# Road Standards Variance Request to the County Road Engineer 

For alternate formats, call 206-296-6600.

| Project Name: |
| :--- |
| Gunshy Manor |
| Project Address and Parcel Number: |
| 20005 NE Union Hill Road, Redmond, WA 98053 |
| Applicant/Design Engineer Name: |
| The Estate of Barbara J Nelson c/o William C. Nelson, Jr. |
| Address: |
| 16508 NE 79th St |
| City, State, ZIP: |
| Redmond, WA 98072 |

Permittina File No.: VARR18-00099

| Signature: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Engineering Firm Náme: |  |
| ESM Consulting Engineers, LLC |  |
| Telephone: |  |
| 253-838-6113 |  |
| Permitting Engineer Initials: |  |
| $\square \quad$ Route Application |  |

Check here if project engineering plans are approved and construction has begun.
INSTRUCTIONS TO APPLICANT/DESIGN ENGINEER:
Please be sure to include all plans, sketches, photos and maps which may assist in complete review and consideration of your variance request. For a complete list of road variance submittal requirements, refer to separate list from Permitting. Failure to provide all pertinent information may result in delayed processing or denial of request. Please submit this request and applicable fee to the Department of Permitting and Environmental Review (Permitting) Permitting Service Center at 35030 SE Douglas Street, Suite 210 in Snoqualmie, WA 98065-9266. To make an appointment for permit submittal, please call 206-296-6797. For more information, refer to the Permitting Web site, www.kingcounty.gov/permits.

## REFER TO SECTION 1.08 OF THE KING COUNTY ROAD STANDARDS FOR VARIANCES DESCRIPTION OF VARIANCE REQUEST: See Attached

| APPLICABLE SECTION(S) OF STANDARDS: | 1) 2.02 Rural Local Roadways; <br> 2) 2.06 Private Roads; <br> 3) 2.08 Cul -de-sacs, Islands and Hammerhead; <br> 4) 2.10 Intersection and Low-Speed Curves; <br> 5) 3.02 Concrete Sidewalks; <br> 6) 3.09 School Access |
| :---: | :---: |

JUSTIFICATION (see attachments, pages
All
to $\qquad$ ):

AUTHORIZATION SIGNATURES:


CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

## - - CONSULTING ENGINEERS LLC

June 20, 2019
Job No. 1359-001-007

Mr. Robert Eichelsdoerfer, PE, Senior Engineer<br>King County Dept. Of Transportation<br>201 S Jackson St<br>Seattle, WA 98104<br>And<br>Ms. Huey-Yi Sung, PE, Senior Engineer<br>King County Dept. of Local Services, Permitting Division 35030 SE Douglas Street, Ste \#210<br>Snoqualmie, WA 98065

RE: Gunshy Manor Preliminary Plat - VARR18-0009
Revised Road Variance Requests to the 2016 King County Road Design and Construction Standards

Dear Robert and Huey:
On behalf of The Estate of Barbara J Nelson and the WCN GST Non-Exempt Marital Trust \#2 (the "applicant") and pursuant to subsection D. 5 of Section 1.13 (Variances) of the 2016 King County Road Design and Construction Standards (KCRDCS), ESM Consulting Engineers is submitting this revised letter and relevant exhibits to serve as the applicant's request for determinations and approvals of certain variances in relation to provisions of the KCRDCS for the proposed Gunshy Manor Preliminary Plat.

In early April 2019, the applicant and ESM Consulting Engineers attended a meeting with King County staff to discuss comments provided by the County on March 21, 2019. During this meeting, County staff provided support of the road variance application and expressed no concerns with the proposed variances. In addition, further correspondence with Robert, KCDOT Engineer, concluded agreement on the revised private-road boulevard near the entrance of the project site and within the critical area buffer. ESM also discussed with Huey, KCDOLS Engineer, the proposal to provide a sidewalk on one side of the boulevard section and the need for a crosswalk that meets sight distance for safety purposes.

This revised road variance request is provided to the County to clarify specific requests and to address additional road variances required, which are italicized in the next section of this letter. Please review the Gunshy Manor Preliminary Site Plan as a visual aid to represent these specific requests.

## Road Variance Requests

The applicant requests the following determinations and variances in relation to one or more subsections of each of the following 2016 KCRDCS sections:
(1) A determination by the Development Engineer for approval of a "curb" type roadway on a nural road within the boulevard section of the proposed Tract $G$, as supported in Section 2.01 - Land Developments in Rural Areas and specified in subsection E of section 2.02 - Rural Local Roadways;
(2) Approval by the Development Engineer to allow a private rural subaccess roadway with thickened asphalt edge rather than with curb, pursuant to subsection A of Section 2.06 (Private Roads);
(3) A determination by the County Road Engineer pursuant to subsection B of Section 2.06 (Private Roads) to allow 23 single-family residential lots to be served by the private road;
(4) Approval by the County Road Engineer of a variance pursuant to subsection A. 4 of Section 2.08 (Cul-de-Sacs, Islands, and Hammerheads) for the length of the proposed $\pm 2900$-foot-long permanent cul-de-sac;
(5) A determination by the County Road Engineer that the intersection spacing provisions of Section 2.10 Intersection and Low-Speed Curves are inapplicable under Section 2.06.G. 8 regarding the proposed private road intersection with NE Union Hill Road;
(6) Approval by the County Road Engineer to allow a concrete sidewalk on one side of the rural road within the boulevard section of the proposed Tract $G$, as specified in Section 3.02(1);
(7) A consideration of following Figure 2-005, Extruded Curb Roadway, along a $60^{\prime}$ long portion of NE Union Hill Road, as an alternative provision for safe School Access for students within the proposed development, as outlined in Section 3.09.

## Background

The proposed Gunshy Manor preliminary plat is for 23 single-family lots arranged in a clustered layout to avoid impacts to the extensive critical areas of the site. The private road (Tract G ) enters from NE Union Hill Road and extends into the project site, crossing Martin Creek and its buffer. The proposed cross-sections are provided to comply with KCC 21A.24.125, avoiding and minimizing impacts to critical areas, as well as to provide for adequate fire access as required in the 2016 KCRDCS.

