street and pedestrian lighting improvements along corridor; landscaping improvements along east side of roadway adjacent to multi-use path	Street lighting improvements along corridor; minimal landscaping improvements no pathway on east side (minimize slope intrusion)	Street and pedestrian lighting improvements along corridor; landscaping improvements along east side of roadway adjacent to multi-use path	Street and pedestrian lighting improvements along corridor; landscaping improvements along east side of roadway adjacent to multi-use path

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 2
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Evaluation Metrics

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Evaluation Metrics				
							No Build	Option A (Alternative A)	Option B (Alternative B1)	Option C (Alternative C)	Final Recommendation
Community Involvement / Community Benefit	Collaborate with WSDOT, Pierce Transit, other stakeholders, and the public to confirm and address future needs	Community Support / Acceptance (survey results)	Contextual	Alternative receives widespread support from the community. Quantitative: Survey results	2.0		N/A	28% First Choice	63% First Choice	Includes multi-use path along east side roadway (aligns with Option A).	Includes multi-use path along east side roadway (aligns with Option A).
		Regional Mobility / Continuity / Resiliency	Contextual	Alternative aligns with stakeholder "complete street" and multimodal priorities. Qualitative: Compatible with relevant WSDOT and Pierce Transit design guidelines and corridor improvement plans	1.0		No multimodal infrastructure along corridor	Alternative provides multimodal infrastructure along the entire segment.	Alternative does not expand multimodal facilities along the corridor	Alternative provides multimodal infrastructure along the entire segment.	Alternative provides multimodal infrastructure along the entire segment.
		Constructability / Extendibility	Contextual	Alternative provides a cost-effective solution to implementing project improvements along the corridor. Quantitative: Improvement costs	1.5		N/A	Capital Costs: Widen corridor to one side (east); construct cut retaining walls; construct non-motorized path; construct pedestrian/bicycle-only bridge over UPRR	Capital Costs: Widen corridor from 3-lanes to 4-lanes on both sides; construct cut and fill retaining walls; construct 2-lane bridge over UPRR	Capital Costs: Widen corridor from 3-lanes to 4-lanes on both sides; construct cut and fill retaining walls; construct non-motorized path; construct 2-lane bridge and pedestrian/bicycle only bridge over UPRR	Capital Costs: Widen corridor to one side (east); construct cut retaining walls; construct non-motorized path; construct 2-lane bridge (to allow for future additional southbound lane) and pedestrian/bicycle only bridge over UPRR
		Funding Availability / Grant Applicability	Contextual	Alternative contains features that will allow the project to apply for local / regional / national funding. Qualitative: Improvement alignment with funding priorities	1.0		N/A	Grant alignment features: Active Transportation (ped/bike facilities) Community Connectivity (access between north and south of hill)	Grant alignment features: Safety (access restriction)	Grant alignment features: Active Transportation (ped/bike facilities) Safety (roundabout installation and left turn lane) Community Connectivity (access between north and south of hill)	Grant alignment features: Active Transportation (ped/bike facilities) Safety (roundabout installation and left turn lane) Community Connectivity (access between north and south of hill)
Natural Environment	Minimize impacts to the environment	Impacts on Natural Environment	Contextual	Alternative minimizes impacts to the areas adjacent to the roadway corridor, including steep slopes and other sensitive / critical areas. Quantitative: Area of Influence / Project Footprint	1.5		N/A	Road+Sidewalk width = 50' Intrusion proposed into adjacent slope on one side of the corridor (east side)	Road+Sidewalk width = 52' Intrusion proposed into adjacent slope on both sides of the corridor to minimize the degree of intrusion to the existing slopes	Road+Sidewalk width = 61' Substantial intrusion into adjacent slopes (both sides)	Road+Sidewalk width = 50' Intrusion proposed into adjacent slope on one side of the corridor (east side)
		Stormwater Management	Contextual	Alternative improves conditions for surface water runoff, including detention and water quality treatment infrastructure. Qualitative: Addition of pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) and/or pervious surfaces	1.0		No stormwater facilities along the corridor	Alternative primarily involves addition of non-pollution generating impervious surfaces (NPGIS) with walls, wide path, and pedestrian bridge over UPRR with widening only on one side of existing corridor (east side). Stormwater facilities may involve having an infiltration trench under the walkway for the new NPGIS.	Alternative involves addition of pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) with the addition of a new vehicular lane along the corridor. Stormwater facilities are required to address the new PGIS and may involve having detention and water quality facilities that are underground and/or on property adjacent to the corridor.	Alternative involves addition of pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) with the addition of a new vehicular lane along the corridor. Stormwater facilities are required to address the new PGIS and may involve having detention and water quality facilities that are underground and/or on property adjacent to the corridor.	Alternative involves addition of pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) with the addition of a new vehicular lane along the southern portion of the corridor. Stormwater facilities are required to address the new PGIS and may involve having detention and water quality facilities that are underground and/or on property adjacent to the

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Evaluation Scoring Results

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Evaluation Scoring Results: Segment 1

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 1
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Scoring Results

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Score			
							Option A (Alternative A)	Option B (Alternative B1)	Option C (Alternative C)	Final Recommendation
Safety		Roadway (vehicle) Safety	Baseline	Alternative reduces collisions along the corridor. Quantitative: Expected collision reduction along the corridor	3.0		○	●	●	●
		Pedestrian Comfort / Safety	Baseline	Alternative improves pedestrian safety and comfort along the corridor. Quantitative: Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress (PLTS) along the corridor	1.0		◑	◑	●	●
		Bicycle Comfort / Safety	Baseline	Alternative improves bicycle safety and comfort along the corridor. Quantitative: Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) along the corridor	1.0		◑	◑	●	●
Mobility	Implement a systematic strategy that addresses multimodal mobility, access, and safety needs along the corridor	Intersection Operations	Baseline	Alternative reduces vehicular delay at intersections and along the corridor. Quantitative: Delay / LOS conditions at the study intersections	2.0	1st	◑	●	◑	◑
		Accessibility (ADA Facilities, Crossings, etc.)	Baseline	Alternative expands ADA accessibility along the corridor. Qualitative: Connectivity of ADA accessible routes	1.5	3rd	◑	◑	●	●
		Effective Transit	Baseline	Alternative expands accessibility to transit facilities and improves transit speed and reliability. Quantitative / Qualitative: Transit travel times along the corridor and transit accessibility to adjacent communities	1.0		◑	◑	○	○

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 1
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Scoring Results

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Score			
							Option A (Alternative A)	Option B (Alternative B1)	Option C (Alternative C)	Final Recommendation
Land Use	Support the City's Town Center Subarea Plan and other growth along the corridor	Town Center Development	Contextual	Alternative supports adjacent land use development in line with the City's Town Center Subarea Plan. Quantitative: Longest distance between pedestrian crossings Qualitative: Infrastructure to promote mixed-use development and pedestrian connectivity	1.0		◑	◑	●	●
		Effective Parallel Corridors	Contextual	Alternative improves intersection locations connecting to the City's planned Collector roadways, as part of the Parallel Road Network. Qualitative: Connectivity to the Parallel Roadway Network	1.0		●	◑	◑	◑
		Local Business Access / Integration	Contextual	Alternative provides safe vehicular access to businesses and residences along the corridor. Qualitative: Accessibility to developments along the corridor	2.0	2nd	●	◑	◑	◑
		Corridor Aesthetics	Contextual	Alternative provides landscaping, lighting, and / or placemaking improvements to the corridor. Qualitative: Landscaping / lighting improvements to the corridor	1.0		◑	●	●	●

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 1
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Scoring Results

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Score			
							Option A (Alternative A)	Option B (Alternative B1)	Option C (Alternative C)	Final Recommendation
Community Involvement / Community Benefit	Collaborate with WSDOT, Pierce Transit, other stakeholders, and the public to confirm and address future needs	Community Support / Acceptance (survey results)	Contextual	Alternative receives widespread support from the community. Quantitative: Survey results	2.0		◑	●	◑	●
		Regional Mobility / Continuity / Resiliency	Contextual	Alternative aligns with stakeholder "complete street" and multimodal priorities. Qualitative: Compatible with relevant WSDOT and Pierce Transit design guidelines and corridor improvement plans	1.0		◑	●	◑	●
		Constructability / Extendibility	Contextual	Alternative provides a cost-effective solution to implementing project improvements along the corridor. Quantitative: Improvement costs	1.5		●	○	◑	◑
		Funding Availability / Grant Applicability	Contextual	Alternative contains features that will allow the project to apply for local / regional / national funding. Qualitative: Improvement alignment with funding priorities	1.0		◑	●	●	●
Natural Environment	Minimize impacts to the environment	Impacts on Natural Environment	Contextual	Alternative minimizes impacts to the areas adjacent to the roadway corridor, including steep slopes and other sensitive / critical areas. Quantitative: Area of Influence / Project Footprint	1.5		●	◑	●	●
		Stormwater Management	Contextual	Alternative improves conditions for surface water runoff, including detention and water quality treatment infrastructure. Qualitative: Addition of pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) and/or pervious surfaces	1.0		◑	●	●	●
						Total Score (Raw)	**19.0**	**22.0**	**24.0**	**26.0**
						Total Score (Weighted)	**25.5**	**32.0**	**33.5**	**36.5**

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Evaluation Scoring Results: Segment 2

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 2
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Scoring Results

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Score			
							Option A (Alternative A)	Option B (Alternative B1)	Option C (Alternative C)	Final Recommendation
Safety		Roadway (vehicle) Safety	Baseline	Alternative reduces collisions along the corridor. Quantitative: Expected collision reduction along the corridor	3.0		◑	●	◑	◑
		Pedestrian Comfort / Safety	Baseline	Alternative improves pedestrian safety and comfort along the corridor. Quantitative: Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress (PLTS) along the corridor	1.0		◑	○	●	●
		Bicycle Comfort / Safety	Baseline	Alternative improves bicycle safety and comfort along the corridor. Quantitative: Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) along the corridor	1.0		◑	○	●	●
Mobility	Implement a systematic strategy that addresses multimodal mobility, access, and safety needs along the corridor	Intersection Operations	Baseline	Alternative reduces vehicular delay at intersections and along the corridor. Quantitative: Delay / LOS conditions at the study intersections	2.0	1st	○	●	◑	◑
		Accessibility (ADA Facilities, Crossings, etc.)	Baseline	Alternative expands ADA accessibility along the corridor. Qualitative: Connectivity of ADA accessible routes	1.5	3rd	●	○	●	●
		Effective Transit	Baseline	Alternative expands accessibility to transit facilities and improves transit speed and reliability. Quantitative / Qualitative: Transit travel times along the corridor and transit accessibility to adjacent communities	1.0		○	◑	○	○

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 2
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Scoring Results

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Score			
							Option A (Alternative A)	Option B (Alternative B1)	Option C (Alternative C)	Final Recommendation
Land Use	Support the City's Town Center Subarea Plan and other growth along the corridor	Town Center Development	Contextual	Alternative supports adjacent land use development in line with the City's Town Center Subarea Plan. Quantitative: Longest distance between pedestrian crossings Qualitative: Infrastructure to promote mixed-use development and pedestrian connectivity	1.0		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Effective Parallel Corridors	Contextual	Alternative improves intersection locations connecting to the City's planned Collector roadways, as part of the Parallel Road Network. Qualitative: Connectivity to the Parallel Roadway Network	1.0		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Local Business Access / Integration	Contextual	Alternative provides safe vehicular access to businesses and residences along the corridor. Qualitative: Accessibility to developments along the corridor	2.0	2nd	●	◑	●	●
		Corridor Aesthetics	Contextual	Alternative provides landscaping, lighting, and / or placemaking improvements to the corridor. Qualitative: Landscaping / lighting improvements to the corridor	1.0		●	◑	●	●