This project proposes a boulevard section through the Martin Creek buffer that includes a gated entryway, two residential and fire apparatus paths for egress and ingress, center median, curb and gutter and a sidewalk on one side.

Beyond the boulevard section, the proposed Tract G contains a 48 ' rural subaccess private roadway with 28 ' of pavement to support two travel lanes and parking on one side, along with thickened edge and a 4' shoulder on both sides, with additional 6 ' of grade on both sides to meet the minimum standard for this type of road section. The entirety of Tract $G$ extends approximately 1,500 feet to a midsection eyebrow cul-de-sac for large-vehicle turnaround relief and extends another approximately 1,400 feet to the end of the cul-de-sac where it terminates in a bulb.

## 1. "Curb" Type Roadway Request - 2.02(E) Rural Local Roadways

Subsection E of the 2016 KCRDCS Section 2.02 provides provision for the County Road Engineer or Development Engineer to approve a variance from a "shoulder" type roadway within Rural Local Roadways. In order to comply with KCC 21A. 24.125 while also providing for the necessary features of a private and rural roadway, the boulevard section of Tract $G$ proposes the use of a "curb" type roadway with a sidewalk on one side to minimize the footprint of the roadway within the Martin Creek crossing and buffer.

The use of the "curb" typing minimizes the permanent road improvements by minimum width of 3 ' along the length of the boulevard section, which totals over $1,300 \mathrm{SF}$ of minimization while also providing a safe walking path for pedestrians. Section 2.01, Land Development in Rural Areas supports the use of "curb" typing within cluster subdivision such as this to support minimizing impacts to critical areas.

## 2. Rural Subaccess Private Roadway with Thickened Edge Variance - 2.06(A) Private Roads

Subsection A of Section 2.06 (Private Roads) expresses that the Development Engineer may allow a thickened edge asphalt with the provision that stormwater treatment will be adequate and safety uncompromised. The cross-section C-C proposed for the primary portion of Tract G includes $2^{\prime}$ thickened edge on both sides of the road as opposed to curbing or immediate shoulder and ditch as depicted on Fig. 2-001 of King County Road Standard Figures.

Curbing is not within this section of the road as it is not consistent with the edges for a rural roadway. An immediate shoulder with a ditch is also not proposed because a storm drainage system, designed to meet the 2016. King County Stormwater Manual standards, is proposed through a series of piping within the roadway and detention facilities on the site to collect, treat and disperse stormwater.

Safety is not compromised with this design - pedestrian access is available along the 4' shoulders immediately adjacent to the thickened edge along the entire road, along with a crosswalk that connects to the sidewalk for the boulevard section. The width of the roadway as proposed, 28 ' of paving in total, provides room for 2 travel lanes and parking on the eastern side of the road.

Additionally, in view of the significant length of the proposed private road, having the road privately owned and maintained supports the intent of a private road because all the existing surrounding parcels already have means of existing access to a public road. The County will not be responsible for maintaining another public road through this proposal.

## 3. Determination to Allow 23 Single-Family Lots - 2.06(B) Private Roads

The proposal plans for the private road to serve all 23 of the proposed single-family lots within the clustered subdivision. KCRDCS Subsection B of Section 2.06 (Private Roads) allows up to 50 lots to be served by private roads when the entire length of a proposed private road system to the nearest public maintained road is considered, and when the County Road Engineer determines that the following criteria are met:

1. There is no opportunity for connecting to neighboring parcels or developments, or
2. When there are physical barriers, zoning regulations, legal constraints or any other applicable restrictions that prohibits the connection to road stub-outs, easements, neighboring parcel(s), public roads, or rights of way.

In addition, there is no opportunity for connection of the subject development to existing roads on adjacent properties or developments because none of those properties have existing roads stubbed to the subject site. Further, steep slopes exist to the south and east, and wetlands and aquatic areas exist to the south and west. Also, the existing lots to the west of the north end of the proposed subdivisions site have been fully developed. In sum, these constraints provide no opportunity for connecting to neighboring parcels or developments.

## 4. Road Length Variance-2.08(A4) Cul-De-Sacs, Islands and Hammerheads

Subsection A. 4 of KCRDCS Section 2.08 (Cul-De-Sacs, Islands, and Hammerheads) provides a general limit of 600 feet on a permanent cul-de-sac but provides for variance opportunity by the County Road Engineer. As proposed, the Gunshy Manor subdivision contains a tract for a private roadway (Tract G) with a cul-de-sac extending approximately 1,400 feet from centerline of the midsection eyebrow cul-de-sac to the center of the terminal bulb and roughly another 1,500 lineal feet for a total length of $\pm 2,900$ lineal feet.

However, because of (1) the site's elongated geometry from north to south and the barriers presented by the site's critical areas and (2) the lack of existing roads to the subject site from surrounding properties, there is no other reasonable layout alternative for a road to serve the proposed lots. In addition to the internal eyebrow cul-de-sac for emergency and service vehicle turnaround, individual driveways would allow turn-around opportunities along the length of the cul-de-sac as each proposed driveway will be longer than 30 feet long (while some over 100 feet long) and 16 feet in width to match KCRDCS standards.

Note that precedent exists for approval of a cul-de-sac in unincorporated King County longer than the length of the subject proposed cul-de-sac. For example, the "Ames Lake Hills" residential subdivision was approved by King County, recorded (King County Recording Number 9505151542 ), and developed with an overall cul-de-sac length of $\pm 4,000$ feet (See the accompanying Ames Lake Hills cul-de-sac exhibit.)

## 5. Determination That the Intersection Spacing Provisions Are Inapplicable to the Proposed Private Roadway - 2.10(B) Intersections and Low-Speed Curve

The intersection spacing provisions of Section $2.10(\mathrm{~B})$ are inapplicable to the subject proposed private road. On page number 6 of the accompanying "Gunshy Manor Site Access Analysis" memorandum prepared by Transpo Group, Transpo explains why, as can be seen in the following excerpt:

## Intersection Spacing

The proposed access along NE Union Hill Road was analyzed relative to intersection spacing per King County Road Design and Construction Standards - 2016. Per King County Road Standards, intersection spacing is set for the highest classification of street involved, which for these intersections is NE Union Hill Road (a minor arterial), resulting in a recommended spacing of 500 feet between intersections. This is intended for public street connections with higher volumes. The proposed private access is located approximately 180 feet west of 199th Avenue NE. Both 199th Avenue NE and the proposed access are private roads intersecting NE Union Hill Road.

As both accesses are private roads, the minimum roadway spacing requirements noted in the standards are not applicable. The intersection spacing is a result of providing improved sight distance east of the proposed driveway along NE Union Hill Road. The private road of 199th Avenue NE serves 7 single-family homes and up to 25 homes via the proposed access. Low volumes are forecast at both of the proposed accesses with up to 21 trips during the weekday PM peak hour at the proposed access as shown above and approximately 7 trips during the weekday PM peak hour at the 199th Avenue NE access. The two private roads provide access to single family homes with low volumes of traffic and the 180 feet between the driveways will be sufficient.

As an additional justification for the requested determination, note that prior to the applicant's purchase of the parcel of land that has become the westernmost part of the site that abuts the south side of NE Union Hill Road, the planned NE Union Hill Road access point to the project site was substantially farther to the east, where there was less sight distance visibility available to and from the east around and behind the NE Union Hill Road curve. That said, the current proposal provides greater sight distance with the new access point location and minimal need for right-of-way clearing. (For additional information concerning sight distance, please refer to page numbers 5 and 6 of Transpo's November 29, 2018 Sight Access Analysis Memorandum).

## 6. Approval for Concrete Sidewalk on One Side of Rural Roadway - 3.02(1) Concrete Sidewalks

In addition to the aforementioned design alternatives and justifications proposed within Tract G , the proposed boulevard section contains a 5 ' wide sidewalk on one side. Section 3.02(1) calls for sidewalks on both sides when provided, unless otherwise allowed by the County Road Engineer.

In an effort to support safe pedestrian use, a crosswalk that meets sight-distance requirements is proposed at the southern end of the boulevard section for those walking along the eastern shoulder, as a walking path is not provided on the eastern side of the boulevard section. The provision for a sidewalk on one side of the boulevard section is to support the effort to minimize impacts to the Martin Creek crossing and buffer.

## 7. Consideration to use Extruded Curb as shown in Figure 2-005-3.09 School Access

Section 3.09 provides specifications for surfacing standards when school access is required as part of the development approval. Since a bus stop is already located within $50^{\prime}$ of the proposed entryway for the project on NE Union Hill Road, school access improvements were not specifically required by the County or Lake Washington School District However, in order to support new students that may reside in the proposed subdivision, this project proposes to provide a safe waiting area for students along Union Hill.

From the western edge of the proposed entryway improvements for the project site, an extruded curb will be installed at the edge of the existing pavement with a $5^{\prime}$ wide crushed-surface walkway that extends $60^{\prime}$ westward. At approximately $50^{\prime}$ west of the entryway, an $8^{\prime}$ wide crosswalk will be provided at the bus stop location. The applicant asks the County Road Engineer to consider and approve the use of design standards shown in Figure 2-005 along NE Union Hill for $60^{\prime}$ in support of safe School Access. Please refer to the included Safe School Walkways Analysis exhibit to view correspondence with Lake Washington School District.

## Summary

The requested determinations and the requested variance to the 2016 KCRDCS should be approved for the reasons set forth above and because they are in the public interest. The public interest will be served by issuance of the requested determinations and variance because (1) those decisions will allow the developable portion of the subject property to be developed for single-family residential lots off the proposed private road, (2) the design alternatives provide for safe vehicle and pedestrian accesses, and (3) impacts to existing critical areas will be reduced while allowing the project to achieve safety, functionality, fire protection, appearance and maintainability of the road network.

We look forward to working with you on this project. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions, comments or concerns.

Sincerely,
EAM CONSULTING ENGINEERS, LLD.


LAURA BARTENHAGEN, PYE., IED ${ }^{\circledR}$ AP
Principal

## Enc: As Noted

cc: Buff Nelson, The Estate of Barbara J. Nelson
David Halinen, Halinen Law Offices
HEsm8lengrIESM-JOBSI135910011007/document|Letter-085.docx


MEMORANDUM

| Date: | November 29, 2018 | TG: | 1.13203.04 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| To: | The Estate of Barbara Nelson C/O Buff Nelson |  |  |
| From: | Dan McKinney, Jr. \& Kassi Leingang, PE - Transpo Group |  |  |
| cc: | Buff Nelson - Gunshy Manor |  |  |
| Subject: | Gunshy Manor Site Access Analysis |  |  |

The following memorandum summarizes the operations of the site accesses to the proposed Gunshy Manor residential development and includes an overview of the project, project traffic volumes, and traffic operations.

## Project Description

The project is located in unincorporated King County just east of the Redmond City limits and is bounded by NE Union Hill Road to the north (see Figure 1) and includes the development of up to 23 single family homes, with 3 existing homes in use being removed. Access to the 23 proposed homes is being provided via NE Union Hill Road approximately 1,000 feet east of the 196th Avenue NE/NE Union Hill Road roundabout in the northwest corner of the property. The driveway location was shifted to the west to enhance sight distances, which improves safety and reduces the amount of vegetation needing to be removed.


Figure 1 - Property Vicinity \& Location

## Traffic Volumes

The following section describes the existing and future without-project traffic volumes as well as estimates the traffic volumes associated with the proposed development.

## Existing and Future Without-Project

A 7-day, 24-hour traffic volumes were collected along NE Union Hill Road in the vicinity of the primary proposed site access in order to capture the existing traffic volume profile in July/August 2018 (see Attachment A). The weekday mid-week (Tuesday-Thursday) average traffic volumes by time of day are shown in Figure 2 below.


Figure 2 - Existing NE Union Hill Road Traffic Volume Profile
As the figure shows, the weekday peak traffic volumes occur during the AM and PM peak periods at approximately 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. The weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes at the site access intersections are discussed below.