City of Edgewood - Meridian Avenue Corridor Study
SEGMENT 2
Alternatives Analysis / Feasibility Screening Process - Scoring Results

Goal	Description	Criteria	Needs Category	Performance Metrics	Weighted Factor	Community Priorities	Score			
							Option A (Alternative A)	Option B (Alternative B1)	Option C (Alternative C)	Final Recommendation
Community Involvement / Community Benefit	Collaborate with WSDOT, Pierce Transit, other stakeholders, and the public to confirm and address future needs	Community Support / Acceptance (survey results)	Contextual	Alternative receives widespread support from the community. Quantitative: Survey results	2.0		◑	●	◑	◑
		Regional Mobility / Continuity / Resiliency	Contextual	Alternative aligns with stakeholder "complete street" and multimodal priorities. Qualitative: Compatible with relevant WSDOT and Pierce Transit design guidelines and corridor improvement plans	1.0		●	○	●	●
		Constructability / Extendibility	Contextual	Alternative provides a cost-effective solution to implementing project improvements along the corridor. Quantitative: Improvement costs	1.5		●	◑	○	◑
		Funding Availability / Grant Applicability	Contextual	Alternative contains features that will allow the project to apply for local / regional / national funding. Qualitative: Improvement alignment with funding priorities	1.0		◑	◑	●	●
Natural Environment	Minimize impacts to the environment	Impacts on Natural Environment	Contextual	Alternative minimizes impacts to the areas adjacent to the roadway corridor, including steep slopes and other sensitive / critical areas. Quantitative: Area of Influence / Project Footprint	1.5		●	◑	○	●
		Stormwater Management	Contextual	Alternative improves conditions for surface water runoff, including detention and water quality treatment infrastructure. Qualitative: Addition of pollution generating impervious surfaces (PGIS) and/or pervious surfaces	1.0		●	◑	◑	◑

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Cost Estimates

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Cost Estimates: Alternative A

City of Edgewood
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project Description:	Meridian Corridor Study (SR 161)	Date: 3/8/2024
Design Concept:	**Option A (Alternative A)** All construction phases summary	Prepared By: KAH

	Option A Phase 1	Option A Phase 2	Option A Phase 3	Option A Phase 4	Option A Phase 5	Option A FULL PROJECT	
From:	24th	S. of 32nd	S. of 36th	S. of 102nd	S. of Dechaux Ext.	24th	
To:	S. of 32nd	S. of 36th	S. of 102nd	S. of Dechaux Ext.	Spencer	Spencer	
Station:	197+00	164+00	150+00	126+00	112+00	197+00	
Station:	164+00	150+00	126+00	112+00	86+00	86+00	
Feet:	3,300	1,400	2,400	1,400	2,600	11,100	
Miles:	0.63	0.27	0.45	0.27	0.49	2.10	
CONSTRUCTION							
Preparation	$ 1,045,680	$ 539,980	$ 1,011,480	$ 254,860	$ 1,188,300	$ 4,040,300	12%
Grading	$ 1,059,040	$ 248,825	$ 364,200	$ 212,510	$ 862,095	$ 2,746,670	8%
Storm Drainage	$ 1,347,600	$ 720,800	$ 696,800	$ 443,300	$ 746,400	$ 3,954,900	12%
Paving	$ 1,201,300	$ 723,850	$ 262,075	$ 156,225	$ 282,375	$ 2,625,825	8%
Concrete	$ 532,955	$ 247,840	$ 251,710	$ 149,425	$ 284,280	$ 1,466,210	4%
Structures	$ 216,505	$ 162,740	$ 5,302,715	$ -	$ 5,940,915	$ 11,622,875	35%
TESC and Landscaping	$ 286,060	$ 206,360	$ 250,425	$ 113,160	$ 275,925	$ 1,131,930	3%
Traffic	$ 2,305,760	$ 1,219,900	$ 492,000	$ 505,430	$ 1,106,370	$ 5,629,460	17%
Other Items	$ 65,000	$ 53,500	$ 53,500	$ 53,500	$ 53,500	$ 279,000	1%
CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL	$ 8,059,900	$ 4,123,795	$ 8,684,905	$ 1,888,410	$ 10,740,160	$ 33,497,170	
Contingency	$ 3,223,960	$ 1,649,520	$ 3,473,970	$ 755,370	$ 4,296,070	$ 13,398,890	40%
CONSTRUCTION TOTAL	**$ 11,283,860**	**$ 5,773,315**	**$ 12,158,875**	**$ 2,643,780**	**$ 15,036,230**	**$ 46,896,060**	
ENGINEERING AND ADMINISTRATION							
Design Engineering	$ 1,692,580	$ 866,000	$ 1,823,840	$ 396,570	$ 2,255,440	$ 7,034,430	15%
Construction Engineering	$ 1,692,580	$ 866,000	$ 1,823,840	$ 396,570	$ 2,255,440	$ 7,034,430	15%
City Engineering and Administration	$ 564,200	$ 288,670	$ 607,950	$ 132,190	$ 751,820	$ 2,344,830	5%
ENGR. & ADMIN. TOTAL	**$ 3,949,360**	**$ 2,020,670**	**$ 4,255,630**	**$ 925,330**	**$ 5,262,700**	**$ 16,413,690**	
ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING							
Environmental Permits, Compliance	$ 338,520	$ 173,210	$ 364,770	$ 79,320	$ 451,100	**$ 1,406,920**	3%
RIGHT OF WAY							
Acquisitions, Easements, etc.	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	**$ -**	
TOTAL ESTIMATED COST							
	$ 15,571,740	**$ 7,967,195**	**$ 16,779,275**	**$ 3,648,430**	**$ 20,750,030**	**$ 64,716,670**	
FUTURE ESTIMATED COST							
Escalation factor not applied in this estimate	**$ 15,571,740**	**$ 7,967,195**	**$ 16,779,275**	**$ 3,648,430**	**$ 20,750,030**	**$ 64,716,670**	

Note: The above opinion of cost is a planning level estimate only. It is based on available information and concept plans, not on the results of a detailed engineering study, and is supplied as a budgeting guide only.

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Cost Estimates: Alternative B

City of Edgewood
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project Description:	Meridian Corridor Study (SR 161)	Date: 3/8/2024
Design Concept:	**Option B (Alternative B1)** All construction phases summary	Prepared By: KAH

	Option B Phase 1	Option B Phase 2	Option B Phase 3	Option B Phase 4	Option B Phase 5	Option B FULL PROJECT	
From:	24th	S. of 32nd	S. of 36th	S. of 102nd	S. of Dechaux Ext.	24th	
To:	S. of 32nd	S. of 36th	S. of 102nd	S. of Dechaux Ext.	Spencer	Spencer	
Station:	197+00	164+00	150+00	126+00	112+00	197+00	
Station:	164+00	150+00	126+00	112+00	86+00	86+00	
Feet:	3,300	1,400	2,400	1,400	2,600	11,100	
Miles:	0.63	0.27	0.45	0.27	0.49	2.10	
CONSTRUCTION							
Preparation	$ 1,061,080	$ 556,280	$ 1,167,480	$ 577,860	$ 1,770,200	$ 5,132,900	12%
Grading	$ 1,031,285	$ 248,825	$ 489,035	$ 285,355	$ 2,265,225	$ 4,319,725	10%
Storm Drainage	$ 1,347,600	$ 720,800	$ 1,114,800	$ 703,800	$ 1,067,200	$ 4,954,200	11%
Paving	$ 806,900	$ 599,150	$ 514,875	$ 303,875	$ 762,625	$ 2,987,425	7%
Concrete	$ 730,400	$ 261,980	$ 13,400	$ 2,700	$ 30,700	$ 1,039,180	2%
Structures	$ 216,505	$ 437,275	$ 5,964,470	$ 2,364,415	$ 8,872,770	$ 17,855,435	41%
TESC and Landscaping	$ 633,760	$ 150,790	$ 183,360	$ 103,660	$ 253,580	$ 1,325,150	3%
Traffic	$ 2,445,510	$ 1,227,950	$ 647,750	$ 574,930	$ 1,118,730	$ 6,014,870	14%
Other Items	$ 65,000	$ 53,500	$ 53,500	$ 53,500	$ 53,500	$ 279,000	1%
CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL	$ 8,338,040	$ 4,256,550	$ 10,148,670	$ 4,970,095	$ 16,194,530	$ 43,907,885	
Contingency	$ 3,335,220	$ 1,702,620	$ 4,059,470	$ 1,988,040	$ 6,477,820	$ 17,563,170	40%
CONSTRUCTION TOTAL	**$ 11,673,260**	**$ 5,959,170**	**$ 14,208,140**	**$ 6,958,135**	**$ 22,672,350**	**$ 61,471,055**	
ENGINEERING AND ADMINISTRATION							
Design Engineering	$ 1,750,990	$ 893,880	$ 2,131,230	$ 1,043,730	$ 3,400,860	$ 9,220,690	15%
Construction Engineering	$ 1,750,990	$ 893,880	$ 2,131,230	$ 1,043,730	$ 3,400,860	$ 9,220,690	15%
City Engineering and Administration	$ 583,670	$ 297,960	$ 710,410	$ 347,910	$ 1,133,620	$ 3,073,570	5%
ENGR. & ADMIN. TOTAL	**$ 4,085,650**	**$ 2,085,720**	**$ 4,972,870**	**$ 2,435,370**	**$ 7,935,340**	**$ 21,514,950**	
ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING							
Environmental Permits, Compliance	$ 350,210	$ 178,790	$ 426,260	$ 208,760	$ 680,180	**$ 1,844,200**	3%
RIGHT OF WAY							
Acquisitions, Easements, etc.	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	**$ -**	
TOTAL ESTIMATED COST							
	$ 16,109,120	**$ 8,223,680**	**$ 19,607,270**	**$ 9,602,265**	**$ 31,287,870**	**$ 84,830,205**	
FUTURE ESTIMATED COST							
Escalation factor not applied in this estimate	**$ 16,109,120**	**$ 8,223,680**	**$ 19,607,270**	**$ 9,602,265**	**$ 31,287,870**	**$ 84,830,205**	

Note: The above opinion of cost is a planning level estimate only. It is based on available information and concept plans, not on the results of a detailed engineering study, and is supplied as a budgeting guide only.