Existing weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic counts were collected at the 196th Avenue NE/NE Union Hill Road intersection, northwest of the site in July 2018. Detailed existing traffic counts are provided in Attachment B. Future (2021) without-project traffic volumes were forecasted by applying an annual growth rate of 3 percent to existing traffic volumes.

## Future With-Project

The traffic volumes associated with the proposed development were estimated based on trip rates in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition (2017). The development is estimated to generate approximately 189 net new vehicular weekday daily trips with 15 trips occurring during the weekday AM peak hour and 20 occurring during the weekday PM peak hour.

Table 1. Estimated Weekday Vehicle Trip Generation

| Single Family Detached Housing (LU \#210) | Size | Daily Trips | AM Peak Hour Trips ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | PM Peak Hour Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Proposed | 23 DU | 227 | 4 | 13 | 17 | 14 | 9 | 23 |
| Existing | 3 DU | 38 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Net New | 20 DU | 189 | 3 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 8 | 20 |

Notes: DU= dwelling unit

1. Trip generation based on ITE Trip Generation Manual (10th Edition, 2017).

These additional trips were distributed to and from the project site based on existing vehicle travel patterns and the proposed accesses. The trips were generally distributed with approximately 65 percent to/from the west, 20 percent to/from the east or southeast, and 15 percent to/from the north. The project trip distribution for vehicle trips is shown in Figure 3. The project trip assignment to each access is illustrated in Figure 3.


Figure 3 - Project Trip Distribution and Assignment and Future With-Project Traffic Volumes

The assigned project generated traffic was added to the future without-project weekday peak hour traffic volumes at the site access intersections. The resulting future (2021) with-project peak hour traffic volumes are shown in Figure 3.

## Traffic Operations

The following section evaluates the operations of the site access intersections. The level of service of both accesses was evaluated. Additionally, the effective vehicle capacity was completed at the NE Union Hill Road site access.

## Level of Service Analysis

The operational characteristics of an intersection are determined by calculating the intersection level of service (LOS). At unsignalized side-street, stop-controlled intersections, LOS is measured by the average delay on the worst-movement of the intersection. Traffic operations and average vehicle delay for an intersection can be described qualitatively with a range of levels of service (LOS A through LOS F), with LOS A indicating free-flowing traffic and LOS F indicating extreme congestion and long vehicle delays. Appendix B contains a detailed explanation of LOS criteria and definitions.

Weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic operations with the development of the project were evaluated at the site access intersections based on the procedures identified in the Highway Capacity Manual (2010) and were evaluated using Synchro 9.1. Synchro 9.1 is a software program that uses HCM methodology to evaluate intersection LOS and average vehicle delays. Detailed LOS worksheets for both site access intersections are included in Attachment C. The weekday AM and PM peak hour operations at the site accesses are summarized in Table 1.

Table 2. Future (2021) With-Project Weekday AM and PM Peak Hour Intersection LOS Summary

| Intersection | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS ${ }^{1}$ | Delay ${ }^{2}$ | WM ${ }^{3}$ | LOS | Delay | WM |
| 1. Site Access/NE Union Hill Road | C | 21 | NB | D | 33 | NB |

Level of Service (A F F) as defined by the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), Transportation Research Board.
Average delay per vehicle in seconds.
Worst movement reported for unsignalized two-way stop controlled intersections.
The primary site access along NE Union Hill Road is forecast to operate at LOS C and LOS D during the weekday AM and PM peak hours respectively with queues estimated to be up to 1 vehicle.

## Effective Vehicle Capacity

In order to verify the LOS D or better operations determined in the LOS analysis above at the site access along NE Union Hill Road, the effective vehicle capacity was also evaluated.
A combination of three factors go into calculating the effective vehicle capacity: the number of gaps ${ }^{1}$ between vehicles, the headway ${ }^{2}$ between vehicles as reflected by the length of time for the observed gaps, and observed courteous driver behavior. The consideration of these three factors is referred to as the effective vehicle capacity.

Data was collected for one week in July/August 2018 along NE Union Hill Road to determine the available vehicle capacity to accommodate vehicles exiting the project site (northbound right and northbound left movements from the site onto NE Union Hill Road). The amount of time required for a vehicle to turn out of the site driveway onto NE Union Hill Road was estimated based on the critical headway calculation per Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2010, Transportation Research

[^0]Board. ${ }^{3}$ The time was estimated to be approximately 6 seconds for both the northbound left-turn and northbound right-turn movements.

The data was collected in various second intervals (e.g. 0 to 0.5 seconds, 0.5 to 1 second, 1 to 2 seconds, 2 to 4 seconds, 4 to 8 seconds, etc.). The number of gaps of 8 seconds or more were utilized for the analysis for both the northbound left-turn and northbound right-turn movements discussed below. The gaps and total time calculations are shown in Attachment D. ${ }^{4}$

- Northbound Right-Turn: The average minimum number of gaps during the AM peak period was 21 gaps during a $15-$ minute period. During the PM peak period ( 4 p.m. to 6 p.m.) the minimum number of gaps was 15 gaps during a 15 -minute period.
- Northbound Left-Turn: The average minimum number of gaps during the AM peak period was 25 gaps during a $15-$ minute period. During the PM peak period ( 4 p.m. to 6 p.m.) the minimum number of gaps was 12 gaps during a 15 -minute period.

As shown in Figure 3 above, the exiting volumes (i.e the northbound left and right-turn movements) are 13 and 9 vehicles during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The gap analysis showed there are greater than 20 gaps every 15 minutes for both movements during the AM peak period and 12 or more gaps every 15 minutes for both movements during the PM peak period, both of which exceed the number of project trips in the respective time periods. Therefore, there is sufficient vehicle capacity along NE Union Hill Road to accommodate the anticipated peak hour vehicles exiting the site during the $A M$ and $P M$ peak hours.

## Sight Distance Evaluation

Sight distance was evaluated at the proposed Gunshy Manor driveways consistent with King County sight distance standards ${ }^{5}$.

The 2012 Arterial Functional Class Unincorporated King County map classifies NE Union Hill Road as a minor arterial roadway. Per Section 2.02 of the King County Road Design and Construction Standards (2016), the design speed of a minor arterial roadway is the posted speed plus 10 mph . In view of NE Union Hill Road's posted speed limit of 35 mph east of 196th Avenue NE, NE Union Hill Road's design speed is 45 mph .

Stopping sight distance is the distance needed for a vehicle to safely stop. Based on the design speed of 45 mph along NE Union Hill Road and the road's 9 percent downward grade, the required stopping sight distance for westbound traffic on NE Union Hill Road is 430 feet per King County Road Design and Construction Standards (2016). For eastbound traffic, the required minimum stopping sight distance is 360 feet based on the design speed and the relatively flat roadway grade, which is less than 3 percent. The required stopping sight distance triangles east and west of the proposed driveway are shown in Attachments E and F, respectively. As shown in the attachments, the required stopping sight distance is met.

Entering sight distance is the distance needed for vehicles to not disrupt ${ }^{6}$ the traffic flow of the main roadway, rather than a distance for safety purposes (i.e. stopping sight distance). The recommended entering sight distance per King County Road Design and Construction Standards (2016), is 500 feet for both eastbound and westbound traffic based on a design speed of 45 mph . The recommended entering sight distance triangles east and west of the proposed driveway are shown in Attachments E and F, respectively.
${ }^{3}$ HCM 2010 Section 19, equation 19-30.
${ }^{4}$ The calculations were based on the mid-week data (Tuesday-Thursday) for the minimum gaps and max time of gaps that were too small for vehicles to exit the site onto NE Union Hill Road.
${ }^{5}$ Per King County Road Design and Construction Standards - 2016.
${ }^{6}$ Disrupt as defined per AASHTO means that "most major-road drivers should not need to reduce speed to less than 70 percent of their initial speed." (A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 6th Edition)

The recommended entering sight distance west of the proposed driveway is met (see Attachment F). East of the driveway, the entering sight distance is currently obstructed by some vegetation and existing trees that are located within the right-of-way (see Attachment E). Attachment E highlights the location of trees near the curve. The developer will work with the County to remove necessary trees and clear underbrush or vegetation in the right-of-way to achieve adequate sight distance. Prior approval was granted by King County under GRDE160105 , which allowed significantly more clearing than is now proposed.

## Intersection Spacing

The proposed access along NE Union Hill Road was analyzed relative to intersection spacing per King County Road Design and Construction Standards - 2016. Per King County Road Standards, intersection spacing is set for the highest classification of street involved, which for these intersections is NE Union Hill Road (a minor arterial), resulting in a recommended spacing of 500 feet between intersections. This is intended for public street connections with higher volumes. The proposed private access is located approximately 180 feet west of 199th Avenue NE. Both 199th Avenue NE and the proposed access are private roads intersecting NE Union Hill Road.

As both accesses are private roads, the minimum roadway spacing requirements noted in the standards are not applicable. ${ }^{8}$ The intersection spacing is a result of providing improved sight distance east of the proposed driveway along NE Union Hill Road. The private road of 199th Avenue NE serves 7 single family homes and up to 25 homes via the proposed access. Low volumes are forecast at both of the proposed accesses with up to 21 trips during the weekday PM peak hour at the proposed access as shown above and approximately 7 trips ${ }^{9}$ during the weekday PM peak hour at the 199th Avenue NE access. The two private roads provide access to single family homes with low volumes of traffic and the 180 feet between the driveways will be sufficient.

## Summary

The Gunshy Manor residential development is located in unincorporated King County just east of the Redmond City limits and is bounded by NE Union Hill Road to the north and includes the development of up to 23 single family homes and removal of up to 3 existing single family homes. Access to the site is proposed along NE Union Hill Road. The development is estimated to generate approximately 189 net new vehicular weekday daily trips with 15 trips occurring during the weekday AM peak hour and 20 occurring during the weekday PM peak hour. The primary site access along NE Union Hill Road is forecast to operate at LOS C and LOS D during the weekday AM and PM peak hours respectively with queues estimated to be up to 1 vehicle. A gap analysis was performed and verified NE Union Hill Road has the capacity to accommodate the additional project trips.