Appendix F: Level 2 Screening: Alternative Cost Estimates: Alternative C

City of Edgewood
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project Description:	Meridian Corridor Study (SR 161)	Date: 3/8/2024
Design Concept:	**Option C (Alternative C)** All construction phases summary	Prepared By: KAH

	Option C Phase 1	Option C Phase 2	Option C Phase 3	Option C Phase 4	Option C Phase 5	Option C FULL PROJECT	
From:	24th	S. of 32nd	S. of 36th	S. of 102nd	S. of Dechaux Ext.	24th	
To:	S. of 32nd	S. of 36th	S. of 102nd	S. of Dechaux Ext.	Spencer	Spencer	
Station:	197+00	164+00	150+00	126+00	112+00	197+00	
Station:	164+00	150+00	126+00	112+00	86+00	86+00	
Feet:	3,300	1,400	2,400	1,400	2,600	11,100	
Miles:	0.63	0.27	0.45	0.27	0.49	2.10	
CONSTRUCTION							
Preparation	$ 1,168,980	$ 754,440	$ 1,373,180	$ 912,760	$ 3,558,000	$ 7,767,360	11%
Grading	$ 1,059,040	$ 248,825	$ 524,895	$ 306,255	$ 2,753,000	$ 4,892,015	7%
Storm Drainage	$ 1,347,600	$ 720,800	$ 1,314,800	$ 903,800	$ 1,177,600	$ 5,464,600	8%
Paving	$ 1,011,350	$ 723,850	$ 522,125	$ 308,225	$ 762,625	$ 3,328,175	5%
Concrete	$ 2,032,955	$ 2,047,840	$ 251,710	$ 2,166,925	$ 1,784,280	$ 8,283,710	12%
Structures	$ 216,505	$ 437,275	$ 6,846,660	$ 2,556,630	$ 21,759,610	$ 31,816,680	46%
TESC and Landscaping	$ 411,000	$ 217,315	$ 292,625	$ 195,560	$ 572,125	$ 1,688,625	2%
Traffic	$ 1,972,330	$ 1,021,320	$ 688,520	$ 704,620	$ 686,920	$ 5,073,710	7%
Other Items	$ 65,000	$ 54,000	$ 54,000	$ 54,000	$ 54,000	$ 281,000	0%
CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL	$ 9,284,760	$ 6,225,665	$ 11,868,515	$ 8,108,775	$ 33,108,160	$ 68,595,875	
Contingency	$ 3,713,910	$ 2,490,270	$ 4,747,410	$ 3,243,510	$ 13,243,270	$ 27,438,370	40%
CONSTRUCTION TOTAL	**$ 12,998,670**	**$ 8,715,935**	**$ 16,615,925**	**$ 11,352,285**	**$ 46,351,430**	**$ 96,034,245**	
ENGINEERING AND ADMINISTRATION							
Design Engineering	$ 1,949,810	$ 1,307,400	$ 2,492,390	$ 1,702,850	$ 6,952,720	$ 14,405,170	15%
Construction Engineering	$ 1,949,810	$ 1,307,400	$ 2,492,390	$ 1,702,850	$ 6,952,720	$ 14,405,170	15%
City Engineering and Administration	$ 649,940	$ 435,800	$ 830,800	$ 567,620	$ 2,317,580	$ 4,801,740	5%
ENGR. & ADMIN. TOTAL	**$ 4,549,560**	**$ 3,050,600**	**$ 5,815,580**	**$ 3,973,320**	**$ 16,223,020**	**$ 33,612,080**	
ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING							
Environmental Permits, Compliance	$ 389,970	$ 261,480	$ 498,480	$ 340,580	$ 1,390,550	**$ 2,881,060**	3%
RIGHT OF WAY							
Acquisitions, Easements, etc.	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	**$ -**	
TOTAL ESTIMATED COST							
	$ 17,938,200	$ 12,028,015	$ 22,929,985	$ 15,666,185	$ 63,965,000	**$ 132,527,385**	
FUTURE ESTIMATED COST							
Escalation factor not applied in this estimate	$ 17,938,200	$ 12,028,015	$ 22,929,985	$ 15,666,185	$ 63,965,000	**$ 132,527,385**	

Note: The above opinion of cost is a planning level estimate only. It is based on available information and concept plans, not on the results of a detailed engineering study, and is supplied as a budgeting guide only.

Appendix G: Final Recommendation Design Concept & Cost Estimate

Appendix G: Design Concept

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- T — EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A2
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT
(RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE)

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP01
SHEET	1
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A2.dwg, 10/31/23 02:26:32pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A2
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT
(RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE)

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP02
SHEET	2
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A2.dwg, 10/31/23 02:26:48pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A2
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT
(RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE)

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP03
SHEET	3
OF	11

C:\Users\eric\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A2.dwg, 10/31/23 02:27:16pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.



CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY



SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A2
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT
(RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE)

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP04
SHEET	4
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A2.dwg, 10/31/23 02:27:34pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.



CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY



SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A2
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT
(RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE)

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP05
SHEET	5
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A2.dwg, 10/31/23 02:28:03pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION A2
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT
(RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE)

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP06
SHEET	1
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt A2.dwg, 10/31/23 02:28:21pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B6
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT
(RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE)

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP07
SHEET	7
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B6.dwg, 10/31/23 03:35:04pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	2/24
Designed	KAH	2/24
Reviewed	KAH	2/24
Approved	VLS	2/24

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B6
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT
(RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE)

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP08
SHEET	8
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B6.dwg, 03/11/24 12:14:36pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B1
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT
(RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE)

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP09
SHEET	9
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B1.dwg, 10/31/23 03:06:06pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'
SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT
(RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE)

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP10
SHEET	10
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B.dwg, 10/31/23 03:01:22pm

SEC. 15, T 20 N, R 04 E, W.M.





SR 161 (EX CL) PROFILE

SCALE: 1"=50' HORIZ., 1"=20' VERT.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1 ---

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ---

LEGEND:

- EXISTING TRANSIT STOP
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (OFF-CORRIDOR)
- EXISTING NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NON-MOTORIZED PATH (ON-CORRIDOR)
- PLANNED NEW ROADWAY

N

50' 25' 0 50' 100'

SCALE IN FEET

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

NO.	BY	DATE	REVISION

	BY:	DATE:
Drawn	EWJ	10/23
Designed	KAH	10/23
Reviewed	KAH	10/23
Approved	VLS	10/23

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

811 Know what's below. Call before you dig.

EDGEWOOD Washington

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE
16932 Woodinville-Redmond Road, Suite A206
Woodinville, WA 98072
(425) 883-4134 | www.tsinw.com

DRAFT

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

OPTION B
ROADWAY PLANS CONCEPT
(RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE)

PROJECT NO.	221033
CONTRACT NO.	-
DRAWING NO.	RP11
SHEET	11
OF	11

C:\Users\ericj\TSI Dropbox\Eric Jackson\TSI Projects\2021\221033 City of Edgewood On-Call Services\0400CAD\PS&E\Figure\Roadway Plans\221033 - RP01_Opt B.dwg, 10/31/23 03:01:37pm

Appendix G: Cost Estimate

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study
Design Option: Recommended Option (Alts B and B1) - Phase 1
Length: 3,300 feet
Description: Construct 32nd roundabout and 29th intersection; widen from 3 to 4 lanes with walkway/landscape improvements both sides; includes pedestrian hybrid beacon at 164+50; matches to existing 4-lane section at existing 36th intersection.

Date: 3/8/24
Prepared by: KAH

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
Preparation												
1	Mobilization (10% of remaining items)	L.S.	1	$826,500.00	$826,500.00	10.0%	---	---	---	---	---	
2	Construction Surveying	L.S.	1	$123,700.00	$123,700.00	1.5%	---	---	---	---	---	1.5% of Construction Subtotal
3	Construction Site Signs	L.S.	1	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	10 signs at $300/sign
4	Clearing and Grubbing	L.S.	1	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Clearing and Grubbing for roadway widening beyond existing pavement plus an additi
5	Removal of Structures and Obstructions	L.S.	1	$80,000.00	$80,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
6	Removing Catch Basin	EA.	6	$750.00	$4,500.00	6	---	---	---	---	---	
7	Removing Cement Conc. Flatwork	S.Y.	56	$15.00	$840.00	---	50	10	---	9	---	
8	Removing Cement Conc. Curb and Gutter	L.F.	100	$10.00	$1,000.00	---	100	---	---	---	---	
9	Removing Extruded Curb	L.F.	100	$10.00	$1,000.00	---	100	---	---	---	---	
10	Removing Pavement Markings	L.S.	1	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
11	Removing Asphalt Conc. Pavement	S.Y.	5,167	$20.00	$103,340.00	---	2325	20	---	9	---	
12	Removing Reinf. Cement Conc. Pavement	F.A.	0	$5,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Preparation Subtotal				*$1,168,880.00*							
Grading						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
13	Roadway Excavation Incl. Haul	C.Y.	9,817	$45.00	$441,765.00	---	2325	57	2	27	---	
14	Unsuitable Foundation Excavation Incl. Haul	C.Y.	982	$65.00	$63,830.00	---	0	0	3	27	---	Assumes 10% of Item 13.
15	Ballast	TON	0	$50.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.95	
16	Gravel Borrow Incl. Haul	TON	9,081	$35.00	$317,835.00	---	2325	57	1	27	1.85	
17	Crushed Surfacing Base Course	TON	2,562	$45.00	$115,290.00	---	2325	24	0.67	27	1.85	
18	Crushed Surfacing Top Course	TON	1,683	$55.00	$92,565.00	---	2325	32	0.33	27	1.85	
19	Controlled Density Fill (CDF)	C.Y.	0	$90.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
20	Structure Excavation for Utility Vault or J-Box	C.Y.	0	$55.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
21	Utility Trenching	C.Y.	0	$55.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
22	Sand Bedding for Utility Trenches	TON	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.55	
23	Foundation Material for Utility Vault or J-Box	TON	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.85	
24	Shoring or Extra Excavation Class B	S.F.	0	$3.00	$0.00	---	0	---	4	---	---	Total Pipe length * 4 feet
	Grading Subtotal				*$1,031,285.00*							
Storm Drainage						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
25	Adjust Catch Basin	EA.	0	$1,200.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
26	Area Inlet	EA.	0	$1,600.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
27	Catch Basin Type 1	EA.	12	$2,800.00	$33,600.00	12	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/2
28	Catch Basin Type 1L	EA.	6	$3,000.00	$18,000.00	6	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/4
29	Catch Basin Type 2, 48 In. Diam.	EA.	6	$6,000.00	$36,000.00	6	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/4
30	Catch Basin Type 2, w/ Oil-Water Separator	EA.	2	$9,000.00	$18,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	
31	Underdrain Pipe 6 In. Diam.	L.F.	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
32	Storm Sewer Pipe 8 In. Diam.	L.F.	0	$40.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
33	Storm Sewer Pipe 12 In. Diam.	L.F.	684	$100.00	$68,400.00	---	684	---	---	---	---	Assume 12" pipe for all crossings
34	Storm Sewer Pipe 18 In. Diam.	L.F.	1,160	$140.00	$162,400.00	---	1160	---	---	---	---	Assume 18" trunkline half of length of road
35	Storm Sewer Pipe 24 In. Diam.	L.F.	1,160	$180.00	$208,800.00	---	1160	---	---	---	---	Assume 24" trunkline half of length of road
36	Connect to Existing Drainage Structure	EA.	2	$1,200.00	$2,400.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	
37	Culvert / Stream Crossing (approx. 72 In. Diam.)	L.F.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
38	Stormwater Detention / Water Quality Facility	L.S.	1	$800,000.00	$800,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Storm Drainage Subtotal				*$1,347,600.00*							