[^1]
## Attachment A: 24-Hour Traffic Counts

| － | \％tt | \％9S | － | \％tt | \％9G | － | \％tt | \％9G | － | \％St | \％GS | － | \％カt | \％9S | － | \％9t | \％tG | － | \％97 | \％カG |  | \％tt | \％9G | риәэлә |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TZL＇ZT | †E9＇S | L80＇L | tSS＇Z | LZS＇S | LZO＇L | ヤヤ8＇Zて | 6L9＇S | S9T＇L | S9L＇ZI | L69＇S | 890＇L | عLI＇ZI | 90t＇S | 29L＇9 | 6IE＇L | LもE＇$\varepsilon$ | ZL6＇E | tS8＇8 | 60I＇t | StL＇t | t6Z＇ZI | Ett＇s | TS8＇9 | ［101 |
| 98 | LI | 69 | $\angle 8$ | OT | LL | S8 | 乙乙 | $\varepsilon 9$ | $\angle 8$ | 02 | $\angle 9$ | 62 | 9T | $\varepsilon 9$ | ZL | 七て | 8t | โદโ | St | 98 | 6IT | โ $\varepsilon$ | 88 | Wd 00：It |
| 891 | $\tau$ | $92 T$ | 191 | $\bigcirc \varepsilon$ | $92 T$ | ZLI | St | LZT | 0＜T | tt | $92 T$ | $99 \tau$ | 切 | 乙てT | でT | $\varepsilon t$ | 66 | 062 | 6 ［1 | T＜T | 9 9て | $6 \downarrow$ | L91 | Wd 00：0t |
| SLZ | TL | †02 | てヵて | 89 | † LT | 662 | 18 | 872 | S82 | t9 | IZ乙 | L8\％ | ع8 | †0Z | S92 | 乙6 | $\varepsilon \angle \tau$ | ¢TE | OZT | S6T | ع6乙 | $\varepsilon 6$ | 002 | Wd 00：6 |
| โ $\downarrow$ | IZT | OTE | S8E | 80T | LLZ | LLD | 8ZT | $6 \downarrow$ ¢ | 0 Ot | LZT | ع0ع | $97 \downarrow$ | \＆ટT | $\varepsilon 6 乙$ | 608 | ع0T | 902 |  | t91 | Stz | 08t | Lعโ | $\varepsilon \downarrow \varepsilon$ | Wd 00：8 |
| Sc9 | TLT | ャ8t | 665 | ャ9 | set | IZL | 691 | ZSS | 979 | 08T | $99 \downarrow$ | 67 S | TST | 86\＆ | $8 \downarrow \varepsilon$ | StI | દદ乙 | Stt | 002 | Stz | TLS | L8T | ヤ8¢ | Wd 00： 2 |
| 8T0＇し | દદ乙 | ヤ8L | 600＇$\tau$ | 七て乙 | S8L | LL6 | $\downarrow$ ャ乙 | EtL | L90＇t | てぃて | sz8 | てャ6 | 002 | てtL | $\angle t \square$ | T9T | 982 | 997 | T8T | S82 | 298 | L82 | GLG | Wd 00：9 |
| $88^{\prime}$＇$\downarrow$ | ع6乙 | S90＇L | 七ऽE＇ป | 0T\＆ | カャO＇L | 0＜E＇ป | ヤ0¢ | 990＇t | OSE＇亡 | 992 | ヤ80＇โ | $61 \varepsilon^{\prime}$ L | ャSZ | S90＇L | 9TS | S6T | โ乙દ | 28S | 627 | $\varepsilon \varsigma \varepsilon$ | 90T＇โ | 9 S | OS8 | Wd 00：s |
| \＆9て＇し | 692 | ャ66 | z9Z＇L | 292 | 000＇โ | てもでし | \＆ऽ乙 | 686 | S8て＇L | 262 | $\varepsilon 66$ |  | てヵて | 106 | ヤLS | 9 9Z | $8 \downarrow \varepsilon$ | で9 | ILZ | TLE | ع9I＇t | 682 | †L8 | Wd 00：t |
| LL6 | 662 | $6 \angle 9$ | 820＇โ | દટદ | SOL | 496 | 162 | $9 \angle 9$ | Lع6 | て8乙 | Sc9 | てZ6 | 982 | Lع9 | †てG | \＆て乙 | น0ع | EtL | S62 | $8 \pm \square$ | GZO＇โ | L92 | 8GL | Wd 00：$\varepsilon$ |
| 20L | \＆ร乙 | $6 \square \square$ | LTL | とャ乙 | $\nabla \angle\rangle$ | 689 | ャ¢ | ¢ $¢$ | 002 | T92 | $68 t$ | T92 | 082 | 18t | 089 | $6 ャ て$ | โยะ | †0L | $9 \angle 乙$ | 8ても | TLL | 692 | ZOG | Wd 00：z |
| 689 | S SL | ¢98 | 979 | 892 | $8 \downarrow \varepsilon$ | ¢99 | て8乙 | $\varepsilon 8 \varepsilon$ | Lع9 | ヤLて | $\varepsilon 9 \varepsilon$ | てて9 | L92 | ¢¢ะ | 6 ¢9 | 992 | ๕ऽะ | 969 | 662 | L6E | 202 | L6乙 | SOt | Wd 00：I |
| $0<9$ | $\dagger$ ¢ | $9 \mathrm{~S} \mathrm{\varepsilon}$ | 089 | 9 9¢ | $\downarrow$ ¢ | $6 \mathrm{S9}$ | ¢t¢ | $\dagger \square \varepsilon$ | $0<9$ | T0\＆ | $69 \varepsilon$ | ¢ ¢9 | $6 \angle 乙$ | $9 \mathrm{9} \varepsilon$ | S89 | ャ9¢ | นてع | L＜9 | $80 \varepsilon$ | $69 \varepsilon$ | 999 | 892 | $86 \varepsilon$ | Wd 00： $2 \tau$ |
| 859 | てદย | S8Z | 209 | $\varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ | 682 | 989 | Lย์ | 662 | St9 | $\angle \downarrow \varepsilon$ | 892 | L19 | L८६ | $06 乙$ | ¢ ¢9 | て0ع | દદદ | TS9 | 0८\＆ | เ乙ะ | $\angle 99$ | $\varepsilon \downarrow \varepsilon$ | ャてદ | W＊00：IT |
| 859 | $88 \varepsilon$ | 0८乙 | LZ9 | โ6ะ | $98 乙$ | โT9 | 08¢ | โદ乙 | St9 | て6£ | દટ乙 | 0 ¢9 | ع0t | LZZ | 987 | 062 | $96 \tau$ | ع＜9 | LSE | 9โع | 989 | $88 \varepsilon$ | $8 \downarrow$ て | W $\forall$ 00：0t |
| OLL | SSS | カtて | ع $\llcorner\llcorner$ | OTS | \＆ટ乙 | †LL | L9G | LOZ | 208 | 689 | ยเ乙 | 902 | S6t | ItZ | OZヤ | $0<Z$ | OST | StS | ヤ८\＆ | It乙 | カTL | EOG | ILZ | W $\forall$ 00：6 |
| S86 | 882 | L6T | $9 \angle 6$ | 882 | 88T | LOO＇T | 208 | SOZ | ZL6 | SLL | L6I | โع6 | ELL | 8ST | 982 | T8T | SOT | $\downarrow$ ¢ $\varepsilon$ | $\varepsilon \varepsilon 乙$ | โZT | $\varepsilon 68$ | LL9 | 9 92 | W $\forall 00: 8$ |
| 682 | T¢9 | 8\＆ | 692 | 979 | $\varepsilon \dagger \tau$ | 162 | $\tau 99$ | 0¢โ | 208 | $\angle 99$ | $0 \downarrow \tau$ | 972 | ＜t9 | 62T | $\angle \downarrow \tau$ | $00 \pm$ | $\angle t$ | โย乙 | \＆9โ | 89 | OZL | 6LS |  | W $\forall 00: 2$ |
| 6 6t | 998 | $\varepsilon L$ | †St | SLE | 62 | LIt | $97 \varepsilon$ | TL | 9 tt | LLE | 69 | ヤてヤ | LSE | $\angle 9$ | 02 | OS | OZ | 601 | SL | $\downarrow \varepsilon$ | ヤても | $0 \downarrow \varepsilon$ | ャ8 | W甘 00：9 |
| ¢ $¢$ | TZT | ¢T | $6 \tau \tau$ | ย0т | $9 \tau$ | $8 \downarrow \tau$ | 6 6T | $6 \tau$ | $6 \varepsilon \tau$ | 0¢โ | 6 | OヵT | ¢ZT | SI | $\varepsilon \varepsilon$ | てZ | ¢ | ts | LE | $\dagger \tau$ | ちてT | $80 \tau$ | 9T | WV 00：G |
| 97 | てt | $\varepsilon$ | $\varepsilon t$ | てt | I | 87 | $\varepsilon t$ | S | 97 | てt | $\dagger$ | $\varepsilon$ ¢ | OS | $\varepsilon$ | 6T | LT | 乙 | 乙乙 | 8T | † | $0 t$ | $\downarrow \varepsilon$ | 9 | W $\forall 00$ ： |
| $\angle \tau$ | † | $\varepsilon$ | $6 \tau$ | $9 \tau$ | $\varepsilon$ | IZ | SI | 9 | TI | OT | I | U | $L$ | † | LT | 6 | 8 | $9 \tau$ | 6 | $L$ | SI | てT | $\varepsilon$ | W $\forall 00: \varepsilon$ |
| $\varepsilon \tau$ | $L$ | 9 | 七T | 9 | 8 | SI | 8 | $L$ | OT | 9 | † | SI | 8 | L | 6T | OT | 6 | ¢Z | IT | ャT | ャT | 6 | G | W $\forall 00: 乙$ |
| ヵ | † | OT | 乙乙 | G | $\angle T$ | OT | $\varepsilon$ | $L$ | OT | G | G | $\angle Z$ | IT | 9T | 97 | てT | $\downarrow \varepsilon$ | $\varepsilon t$ | ST | 82 | 02 | 8 | ZT | W＊00：$\tau$ |
| $9 \varepsilon$ | 8 | LZ | $9 \varepsilon$ | IT | SZ | Et | OT | $\varepsilon \varepsilon$ | 82 | † | 七乙 | て£ | 6 | $\varepsilon 乙$ | 09 | $\varepsilon 乙$ | LE | $\angle 9$ | $\varepsilon 乙$ | 切 | £G | 乙T | 切 | W $\forall$ 00： $2 \tau$ |
| 1ełO1 | 9M | $8 \exists$ | 1¢łO1 | 9M | 93 | 「10¢01 | 9M | 89 | 1elol | 9M | 93 | 「101 | 9M | 93 | 「セ¢01 | 9M | 9 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 「セı01 | 9M | 83 | 「セı01 | 9M | 89 | әш！1 |
| әбеләлヲ уәәМ－p！W |  |  | 8T0ZIZI8 |  |  | 8TOZ／T／8 |  |  | 8TOZ／TE／L |  |  | 8LOZ／0E／L |  |  | 8LOZ／6ZIL |  |  | 8T0Z／8ZIL |  |  | 8TOZILZIL |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Keps．nप1 |  |  | KерsəupəМ |  |  | Kepsan」 |  |  | Kepuow |  |  | Kepuns |  |  | Kep．nıes |  |  | Kер！」」 |  |  |  |