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alts B and B1) - Phase 1 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 3,300 feet
Description: Construct 32nd roundabout and 29th intersection; widen from 3 to 4 lanes with walkway/landscape improvements both sides; includes pedestrian hybrid beacon at 164+50; matches to existing 4-lane section at existing 36th intersection.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
	Paving											
39	Planing Bituminous Pavement	S.Y.	294	$25.00	$7,350.00	---	60	44	---	9	---	
40	Hot Mix Asphalt	TON	5,450	$145.00	$790,250.00	---	2325	46	0.67	27	2.05	
41	Incidental Hot Mix Asphalt	TON	60	$155.00	$9,300.00	---	200	15	0.25	27	2.05	
	HMA Subtotal				*$806,900.00*							
	Concrete					EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
42	Cement Conc. Driveway Entrance	S.Y.	356	$100.00	$35,600.00	---	200	16	---	9	---	
43	Cement Conc. Sidewalk	S.Y.	7,320	$65.00	$475,800.00	---	2125	31	---	9	---	10' sidewalk both sides of road
44	Cement Conc. Curb Ramp Type ___	EA.	14	$3,500.00	$49,000.00	14	---	---	---	---	---	
45	Cement Conc. Barrier Curb and Gutter	L.F.	4,250	$40.00	$170,000.00	---	4250	---	---	---	---	
46	Mountable Cement Conc. Traffic Curb	L.F.	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
47	Roundabout Truck Apron Cement Conc. C & G	L.F.	0	$75.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
48	Roundabout, Central and Splitter Islands Complete	L.S.	1	$1,500,000.00	$1,500,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
49	Cement Concrete Roadway	C.Y.	0	$450.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0.0	27	---	
	Concrete Subtotal				*$2,230,400.00*							
	Structures					EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
50	Structure Excavation Class A Incl. Haul	C.Y.	149	$45.00	$6,705.00	---	500	2	4	27	---	
51	Gravel Backfill for Walls	TON	140	$70.00	$9,800.00	---	500	1	4	27	1.85	
52	Retaining Wall > 8'	S.F.	0	$235.00	$0.00	---	0	---	10	---	---	
53	Retaining Wall <= 8'	S.F.	2,000	$100.00	$200,000.00	---	500	---	4	---	---	
54	Bridge Structure	S.F.	0	$900.00	$0.00	---	0	0	---	---	---	
	Structures Subtotal				*$216,505.00*							
	TESC and Landscaping					EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
55	Temporary Water Pollution / Erosion Control	L.S.	1	$124,100.00	$124,100.00	1.5%	---	---	---	---	---	
56	Inlet Protection	EA.	26	$110.00	$2,860.00	26	---	---	---	---	---	One at each new CB
57	Silt Fence	L.F.	2,300	$7.00	$16,100.00	---	2300	---	---	---	---	
58	Topsoil Type C	C.Y.	282	$65.00	$18,330.00	---	3800	8	0.25	27	---	4" Topsoil in planter median and planter strips.
59	Sod Installation	S.Y.	0	$35.00	$0.00	---	0	0	---	9	---	
60	Trees	EA.	92	$600.00	$55,200.00	92	---	---	---	---	---	Trees spaced every 50' in planter strip and median.
61	Plant Selection and Estab. (various species)	S.Y.	3,378	$40.00	$135,120.00	---	3800	8	---	9	---	For landscaped buffers and medians
62	Miscellaneous Improvements (Property Restoration)	L.S.	1	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
63	Irrigation System Complete	L.S.	1	$171,000.00	$171,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Assumes Irrigation is equal to 90% of value of Trees and Plants
64	Irrigation System Repair	F.A.	1	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	TESC and Landscaping Subtotal				*$577,710.00*							
	Traffic					EA/Day/Hr	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	DYCL	Tons/CY	
65	Paint Line	L.F.	9,400	$2.00	$18,800.00	---	9400	---	---	---	---	Lane Line, Median Line
66	Plastic Bicycle Lane Symbol	EA.	19	$550.00	$10,450.00	19	---	---	---	---	---	Every 250' both sides.
67	Plastic Line	L.F.	9,400	$5.00	$47,000.00	---	9400	---	---	---	---	Bike Lanes, Left Turn Lanes
68	Plastic Stop Line	L.F.	103	$20.00	$2,060.00	---	103	---	---	---	---	
69	Plastic Yield Line Symbol	EA.	24	$55.00	$1,320.00	24	---					1 symbol per 2 feet of lane width
70	Plastic Crosswalk Line	S.F.	1,520	$15.00	$22,800.00	---	152	10	---	---	---	
71	Plastic Traffic Arrow	EA.	3	$400.00	$1,200.00	3	---	---	---	---	---	2 arrows per lt turn lane
72	Raised Pavement Marker, Type 1	HUND.	0	$600.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	0.60	---	
73	Raised Pavement Marker, Type 2	HUND.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	0.10	---	
74	Permanent Signing	EA.	23	$400.00	$9,200.00	23	---	---	---	---	---	Every 200' both sides.

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alts B and B1) - Phase 1 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 3,300 feet
Description: Construct 32nd roundabout and 29th intersection; widen from 3 to 4 lanes with walkway/landscape improvements both sides; includes pedestrian hybrid beacon at 164+50; matches to existing 4-lane section at existing 36th intersection.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT							
75	Beam Guardrail Type 31	L.F.	0	$45.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	Guardrail at all fill walls and fill slopes
76	Beam Guardrail Terminal	EA.	0	$4,000.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
77	Beam Guardrail Anchor	EA.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
78	Safety Handrail	L.F.	0	$200.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	At all fill walls
79	Remove Existing Traffic Signal System	L.S.	0	$75,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
80	Foundation Potholing	EA.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
81	Traffic Signal System Complete	L.S.	0	$400,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
82	Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon System Complete	L.S.	2	$250,000.00	$500,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
83	Interconnect System Complete	L.S.	1	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
84	Illumination System Complete	L.S.	0	$200,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
85	Adjust Junction Box	EA.	10	$800.00	$8,000.00	10	---	---	---	---	---	
86	Street Lighting	EA.	33	$7,500.00	$247,500.00	33	---	---	---	---	---	One luminaire every 200 feet both sides of the road
87	Temporary Traffic Control Devices	L.S.	1	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
88	Traffic Control Labor - Flagging	HOUR	5,120	$75.00	$384,000.00	5120	---	---	---	---	---	160 working days, 8 hours a day, 4 flaggers needed.
89	Portable Sequential Arrow Sign	EA.	2	$4,000.00	$8,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	160
90	Portable Changeable Message Sign	EA.	2	$6,000.00	$12,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	
91	Operation of Portable Sequential Arrow Sign	DAY	160	$1,000.00	$160,000.00	160	---	---	---	---	---	Assume use for half the number of working days
92	Operation of Portable Changeable Message Sign	DAY	320	$1,000.00	$320,000.00	320	---	---	---	---	---	Assume use for the number of working days
	Traffic Subtotal				*$1,902,330.00*							

	Other Items					EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
93	Utility Relocates	L.S.	1	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Franchise, cost by others
94	Undergrounding Utilities	L.F.	0	$400.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
95	Monument Case and Cover	EA.	2	$1,500.00	$3,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	Placed at all intersections and pc's/pt's
96	Adjust Monument Case and Cover	EA.	2	$1,000.00	$2,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	
97	Trimming and Cleanup	L.S.	1	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Other Items Subtotal				*$65,000.00*							

SUBTOTAL				$9,346,610.00
CONTINGENCY	40%			$3,738,650.00
CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL				**$13,085,260.00**
DESIGN ENGINEERING	15%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$1,962,790.00
CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING	15%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$1,962,790.00
PROJECT ADMINISTRATION	5%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$654,270.00
ENGR. AND ADMIN. SUBTOTAL				**$4,579,850.00**
ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING	2%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$261,710.00
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION	1%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$130,860.00
ENVIRONMENTAL SUBTOTAL				**$392,570.00**
RIGHT-OF-WAY				
Commercial Property	S.F.	0	$50.00	$0.00
Residential Property	S.F.	0	$35.00	$0.00
Number of Individual Properties	EA.	0	$10,000.00	$0.00
RIGHT-OF-WAY SUBTOTAL				**$0.00**
TOTAL PROJECT COST				**$18,057,680.00**

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alts A2 and B6) - Phase 2 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 1,400 feet
Description: Construct 36th roundabout and disconnect Chrisella with a cul-de-sac (new Chrisella alignment and cul-de-sac excluded from Meridian estimate); matches to existing 3-lane section to the south until Phase 3 is constructed.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
Preparation												
1	Mobilization (10% of remaining items)	L.S.	1	$515,600.00	$515,600.00	10.0%	---	---	---	---	---	
2	Construction Surveying	L.S.	1	$76,100.00	$76,100.00	1.5%	---	---	---	---	---	1.5% of Construction Subtotal
3	Construction Site Signs	L.S.	1	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	10 signs at $300/sign
4	Clearing and Grubbing	L.S.	1	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Clearing and Grubbing for roadway widening beyond existing pavement plus an additi
5	Removal of Structures and Obstructions	L.S.	1	$40,000.00	$40,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
6	Removing Catch Basin	EA.	2	$750.00	$1,500.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	
7	Removing Cement Conc. Flatwork	S.Y.	0	$15.00	$0.00	---	0	0	---	9	---	
8	Removing Cement Conc. Curb and Gutter	L.F.	0	$10.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
9	Removing Extruded Curb	L.F.	100	$10.00	$1,000.00	---	100	---	---	---	---	
10	Removing Pavement Markings	L.S.	1	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
11	Removing Asphalt Conc. Pavement	S.Y.	2,667	$20.00	$53,340.00	---	600	40	---	9	---	
12	Removing Reinf. Cement Conc. Pavement	F.A.	0	$5,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Preparation Subtotal				*$705,540.00*							
Grading						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
13	Roadway Excavation Incl. Haul	C.Y.	1,778	$45.00	$80,010.00	---	600	40	2	27	---	
14	Unsuitable Foundation Excavation Incl. Haul	C.Y.	178	$65.00	$11,570.00	---	0	0	3	27	---	Assumes 10% of Item 13.
15	Ballast	TON	0	$50.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.95	
16	Gravel Borrow Incl. Haul	TON	1,645	$35.00	$57,575.00	---	600	40	1	27	1.85	
17	Crushed Surfacing Base Course	TON	1,286	$45.00	$57,870.00	---	1400	20	0.67	27	1.85	
18	Crushed Surfacing Top Course	TON	760	$55.00	$41,800.00	---	1400	24	0.33	27	1.85	
19	Controlled Density Fill (CDF)	C.Y.	0	$90.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
20	Structure Excavation for Utility Vault or J-Box	C.Y.	0	$55.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
21	Utility Trenching	C.Y.	0	$55.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
22	Sand Bedding for Utility Trenches	TON	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.55	
23	Foundation Material for Utility Vault or J-Box	TON	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.85	
24	Shoring or Extra Excavation Class B	S.F.	0	$3.00	$0.00	---	0	---	4	---	---	Total Pipe length * 4 feet
	Grading Subtotal				*$248,825.00*							
Storm Drainage						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
25	Adjust Catch Basin	EA.	0	$1,200.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
26	Area Inlet	EA.	0	$1,600.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
27	Catch Basin Type 1	EA.	7	$2,800.00	$19,600.00	7	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/2
28	Catch Basin Type 1L	EA.	4	$3,000.00	$12,000.00	4	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/4
29	Catch Basin Type 2, 48 In. Diam.	EA.	4	$6,000.00	$24,000.00	4	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/4
30	Catch Basin Type 2, w/ Oil-Water Separator	EA.	1	$9,000.00	$9,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
31	Underdrain Pipe 6 In. Diam.	L.F.	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
32	Storm Sewer Pipe 8 In. Diam.	L.F.	0	$40.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
33	Storm Sewer Pipe 12 In. Diam.	L.F.	280	$100.00	$28,000.00	---	280	---	---	---	---	Assume 12" pipe for all crossings
34	Storm Sewer Pipe 18 In. Diam.	L.F.	700	$140.00	$98,000.00	---	700	---	---	---	---	Assume 18" trunkline half of length of road
35	Storm Sewer Pipe 24 In. Diam.	L.F.	710	$180.00	$127,800.00	---	710	---	---	---	---	Assume 24" trunkline half of length of road
36	Connect to Existing Drainage Structure	EA.	2	$1,200.00	$2,400.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	
37	Culvert / Stream Crossing (approx. 72 In. Diam.)	L.F.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
38	Stormwater Detention / Water Quality Facility	L.S.	1	$400,000.00	$400,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Storm Drainage Subtotal				*$720,800.00*							