## Attachment B: Existing Peak Hour Traffic Counts

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $t$ | $\tau$ | 0 | $\tau$ | 2 | $\angle z$ | 6 | $\tau$ | $\varepsilon$ | †t | 1noH yeәd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | $\tau$ | 0 | I | † | St | 02 | I | $\varepsilon$ | I2 | relol funos |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | G | † | 0 | 0 | I | Wd St：${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\tau$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | z | $\varepsilon$ | 乙 | 0 | 0 | I | Wd 0¢： |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\tau$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\tau$ | Wd St： |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | G | 0 | 0 | $\varepsilon$ | Wd 00：s |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\tau$ | 0 | 0 | I | I | 9 | 乙 | 0 | 0 | † | Wd st：${ }_{\text {t }}$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ป | $t$ | て | 0 | I | I | Wd 0 ¢ ${ }_{\text {t }}$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | I | I | I | s | Wd St： t |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | I | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | $t$ | 0 | I | $t$ | Wd 00：t |
| ｜ełol | yınos | Ypon | 15 M | 15 Sa | ｜eło」 | gS | 9N | gM | $9 \exists$ | ｜elo | gS | QN | 9M | 93 | Hers релаәии |
| （6ə7 6u！ssorj）sue！usapad |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | speıоп әр！чәл Клеән |  |  |  |  |  |


| Interval Start | NE UNION HILL RD |  |  |  | NE UNION HILL RD |  |  |  | 196TH AVE NE |  |  |  | 196TH AVE NE |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 15-min } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4：00 PM | 0 | 215 | 204 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 63 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 70 | 606 | 0 |
| 4：15 PM | 0 | 174 | 228 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 55 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 53 | 566 | 0 |
| 4：30 PM | 0 | 151 | 258 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 54 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 52 | 560 | 0 |
| 4：45 PM | 0 | 160 | 242 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 55 | 21 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 43 | 555 | 2，287 |
| 5：00 PM | 0 | 159 | 230 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 53 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 43 | 536 | 2，217 |
| 5：15 PM | 0 | 157 | 261 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 50 | 592 | 2，243 |
| 5：30 PM | 0 | 152 | 214 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 55 | 526 | 2，209 |
| 5：45 PM | 0 | 132 | 242 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 49 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 48 | 530 | 2，184 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1，300 | 1，879 | 12 | 3 | 6 | 434 | 132 | 0 | 8 | 40 | 4 | 0 | 239 | 0 | 414 | 4，471 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 700 | 932 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 227 | 67 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 218 | 2，287 | 0 |