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alts A2 and B6) - Phase 2 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 1,400 feet
Description: Construct 36th roundabout and disconnect Chrisella with a cul-de-sac (new Chrisella alignment and cul-de-sac excluded from Meridian estimate); matches to existing 3-lane section to the south until Phase 3 is constructed.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
	Paving											
39	Planing Bituminous Pavement	S.Y.	294	$25.00	$7,350.00	---	60	44	---	9	---	
40	Hot Mix Asphalt	TON	4,060	$145.00	$588,700.00	---	1400	57	0.67	27	2.05	
41	Incidental Hot Mix Asphalt	TON	20	$155.00	$3,100.00	---	60	15	0.25	27	2.05	
	HMA Subtotal				*$599,150.00*							
	Concrete											
42	Cement Conc. Driveway Entrance	S.Y.	107	$100.00	$10,700.00	---	60	16	---	9	---	
43	Cement Conc. Sidewalk	S.Y.	1,712	$65.00	$111,280.00	---	1400	11	---	9	---	10' sidewalk both sides of road
44	Cement Conc. Curb Ramp Type ___	EA.	8	$3,500.00	$28,000.00	8	---	---	---	---	---	
45	Cement Conc. Barrier Curb and Gutter	L.F.	2,800	$40.00	$112,000.00	---	2800	---	---	---	---	
46	Mountable Cement Conc. Traffic Curb	L.F.	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
47	Roundabout Truck Apron Cement Conc. C & G	L.F.	0	$75.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
48	Roundabout, Central and Splitter Islands Complete	L.S.	1	$1,800,000.00	$1,800,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
49	Cement Concrete Roadway	C.Y.	0	$450.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0.0	27	---	
	Concrete Subtotal				*$2,061,980.00*							
	Structures											
50	Structure Excavation Class A Incl. Haul	C.Y.	112	$45.00	$5,040.00	---	300	2	5	27	---	
51	Gravel Backfill for Walls	TON	110	$70.00	$7,700.00	---	300	1	5	27	1.85	
52	Retaining Wall > 8'	S.F.	0	$235.00	$0.00	---	0	---	10	---	---	
53	Retaining Wall <= 8'	S.F.	1,500	$100.00	$150,000.00	---	300	---	5	---	---	
54	Bridge Structure	S.F.	0	$900.00	$0.00	---	0	0	---	---	---	
	Structures Subtotal				*$162,740.00*							

						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
	TESC and Landscaping											
55	Temporary Water Pollution / Erosion Control	L.S.	1	$76,400.00	$76,400.00	1.5%	---	---	---	---	---	
56	Inlet Protection	EA.	16	$110.00	$1,760.00	16	---	---	---	---	---	One at each new CB
57	Silt Fence	L.F.	2,800	$7.00	$19,600.00	---	2800	---	---	---	---	
58	Topsoil Type C	C.Y.	67	$65.00	$4,355.00	---	900	8	0.25	27	---	4" Topsoil in planter median and planter strips.
59	Sod Installation	S.Y.	0	$35.00	$0.00	---	0	0	---	9	---	
60	Trees	EA.	20	$600.00	$12,000.00	20	---	---	---	---	---	Trees spaced every 50' in planter strip and median.
61	Plant Selection and Estab. (various species)	S.Y.	800	$40.00	$32,000.00	---	900	8	---	9	---	For landscaped buffers and medians
62	Miscellaneous Improvements (Property Restoration)	L.S.	1	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
63	Irrigation System Complete	L.S.	1	$40,000.00	$40,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Assumes Irrigation is equal to 90% of value of Trees and Plants
64	Irrigation System Repair	F.A.	1	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	TESC and Landscaping Subtotal				*$211,115.00*							

						EA/Day/Hr	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	DYCL	Tons/CY	
	Traffic											
65	Paint Line	L.F.	5,600	$2.00	$11,200.00	---	5600	---	---	---	---	Lane Line, Median Line
66	Plastic Bicycle Lane Symbol	EA.	0	$550.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	Every 250' both sides.
67	Plastic Line	L.F.	5,600	$5.00	$28,000.00	---	5600	---	---	---	---	Bike Lanes, Left Turn Lanes
68	Plastic Stop Line	L.F.	0	$20.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
69	Plastic Yield Line Symbol	EA.	24	$55.00	$1,320.00	24	---					1 symbol per 2 feet of lane width
70	Plastic Crosswalk Line	S.F.	950	$15.00	$14,250.00	---	95	10	---	---	---	
71	Plastic Traffic Arrow	EA.	0	$400.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	2 arrows per lt turn lane
72	Raised Pavement Marker, Type 1	HUND.	0	$600.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	0.60	---	
73	Raised Pavement Marker, Type 2	HUND.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	0.10	---	
74	Permanent Signing	EA.	14	$400.00	$5,600.00	14	---	---	---	---	---	Every 200' both sides.

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alts A2 and B6) - Phase 2 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 1,400 feet
Description: Construct 36th roundabout and disconnect Chrisella with a cul-de-sac (new Chrisella alignment and cul-de-sac excluded from Meridian estimate); matches to existing 3-lane section to the south until Phase 3 is constructed.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT							
75	Beam Guardrail Type 31	L.F.	200	$45.00	$9,000.00	---	200	---	---	---	---	Guardrail at all fill walls and fill slopes
76	Beam Guardrail Terminal	EA.	1	$4,000.00	$4,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
77	Beam Guardrail Anchor	EA.	1	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
78	Safety Handrail	L.F.	100	$200.00	$20,000.00	---	100	---	---	---	---	At all fill walls
79	Remove Existing Traffic Signal System	L.S.	1	$75,000.00	$75,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
80	Foundation Potholing	EA.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
81	Traffic Signal System Complete	L.S.	0	$400,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
82	Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon System Complete	L.S.	0	$250,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
83	Interconnect System Complete	L.S.	0	$25,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
84	Illumination System Complete	L.S.	0	$200,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
85	Adjust Junction Box	EA.	0	$800.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
86	Street Lighting	EA.	14	$7,500.00	$105,000.00	14	---	---	---	---	---	One luminaire every 200 feet both sides of the road
87	Temporary Traffic Control Devices	L.S.	1	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
88	Traffic Control Labor - Flagging	HOUR	3,840	$75.00	$288,000.00	3840	---	---	---	---	---	120 working days, 8 hours a day, 4 flaggers needed.
89	Portable Sequential Arrow Sign	EA.	2	$4,000.00	$8,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	120
90	Portable Changeable Message Sign	EA.	2	$6,000.00	$12,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	
91	Operation of Portable Sequential Arrow Sign	DAY	120	$1,000.00	$120,000.00	120	---	---	---	---	---	Assume use for half the number of working days
92	Operation of Portable Changeable Message Sign	DAY	240	$1,000.00	$240,000.00	240	---	---	---	---	---	Assume use for the number of working days
	Traffic Subtotal				*$992,370.00*							

	Other Items					EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
93	Utility Relocates	L.S.	1	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Franchise, cost by others
94	Undergrounding Utilities	L.F.	0	$400.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
95	Monument Case and Cover	EA.	2	$1,500.00	$3,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	Placed at all intersections and pc's/pt's
96	Adjust Monument Case and Cover	EA.	1	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
97	Trimming and Cleanup	L.S.	1	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Other Items Subtotal				*$54,000.00*							

SUBTOTAL				$5,756,520.00
CONTINGENCY	40%			$2,302,610.00
CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL				**$8,059,130.00**
DESIGN ENGINEERING	15%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$1,208,870.00
CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING	15%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$1,208,870.00
PROJECT ADMINISTRATION	5%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$402,960.00
ENGR. AND ADMIN. SUBTOTAL				**$2,820,700.00**
ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING	2%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$161,190.00
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION	1%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$80,600.00
ENVIRONMENTAL SUBTOTAL				**$241,790.00**
RIGHT-OF-WAY				
Commercial Property	S.F.	0	$50.00	$0.00
Residential Property	S.F.	0	$35.00	$0.00
Number of Individual Properties	EA.	0	$10,000.00	$0.00
RIGHT-OF-WAY SUBTOTAL				**$0.00**
TOTAL PROJECT COST				**$11,121,620.00**

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alt A2) - Phase 3 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 2,400 feet
Description: Maintain 3 lane corridor; construct 102nd intersection with with added deceleration/acceleration lane for ingress/egress; extend shared use path (east side) from 36th roundabout south to 43rd; matches to existing 3-lane section to the south until Phase 4.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
Preparation												
1	Mobilization (10% of remaining items)	L.S.	1	$898,900.00	$898,900.00	10.0%	---	---	---	---	---	
2	Construction Surveying	L.S.	1	$131,900.00	$131,900.00	1.5%	---	---	---	---	---	1.5% of Construction Subtotal
3	Construction Site Signs	L.S.	1	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	10 signs at $300/sign
4	Clearing and Grubbing	L.S.	1	$60,000.00	$60,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Clearing and Grubbing for roadway widening beyond existing pavement plus an additi
5	Removal of Structures and Obstructions	L.S.	1	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
6	Removing Catch Basin	EA.	0	$750.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
7	Removing Cement Conc. Flatwork	S.Y.	0	$15.00	$0.00	---	0	0	---	9	---	
8	Removing Cement Conc. Curb and Gutter	L.F.	0	$10.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
9	Removing Extruded Curb	L.F.	0	$10.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
10	Removing Pavement Markings	L.S.	1	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
11	Removing Asphalt Conc. Pavement	S.Y.	1,334	$20.00	$26,680.00	---	2400	5	---	9	---	
12	Removing Reinf. Cement Conc. Pavement	F.A.	0	$5,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Preparation Subtotal				*$1,160,480.00*							
Grading						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
13	Roadway Excavation Incl. Haul	C.Y.	6,445	$45.00	$290,025.00	---	2900	20	3	27	---	
14	Unsuitable Foundation Excavation Incl. Haul	C.Y.	645	$65.00	$41,925.00	---	0	0	3	27	---	Assumes 10% of Item 13.
15	Ballast	TON	0	$50.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.95	
16	Gravel Borrow Incl. Haul	TON	994	$35.00	$34,790.00	---	2900	5	1	27	1.85	
17	Crushed Surfacing Base Course	TON	551	$45.00	$24,795.00	---	2400	5	0.67	27	1.85	
18	Crushed Surfacing Top Course	TON	652	$55.00	$35,860.00	---	2400	12	0.33	27	1.85	
19	Controlled Density Fill (CDF)	C.Y.	0	$90.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
20	Structure Excavation for Utility Vault or J-Box	C.Y.	0	$55.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
21	Utility Trenching	C.Y.	0	$55.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
22	Sand Bedding for Utility Trenches	TON	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.55	
23	Foundation Material for Utility Vault or J-Box	TON	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.85	
24	Shoring or Extra Excavation Class B	S.F.	0	$3.00	$0.00	---	0	---	4	---	---	Total Pipe length * 4 feet
	Grading Subtotal				*$427,395.00*							
Storm Drainage						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
25	Adjust Catch Basin	EA.	0	$1,200.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
26	Area Inlet	EA.	0	$1,600.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
27	Catch Basin Type 1	EA.	12	$2,800.00	$33,600.00	12	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/2
28	Catch Basin Type 1L	EA.	6	$3,000.00	$18,000.00	6	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/4
29	Catch Basin Type 2, 48 In. Diam.	EA.	6	$6,000.00	$36,000.00	6	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/4
30	Catch Basin Type 2, w/ Oil-Water Separator	EA.	2	$9,000.00	$18,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	
31	Underdrain Pipe 6 In. Diam.	L.F.	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
32	Storm Sewer Pipe 8 In. Diam.	L.F.	0	$40.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
33	Storm Sewer Pipe 12 In. Diam.	L.F.	60	$100.00	$6,000.00	---	60	---	---	---	---	Assume 12" pipe for all crossings
34	Storm Sewer Pipe 18 In. Diam.	L.F.	1,200	$140.00	$168,000.00	---	1200	---	---	---	---	Assume 18" trunkline half of length of road
35	Storm Sewer Pipe 24 In. Diam.	L.F.	1,200	$180.00	$216,000.00	---	1200	---	---	---	---	Assume 24" trunkline half of length of road
36	Connect to Existing Drainage Structure	EA.	1	$1,200.00	$1,200.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
37	Culvert / Stream Crossing (approx. 72 In. Diam.)	L.F.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
38	Stormwater Detention / Water Quality Facility	L.S.	1	$400,000.00	$400,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Storm Drainage Subtotal				*$896,800.00*							

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alt A2) - Phase 3 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 2,400 feet
Description: Maintain 3 lane corridor; construct 102nd intersection with with added deceleration/acceleration lane for ingress/egress; extend shared use path (east side) from 36th roundabout south to 43rd; matches to existing 3-lane section to the south until Phase 4.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
	Paving											
39	Planing Bituminous Pavement	S.Y.	267	$25.00	$6,675.00	---	60	40	---	9	---	
40	Hot Mix Asphalt	TON	2,190	$145.00	$317,550.00	---	2400	48	0.25	27	2.05	
41	Incidental Hot Mix Asphalt	TON	260	$155.00	$40,300.00	---	500	16	0.42	27	2.05	
	HMA Subtotal				*$364,525.00*							
	Concrete					EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
42	Cement Conc. Driveway Entrance	S.Y.	100	$100.00	$10,000.00	---	75	12	---	9	---	
43	Cement Conc. Sidewalk	S.Y.	2,134	$65.00	$138,710.00	---	2400	8	---	9	---	10' sidewalk both sides of road
44	Cement Conc. Curb Ramp Type ___	EA.	2	$3,500.00	$7,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	
45	Cement Conc. Barrier Curb and Gutter	L.F.	2,400	$40.00	$96,000.00	---	2400	---	---	---	---	
46	Mountable Cement Conc. Traffic Curb	L.F.	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
47	Roundabout Truck Apron Cement Conc. C & G	L.F.	0	$75.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
48	Roundabout, Central and Splitter Islands Complete	L.S.	0	$1,800,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
49	Cement Concrete Roadway	C.Y.	0	$450.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0.0	27	---	
	Concrete Subtotal				*$251,710.00*							
	Structures					EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
50	Structure Excavation Class A Incl. Haul	C.Y.	908	$45.00	$40,860.00	---	2,450	2	5	27	---	
51	Gravel Backfill for Walls	TON	60	$70.00	$4,200.00	---	200	1	4	27	1.85	
52	Retaining Wall > 8'	S.F.	24,500	$235.00	$5,757,500.00	---	2,450	---	10	---	---	
53	Retaining Wall <= 8'	S.F.	800	$100.00	$80,000.00	---	200	---	4	---	---	
54	Bridge Structure	S.F.	0	$900.00	$0.00	---	0	0	---	---	---	
	Structures Subtotal				*$5,882,560.00*							
	TESC and Landscaping					EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
55	Temporary Water Pollution / Erosion Control	L.S.	1	$132,200.00	$132,200.00	1.5%	---	---	---	---	---	
56	Inlet Protection	EA.	26	$110.00	$2,860.00	26	---	---	---	---	---	One at each new CB
57	Silt Fence	L.F.	3,000	$7.00	$21,000.00	---	3000	---	---	---	---	
58	Topsoil Type C	C.Y.	89	$65.00	$5,785.00	---	2400	4	0.25	27	---	4" Topsoil in planter median and planter strips.
59	Sod Installation	S.Y.	0	$35.00	$0.00	---	0	0	---	9	---	
60	Trees	EA.	0	$600.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	Trees spaced every 50' in planter strip and median.
61	Plant Selection and Estab. (various species)	S.Y.	1,067	$40.00	$42,680.00	---	2400	4	---	9	---	For landscaped buffers and medians
62	Miscellaneous Improvements (Property Restoration)	L.S.	1	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
63	Irrigation System Complete	L.S.	1	$38,000.00	$38,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Assumes Irrigation is equal to 90% of value of Trees and Plants
64	Irrigation System Repair	F.A.	1	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	TESC and Landscaping Subtotal				*$267,525.00*							
	Traffic					EA/Day/Hr	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	DYCL	Tons/CY	
65	Paint Line	L.F.	7,200	$2.00	$14,400.00	---	7200	---	---	---	---	Lane Line, Median Line
66	Plastic Bicycle Lane Symbol	EA.	0	$550.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	Every 250' both sides.
67	Plastic Line	L.F.	0	$5.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	Bike Lanes, Left Turn Lanes
68	Plastic Stop Line	L.F.	15	$20.00	$300.00	---	15	---	---	---	---	
69	Plastic Yield Line Symbol	EA.	24	$55.00	$1,320.00	24	---					1 symbol per 2 feet of lane width
70	Plastic Crosswalk Line	S.F.	0	$15.00	$0.00	---	0	10	---	---	---	
71	Plastic Traffic Arrow	EA.	4	$400.00	$1,600.00	4	---	---	---	---	---	2 arrows per lt turn lane
72	Raised Pavement Marker, Type 1	HUND.	0	$600.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	0.60	---	
73	Raised Pavement Marker, Type 2	HUND.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	0.10	---	
74	Permanent Signing	EA.	24	$400.00	$9,600.00	24	---	---	---	---	---	Every 200' both sides.

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alt A2) - Phase 3 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 2,400 feet
Description: Maintain 3 lane corridor; construct 102nd intersection with with added deceleration/acceleration lane for ingress/egress; extend shared use path (east side) from 36th roundabout south to 43rd; matches to existing 3-lane section to the south until Phase 4.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT							
75	Beam Guardrail Type 31	L.F.	200	$45.00	$9,000.00	---	200	---	---	---	---	Guardrail at all fill walls and fill slopes
76	Beam Guardrail Terminal	EA.	1	$4,000.00	$4,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
77	Beam Guardrail Anchor	EA.	1	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
78	Safety Handrail	L.F.	100	$200.00	$20,000.00	---	100	---	---	---	---	At all fill walls
79	Remove Existing Traffic Signal System	L.S.	0	$75,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
80	Foundation Potholing	EA.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
81	Traffic Signal System Complete	L.S.	0	$400,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
82	Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon System Complete	L.S.	0	$250,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
83	Interconnect System Complete	L.S.	0	$25,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
84	Illumination System Complete	L.S.	0	$200,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
85	Adjust Junction Box	EA.	0	$800.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
86	Street Lighting	EA.	4	$7,500.00	$30,000.00	4	---	---	---	---	---	One luminaire every 200 feet both sides of the road
87	Temporary Traffic Control Devices	L.S.	1	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
88	Traffic Control Labor - Flagging	HOUR	1,920	$75.00	$144,000.00	1920	---	---	---	---	---	120 working days, 8 hours a day, 2 flaggers needed.
89	Portable Sequential Arrow Sign	EA.	2	$4,000.00	$8,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	120
90	Portable Changeable Message Sign	EA.	2	$6,000.00	$12,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	
91	Operation of Portable Sequential Arrow Sign	DAY	120	$1,000.00	$120,000.00	120	---	---	---	---	---	Assume use for half the number of working days
92	Operation of Portable Changeable Message Sign	DAY	240	$1,000.00	$240,000.00	240	---	---	---	---	---	Assume use for the number of working days
	Traffic Subtotal				*$665,220.00*							

	Other Items					EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
93	Utility Relocates	L.S.	1	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Franchise, cost by others
94	Undergrounding Utilities	L.F.	0	$400.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
95	Monument Case and Cover	EA.	2	$1,500.00	$3,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	Placed at all intersections and pc's/pt's
96	Adjust Monument Case and Cover	EA.	1	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
97	Trimming and Cleanup	L.S.	1	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Other Items Subtotal				*$54,000.00*							

SUBTOTAL				$9,970,215.00
CONTINGENCY	40%			$3,988,090.00
CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL				**$13,958,305.00**
DESIGN ENGINEERING	15%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$2,093,750.00
CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING	15%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$2,093,750.00
PROJECT ADMINISTRATION	5%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$697,920.00
ENGR. AND ADMIN. SUBTOTAL				**$4,885,420.00**
ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING	2%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$279,170.00
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION	1%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$139,590.00
ENVIRONMENTAL SUBTOTAL				**$418,760.00**
RIGHT-OF-WAY				
Commercial Property	S.F.	0	$50.00	$0.00
Residential Property	S.F.	0	$35.00	$0.00
Number of Individual Properties	EA.	0	$10,000.00	$0.00
RIGHT-OF-WAY SUBTOTAL				**$0.00**
TOTAL PROJECT COST				**$19,262,485.00**

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alt A2) - Phase 4 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 1,400 feet
Description: Maintain 3 lane corridor; construct new Dechaux Extension roundabout (estimate excludes Dechaux Extension new road); extend shared use path (east side) from 43rd to new roundabout; matches to existing 3-lane section to the south until Phase 5 is constructed.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
Preparation												
1	Mobilization (10% of remaining items)	L.S.	1	$573,600.00	$573,600.00	10.0%	---	---	---	---	---	
2	Construction Surveying	L.S.	1	$84,100.00	$84,100.00	1.5%	---	---	---	---	---	1.5% of Construction Subtotal
3	Construction Site Signs	L.S.	1	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	10 signs at $300/sign
4	Clearing and Grubbing	L.S.	1	$40,000.00	$40,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Clearing and Grubbing for roadway widening beyond existing pavement plus an additi
5	Removal of Structures and Obstructions	L.S.	1	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
6	Removing Catch Basin	EA.	0	$750.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
7	Removing Cement Conc. Flatwork	S.Y.	0	$15.00	$0.00	---	0	0	---	9	---	
8	Removing Cement Conc. Curb and Gutter	L.F.	0	$10.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
9	Removing Extruded Curb	L.F.	0	$10.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
10	Removing Pavement Markings	L.S.	1	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
11	Removing Asphalt Conc. Pavement	S.Y.	778	$20.00	$15,560.00	---	1400	5	---	9	---	
12	Removing Reinf. Cement Conc. Pavement	F.A.	0	$5,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Preparation Subtotal				*$731,260.00*							
Grading						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
13	Roadway Excavation Incl. Haul	C.Y.	3,112	$45.00	$140,040.00	---	1400	20	3	27	---	
14	Unsuitable Foundation Excavation Incl. Haul	C.Y.	312	$65.00	$20,280.00	---	0	0	3	27	---	Assumes 10% of Item 13.
15	Ballast	TON	0	$50.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.95	
16	Gravel Borrow Incl. Haul	TON	994	$35.00	$34,790.00	---	2900	5	1	27	1.85	
17	Crushed Surfacing Base Course	TON	551	$45.00	$24,795.00	---	2400	5	0.67	27	1.85	
18	Crushed Surfacing Top Course	TON	652	$55.00	$35,860.00	---	2400	12	0.33	27	1.85	
19	Controlled Density Fill (CDF)	C.Y.	0	$90.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
20	Structure Excavation for Utility Vault or J-Box	C.Y.	0	$55.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
21	Utility Trenching	C.Y.	0	$55.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
22	Sand Bedding for Utility Trenches	TON	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.55	
23	Foundation Material for Utility Vault or J-Box	TON	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.85	
24	Shoring or Extra Excavation Class B	S.F.	0	$3.00	$0.00	---	0	---	4	---	---	Total Pipe length * 4 feet
	Grading Subtotal				*$255,765.00*							
Storm Drainage						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
25	Adjust Catch Basin	EA.	0	$1,200.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
26	Area Inlet	EA.	0	$1,600.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
27	Catch Basin Type 1	EA.	7	$2,800.00	$19,600.00	7	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/2
28	Catch Basin Type 1L	EA.	4	$3,000.00	$12,000.00	4	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/4
29	Catch Basin Type 2, 48 In. Diam.	EA.	4	$6,000.00	$24,000.00	4	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/4
30	Catch Basin Type 2, w/ Oil-Water Separator	EA.	1	$9,000.00	$9,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
31	Underdrain Pipe 6 In. Diam.	L.F.	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
32	Storm Sewer Pipe 8 In. Diam.	L.F.	0	$40.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
33	Storm Sewer Pipe 12 In. Diam.	L.F.	35	$100.00	$3,500.00	---	35	---	---	---	---	Assume 12" pipe for all crossings
34	Storm Sewer Pipe 18 In. Diam.	L.F.	700	$140.00	$98,000.00	---	700	---	---	---	---	Assume 18" trunkline half of length of road
35	Storm Sewer Pipe 24 In. Diam.	L.F.	700	$180.00	$126,000.00	---	700	---	---	---	---	Assume 24" trunkline half of length of road
36	Connect to Existing Drainage Structure	EA.	1	$1,200.00	$1,200.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
37	Culvert / Stream Crossing (approx. 72 In. Diam.)	L.F.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
38	Stormwater Detention / Water Quality Facility	L.S.	1	$300,000.00	$300,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Storm Drainage Subtotal				*$593,300.00*							

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alt A2) - Phase 4 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 1,400 feet
Description: Maintain 3 lane corridor; construct new Dechaux Extension roundabout (estimate excludes Dechaux Extension new road); extend shared use path (east side) from 43rd to new roundabout; matches to existing 3-lane section to the south until Phase 5 is constructed.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
Paving												
39	Planing Bituminous Pavement	S.Y.	267	$25.00	$6,675.00	---	60	40	---	9	---	
40	Hot Mix Asphalt	TON	1,280	$145.00	$185,600.00	---	1400	48	0.25	27	2.05	
41	Incidental Hot Mix Asphalt	TON	20	$155.00	$3,100.00	---	60	15	0.25	27	2.05	
	HMA Subtotal				*$195,375.00*							
Concrete						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
42	Cement Conc. Driveway Entrance	S.Y.	20	$100.00	$2,000.00	---	15	12	---	9	---	
43	Cement Conc. Sidewalk	S.Y.	1,245	$65.00	$80,925.00	---	1400	8	---	9	---	10' sidewalk both sides of road
44	Cement Conc. Curb Ramp Type ___	EA.	8	$3,500.00	$28,000.00	8	---	---	---	---	---	
45	Cement Conc. Barrier Curb and Gutter	L.F.	1,400	$40.00	$56,000.00	---	1400	---	---	---	---	
46	Mountable Cement Conc. Traffic Curb	L.F.	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
47	Roundabout Truck Apron Cement Conc. C & G	L.F.	0	$75.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
48	Roundabout, Central and Splitter Islands Complete	L.S.	1	$2,000,000.00	$2,000,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
49	Cement Concrete Roadway	C.Y.	0	$450.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0.0	27	---	
	Concrete Subtotal				*$2,166,925.00*							
Structures						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
50	Structure Excavation Class A Incl. Haul	C.Y.	250	$45.00	$11,250.00	---	750	2	4.5	27	---	
51	Gravel Backfill for Walls	TON	0	$70.00	$0.00	---	0	1	0	27	1.85	
52	Retaining Wall > 8'	S.F.	6,750	$235.00	$1,586,250.00	---	750	---	9	---	---	
53	Retaining Wall <= 8'	S.F.	0	$100.00	$0.00	---	0	---	0	---	---	
54	Bridge Structure	S.F.	0	$900.00	$0.00	---	0	0	---	---	---	
	Structures Subtotal				*$1,597,500.00*							
TESC and Landscaping						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
55	Temporary Water Pollution / Erosion Control	L.S.	1	$84,400.00	$84,400.00	1.5%	---	---	---	---	---	
56	Inlet Protection	EA.	16	$110.00	$1,760.00	16	---	---	---	---	---	One at each new CB
57	Silt Fence	L.F.	3,000	$7.00	$21,000.00	---	3000	---	---	---	---	
58	Topsoil Type C	C.Y.	52	$65.00	$3,380.00	---	1400	4	0.25	27	---	4" Topsoil in planter median and planter strips.
59	Sod Installation	S.Y.	0	$35.00	$0.00	---	0	0	---	9	---	
60	Trees	EA.	0	$600.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	Trees spaced every 50' in planter strip and median.
61	Plant Selection and Estab. (various species)	S.Y.	623	$40.00	$24,920.00	---	1400	4	---	9	---	For landscaped buffers and medians
62	Miscellaneous Improvements (Property Restoration)	L.S.	1	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
63	Irrigation System Complete	L.S.	1	$22,000.00	$22,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Assumes Irrigation is equal to 90% of value of Trees and Plants
64	Irrigation System Repair	F.A.	1	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	TESC and Landscaping Subtotal				*$172,460.00*							
Traffic						EA/Day/Hr	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	DYCL	Tons/CY	
65	Paint Line	L.F.	4,200	$2.00	$8,400.00	---	4200	---	---	---	---	Lane Line, Median Line
66	Plastic Bicycle Lane Symbol	EA.	0	$550.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	Every 250' both sides.
67	Plastic Line	L.F.	0	$5.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	Bike Lanes, Left Turn Lanes
68	Plastic Stop Line	L.F.	0	$20.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
69	Plastic Yield Line Symbol	EA.	24	$55.00	$1,320.00	24	---					1 symbol per 2 feet of lane width
70	Plastic Crosswalk Line	S.F.	0	$15.00	$0.00	---	0	10	---	---	---	
71	Plastic Traffic Arrow	EA.	0	$400.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	2 arrows per lt turn lane
72	Raised Pavement Marker, Type 1	HUND.	0	$600.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	0.60	---	
73	Raised Pavement Marker, Type 2	HUND.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	0.10	---	
74	Permanent Signing	EA.	14	$400.00	$5,600.00	14	---	---	---	---	---	Every 200' both sides.

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alt A2) - Phase 4 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 1,400 feet
Description: Maintain 3 lane corridor; construct new Dechaux Extension roundabout (estimate excludes Dechaux Extension new road); extend shared use path (east side) from 43rd to new roundabout; matches to existing 3-lane section to the south until Phase 5 is constructed.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT							
75	Beam Guardrail Type 31	L.F.	200	$45.00	$9,000.00	---	200	---	---	---	---	Guardrail at all fill walls and fill slopes
76	Beam Guardrail Terminal	EA.	1	$4,000.00	$4,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
77	Beam Guardrail Anchor	EA.	1	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
78	Safety Handrail	L.F.	100	$200.00	$20,000.00	---	100	---	---	---	---	At all fill walls
79	Remove Existing Traffic Signal System	L.S.	0	$75,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
80	Foundation Potholing	EA.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
81	Traffic Signal System Complete	L.S.	0	$400,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
82	Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon System Complete	L.S.	0	$250,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
83	Interconnect System Complete	L.S.	0	$25,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
84	Illumination System Complete	L.S.	0	$200,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
85	Adjust Junction Box	EA.	0	$800.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
86	Street Lighting	EA.	8	$7,500.00	$60,000.00	8	---	---	---	---	---	One luminaire every 200 feet both sides of the road
87	Temporary Traffic Control Devices	L.S.	1	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
88	Traffic Control Labor - Flagging	HOUR	1,600	$75.00	$120,000.00	1600	---	---	---	---	---	100 working days, 8 hours a day, 2 flaggers needed.
89	Portable Sequential Arrow Sign	EA.	2	$4,000.00	$8,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	100
90	Portable Changeable Message Sign	EA.	2	$6,000.00	$12,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	
91	Operation of Portable Sequential Arrow Sign	DAY	100	$1,000.00	$100,000.00	100	---	---	---	---	---	Assume use for half the number of working days
92	Operation of Portable Changeable Message Sign	DAY	200	$1,000.00	$200,000.00	200	---	---	---	---	---	Assume use for the number of working days
	Traffic Subtotal				*$599,320.00*							

	Other Items					EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
93	Utility Relocates	L.S.	1	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Franchise, cost by others
94	Undergrounding Utilities	L.F.	0	$400.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
95	Monument Case and Cover	EA.	2	$1,500.00	$3,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	Placed at all intersections and pc's/pt's
96	Adjust Monument Case and Cover	EA.	1	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
97	Trimming and Cleanup	L.S.	1	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Other Items Subtotal				*$54,000.00*							

SUBTOTAL				$6,365,905.00
CONTINGENCY	40%			$2,546,370.00
CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL				**$8,912,275.00**
DESIGN ENGINEERING	15%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$1,336,850.00
CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING	15%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$1,336,850.00
PROJECT ADMINISTRATION	5%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$445,620.00
ENGR. AND ADMIN. SUBTOTAL				**$3,119,320.00**
ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING	2%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$178,250.00
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION	1%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$89,130.00
ENVIRONMENTAL SUBTOTAL				**$267,380.00**
RIGHT-OF-WAY				
Commercial Property	S.F.	0	$50.00	$0.00
Residential Property	S.F.	0	$35.00	$0.00
Number of Individual Properties	EA.	0	$10,000.00	$0.00
RIGHT-OF-WAY SUBTOTAL				**$0.00**
TOTAL PROJECT COST				**$12,298,975.00**

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alt A2) - Phase 5 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 2,600 feet
Description: Construct non-motorized bridge (east of existing bridge); construct motorized bridge (west of existing bridge); upgrade existing bridge to meet current seismic design criteria; extend 3-lane section south to Spencer; construct Spencer roundabout, matches 4-lane section.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
	Preparation											
1	Mobilization (10% of remaining items)	L.S.	1	$3,001,900.00	$3,001,900.00	10.0%	---	---	---	---	---	
2	Construction Surveying	L.S.	1	$438,000.00	$438,000.00	1.5%	---	---	---	---	---	1.5% of Construction Subtotal
3	Construction Site Signs	L.S.	1	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	10 signs at $300/sign
4	Clearing and Grubbing	L.S.	1	$60,000.00	$60,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Clearing and Grubbing for roadway widening beyond existing pavement plus an additi
5	Removal of Structures and Obstructions	L.S.	1	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
6	Removing Catch Basin	EA.	0	$750.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
7	Removing Cement Conc. Flatwork	S.Y.	0	$15.00	$0.00	---	0	0	---	9	---	
8	Removing Cement Conc. Curb and Gutter	L.F.	0	$10.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
9	Removing Extruded Curb	L.F.	0	$10.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
10	Removing Pavement Markings	L.S.	1	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
11	Removing Asphalt Conc. Pavement	S.Y.	1,445	$20.00	$28,900.00	---	2600	5	---	9	---	
12	Removing Reinf. Cement Conc. Pavement	F.A.	0	$5,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Preparation Subtotal				*$3,556,800.00*							
	Grading					EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
13	Roadway Excavation Incl. Haul	C.Y.	5,778	$45.00	$260,010.00	---	2600	20	3	27	---	
14	Unsuitable Foundation Excavation Incl. Haul	C.Y.	578	$65.00	$37,570.00	---	0	0	3	27	---	Assumes 10% of Item 13.
15	Ballast	TON	0	$50.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.95	
16	Gravel Borrow Incl. Haul	TON	64,134	$35.00	$2,244,690.00	---	2600	40	9	27	1.85	
17	Crushed Surfacing Base Course	TON	3,820	$45.00	$171,900.00	---	2600	32	0.67	27	1.85	
18	Crushed Surfacing Top Course	TON	706	$55.00	$38,830.00	---	2600	12	0.33	27	1.85	
19	Controlled Density Fill (CDF)	C.Y.	0	$90.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
20	Structure Excavation for Utility Vault or J-Box	C.Y.	0	$55.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
21	Utility Trenching	C.Y.	0	$55.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	---	
22	Sand Bedding for Utility Trenches	TON	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.55	
23	Foundation Material for Utility Vault or J-Box	TON	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0	27	1.85	
24	Shoring or Extra Excavation Class B	S.F.	0	$3.00	$0.00	---	0	---	4	---	---	Total Pipe length * 4 feet
	Grading Subtotal				*$2,753,000.00*							
	Storm Drainage					EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
25	Adjust Catch Basin	EA.	0	$1,200.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
26	Area Inlet	EA.	0	$1,600.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
27	Catch Basin Type 1	EA.	13	$2,800.00	$36,400.00	13	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/2
28	Catch Basin Type 1L	EA.	7	$3,000.00	$21,000.00	7	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/4
29	Catch Basin Type 2, 48 In. Diam.	EA.	7	$6,000.00	$42,000.00	7	---	---	---	---	---	cb every 200 ' both sides/4
30	Catch Basin Type 2, w/ Oil-Water Separator	EA.	1	$9,000.00	$9,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
31	Underdrain Pipe 6 In. Diam.	L.F.	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
32	Storm Sewer Pipe 8 In. Diam.	L.F.	0	$40.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
33	Storm Sewer Pipe 12 In. Diam.	L.F.	520	$100.00	$52,000.00	---	520	---	---	---	---	Assume 12" pipe for all crossings
34	Storm Sewer Pipe 18 In. Diam.	L.F.	1,300	$140.00	$182,000.00	---	1300	---	---	---	---	Assume 18" trunkline half of length of road
35	Storm Sewer Pipe 24 In. Diam.	L.F.	1,300	$180.00	$234,000.00	---	1300	---	---	---	---	Assume 24" trunkline half of length of road
36	Connect to Existing Drainage Structure	EA.	1	$1,200.00	$1,200.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
37	Culvert / Stream Crossing (approx. 72 In. Diam.)	L.F.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
38	Stormwater Detention / Water Quality Facility	L.S.	1	$600,000.00	$600,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Storm Drainage Subtotal				*$1,177,600.00*							

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alt A2) - Phase 5 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 2,600 feet
Description: Construct non-motorized bridge (east of existing bridge); construct motorized bridge (west of existing bridge); upgrade existing bridge to meet current seismic design criteria; extend 3-lane section south to Spencer; construct Spencer roundabout, matches 4-lane section.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
Paving												
39	Planing Bituminous Pavement	S.Y.	267	$25.00	$6,675.00	---	60	40	---	9	---	
40	Hot Mix Asphalt	TON	2,370	$145.00	$343,650.00	---	2600	48	0.25	27	2.05	
41	Incidental Hot Mix Asphalt	TON	2,660	$155.00	$412,300.00	---	2600	32	0.42	27	2.05	
	HMA Subtotal				*$762,625.00*							
Concrete						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
42	Cement Conc. Driveway Entrance	S.Y.	0	$100.00	$0.00	---	0	12	---	9	---	
43	Cement Conc. Sidewalk	S.Y.	2,312	$65.00	$150,280.00	---	2600	8	---	9	---	10' sidewalk both sides of road
44	Cement Conc. Curb Ramp Type ___	EA.	8	$3,500.00	$28,000.00	8	---	---	---	---	---	
45	Cement Conc. Barrier Curb and Gutter	L.F.	2,600	$40.00	$104,000.00	---	2600	---	---	---	---	
46	Mountable Cement Conc. Traffic Curb	L.F.	0	$30.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
47	Roundabout Truck Apron Cement Conc. C & G	L.F.	0	$75.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
48	Roundabout, Central and Splitter Islands Complete	L.S.	1	$1,500,000.00	$1,500,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
49	Cement Concrete Roadway	C.Y.	0	$450.00	$0.00	---	0	0	0.0	27	---	
	Concrete Subtotal				*$1,782,280.00*							
Structures						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
50	Structure Excavation Class A Incl. Haul	C.Y.	978	$45.00	$44,010.00	---	2,200	2	6	27	---	
51	Gravel Backfill for Walls	TON	15,380	$70.00	$1,076,600.00	---	2,200	6	17	27	1.85	
52	Retaining Wall > 8'	S.F.	37,400	$235.00	$8,789,000.00	---	2,200	---	17	---	---	
53	Retaining Wall <= 8'	S.F.	10,500	$100.00	$1,050,000.00	---	1,050	---	10	---	---	
54	Bridge Structure	S.F.	12,000	$900.00	$10,800,000.00	---	250	48	---	---	---	
	Structures Subtotal				*$21,759,610.00*							
TESC and Landscaping						EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
55	Temporary Water Pollution / Erosion Control	L.S.	1	$438,300.00	$438,300.00	1.5%	---	---	---	---	---	
56	Inlet Protection	EA.	28	$110.00	$3,080.00	28	---	---	---	---	---	One at each new CB
57	Silt Fence	L.F.	3,000	$7.00	$21,000.00	---	3000	---	---	---	---	
58	Topsoil Type C	C.Y.	97	$65.00	$6,305.00	---	2600	4	0.25	27	---	4" Topsoil in planter median and planter strips.
59	Sod Installation	S.Y.	0	$35.00	$0.00	---	0	0	---	9	---	
60	Trees	EA.	0	$600.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	Trees spaced every 50' in planter strip and median.
61	Plant Selection and Estab. (various species)	S.Y.	1,156	$40.00	$46,240.00	---	2600	4	---	9	---	For landscaped buffers and medians
62	Miscellaneous Improvements (Property Restoration)	L.S.	1	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
63	Irrigation System Complete	L.S.	1	$42,000.00	$42,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Assumes Irrigation is equal to 90% of value of Trees and Plants
64	Irrigation System Repair	F.A.	1	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	TESC and Landscaping Subtotal				*$571,925.00*							
Traffic						EA/Day/Hr	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	DYCL	Tons/CY	
65	Paint Line	L.F.	4,200	$2.00	$8,400.00	---	4200	---	---	---	---	Lane Line, Median Line
66	Plastic Bicycle Lane Symbol	EA.	0	$550.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	Every 250' both sides.
67	Plastic Line	L.F.	0	$5.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	Bike Lanes, Left Turn Lanes
68	Plastic Stop Line	L.F.	0	$20.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
69	Plastic Yield Line Symbol	EA.	24	$55.00	$1,320.00	24	---					1 symbol per 2 feet of lane width
70	Plastic Crosswalk Line	S.F.	0	$15.00	$0.00	---	0	10	---	---	---	
71	Plastic Traffic Arrow	EA.	0	$400.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	2 arrows per lt turn lane
72	Raised Pavement Marker, Type 1	HUND.	0	$600.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	0.60	---	
73	Raised Pavement Marker, Type 2	HUND.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	0.10	---	
74	Permanent Signing	EA.	26	$400.00	$10,400.00	26	---	---	---	---	---	Every 200' both sides.

CITY OF EDGEWOOD
Planning Level Cost Estimate

Transportation Solutions
INNOVATIVE | PRACTICAL | EQUITABLE

Project: **Meridian (SR 161) Corridor Study** **Date:** 3/8/24
Design Option Recommended Option (Alt A2) - Phase 5 **Prepared by:** KAH
Length: 2,600 feet
Description: Construct non-motorized bridge (east of existing bridge); construct motorized bridge (west of existing bridge); upgrade existing bridge to meet current seismic design criteria; extend 3-lane section south to Spencer; construct Spencer roundabout, matches 4-lane section.

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	PLAN QTY	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT							
75	Beam Guardrail Type 31	L.F.	0	$45.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	Guardrail at all fill walls and fill slopes
76	Beam Guardrail Terminal	EA.	1	$4,000.00	$4,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
77	Beam Guardrail Anchor	EA.	1	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
78	Safety Handrail	L.F.	100	$200.00	$20,000.00	---	100	---	---	---	---	At all fill walls
79	Remove Existing Traffic Signal System	L.S.	0	$75,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
80	Foundation Potholing	EA.	0	$1,000.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
81	Traffic Signal System Complete	L.S.	0	$400,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
82	Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon System Complete	L.S.	0	$250,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
83	Interconnect System Complete	L.S.	0	$25,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
84	Illumination System Complete	L.S.	0	$200,000.00	$0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
85	Adjust Junction Box	EA.	0	$800.00	$0.00	0	---	---	---	---	---	
86	Street Lighting	EA.	8	$7,500.00	$60,000.00	8	---	---	---	---	---	One luminaire every 200 feet both sides of the road
87	Temporary Traffic Control Devices	L.S.	1	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
88	Traffic Control Labor - Flagging	HOUR	1,920	$75.00	$144,000.00	1920	---	---	---	---	---	120 working days, 8 hours a day, 2 flaggers needed.
89	Portable Sequential Arrow Sign	EA.	2	$4,000.00	$8,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	120
90	Portable Changeable Message Sign	EA.	2	$6,000.00	$12,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	
91	Operation of Portable Sequential Arrow Sign	DAY	120	$1,000.00	$120,000.00	120	---	---	---	---	---	Assume use for half the number of working days
92	Operation of Portable Changeable Message Sign	DAY	240	$1,000.00	$240,000.00	240	---	---	---	---	---	Assume use for the number of working days
	Traffic Subtotal				*$679,120.00*							
	Other Items					EACH	Length (FT)	Width (FT)	Depth (FT)	Conversion	Tons/CY	
93	Utility Relocates	L.S.	1	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	Franchise, cost by others
94	Undergrounding Utilities	L.F.	0	$400.00	$0.00	---	0	---	---	---	---	
95	Monument Case and Cover	EA.	2	$1,500.00	$3,000.00	2	---	---	---	---	---	Placed at all intersections and pc's/pt's
96	Adjust Monument Case and Cover	EA.	1	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	1	---	---	---	---	---	
97	Trimming and Cleanup	L.S.	1	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	
	Other Items Subtotal				*$54,000.00*							
	SUBTOTAL				$33,096,960.00							
	CONTINGENCY	40%			$13,238,790.00							
	CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL				**$46,335,750.00**							
	DESIGN ENGINEERING	15%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$6,950,370.00							
	CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING	15%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$6,950,370.00							
	PROJECT ADMINISTRATION	5%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$2,316,790.00							
	ENGR. AND ADMIN. SUBTOTAL				**$16,217,530.00**							
	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING	2%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$926,720.00							
	ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION	1%	(of Constr. Subtotal)		$463,360.00							
	ENVIRONMENTAL SUBTOTAL				**$1,390,080.00**							
	RIGHT-OF-WAY											
	Commercial Property	S.F.	0	$50.00	$0.00							
	Residential Property	S.F.	0	$35.00	$0.00							
	Number of Individual Properties	EA.	0	$10,000.00	$0.00							
	RIGHT-OF-WAY SUBTOTAL				**$0.00**							
	TOTAL PROJECT COST				**$63,943,360.00**							