Two－Hour Count Summaries


|  | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \stackrel{0}{0} \\ 0 \\ \underline{y} \\ \stackrel{1}{2} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{array}\right\|$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\widetilde{\omega}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega}$ |  |  |  |
| － | $\vdash$ |  | $\circ \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \vdash 00$ |  |
| $\sim$ | $\underset{\sim}{\omega}$ | $\circ$ | $\nu \circ \vee \vdash \vdash \perp \omega$ |  |
| $\cdots$ | $\bigcirc$ | N | $こ \begin{aligned} & \text { a } \\ & \text { a }\end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{-1}{\stackrel{-1}{2}}$ |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{+}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ }$ | $\stackrel{+}{+}$ | 0000000 | 畋 |
| 0 | $v$ | － | $0000 \vdash N N O$ | ¢ |
| － | $\bigcirc$ | － | 0000000 | 㳦 |
| $\stackrel{ }{ }$ | $\stackrel{ }{-}$ | － | $\bigcirc \bigcirc 00000$ | \％ |
| $N$ | $v$ | $\sim$ | 0 N | $\stackrel{-1}{2}$ |
| 0 | － | － | 0000000 | 0 |
| － | or | － | －○ ○ ト |  |
| － | 0 | － | $0000$ |  |
| － | $\bigcirc$ |  | $000$ |  |
| 0 | a | － | $000 \cdots \cdots \cdots$ | $\stackrel{-1}{2}$ |


| Interval Start | NE UNION HILL RD |  |  |  | NE UNION HILL RD |  |  |  | 196TH AVE NE |  |  |  | 196TH AVE NE |  |  |  | 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 | 14 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 138 | 332 | 0 |
| 7：15 AM | 0 | 31 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 176 | 394 | 0 |
| 7：30 AM | 1 | 22 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 148 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 199 | 425 | 0 |
| 7：45 AM | 0 | 21 | 37 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 172 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 198 | 460 | 1，611 |
| 8：00 AM | 0 | 21 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 141 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 202 | 423 | 1，702 |
| 8：15 AM | 0 | 22 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 227 | 445 | 1，753 |
| 8：30 AM | 0 | 22 | 37 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 25 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 233 | 538 | 1，866 |
| 8：45 AM | 2 | 43 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 210 | 28 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 239 | 587 | 1，993 |
| Count Total | 3 | 196 | 263 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 1，268 | 141 | 0 | 12 | 29 | 6 | 0 | 55 | 7 | 1，612 | 3，604 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 2 | 108 | 142 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 680 | 81 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 6 | 0 | 31 | 4 | 901 | 1，993 | 0 |

soluemuns łunos $1 \mathrm{InOH}^{-0 M 1}$


## Attachment C: LOS Worksheets

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 195 | 3 | 1 | 830 | 10 | 3 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 195 | 3 | 1 | 830 | 10 | 3 |
| 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 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 9 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 229 | 4 | 1 | 976 | 12 | 4 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 233 | 0 | 1210 | 231 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 231 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 979 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 4.11 | - | 6.4 | 6.2 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.4 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.4 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | 2.209 | - | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1340 | - | 204 | 813 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 812 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 367 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1340 | - | 204 | 813 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 204 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 812 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 366 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 0 |  | 20.5 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 247 | - | - | 1340 | Wr |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.062 | - |  | 0.001 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 20.5 | - | - | 7.7 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | C | - | - | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.2 | - | - | 0 | - |


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


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 1214 | 0 | 1565 | 1208 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | . | - | 1208 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 357 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 4.11 | - | 6.4 | 6.2 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.4 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.4 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | 2.209 | - | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 578 | - | 124 | 225 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 286 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 713 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 578 | - | 123 | 225 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 123 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 286 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 709 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 0.1 |  | 33.2 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | D |  |
| HCMLOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 137 | - | - | 578 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.07 | - | - | 0.006 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 33.2 | - | - | 11.3 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | D | - | - | B | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.2 | - | - | 0 | - |

## Attachment D: Gap Analysis

NORTHBOUND LEFT - uses the combined gap data as it crosses both the eastbound and westbound approaches


NORTHBOUND RIGHT - uses the eastbound gap data as it enters only the eastbound approach

| Time | Tuesday, July 31, 2018 |  | Wednesday, August 1, 2018 |  | Thursday, August 2, 2018 | Minimum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0700 |  | 22 |  | 14 | 20 | 14 |
| 0715 |  | 26 |  | 23 | 16 | 16 |
| 0730 |  | 22 |  | 27 | 22 | 22 |
| 0745 |  | 19 |  | 22 | 24 | 19 |
| 0800 |  | 20 |  | 27 | 24 | 20 |
| 0815 |  | 26 |  | 24 | 26 | 24 |
| 0830 |  | 23 |  | 30 | 23 | 23 |
| 0845 |  | 26 |  | 27 | 27 | 26 |
| Minimum |  | 19 |  | 14 | 16 | 21 |
| 1600 |  | 22 |  | 25 | 21 | 21 |
| 1615 |  | 26 |  | 22 | 16 | 16 |
| 1630 |  | 14 |  | 14 | 24 | 14 |
| 1645 |  | 21 |  | 22 | 19 | 19 |
| 1700 |  | 15 |  | 18 | 7 | 7 |
| 1715 |  | 20 |  | 16 | 21 | 16 |
| 1730 |  | 12 |  | 11 | 21 | 11 |
| 1745 |  | 13 |  | 18 | 19 | 13 |
| Minimum |  | 12 |  | 11 | 7 | 15 |





Sight Distance East of Proposed NE Union Hill Rd Driveway attachment


Sight Distance West of Proposed NE Union Hill Rd Driveway

## GUNSHY MANOR
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|  | LEGEND |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ＊ | wetano fag | － | Power pole w／orop LINE |
|  | 。 | воLlard | \％ | Power Pole W／LLGHT |
|  | 0 | Nant | $\bigcirc$ | Power Pole |
| Tano | － | soll 106 | $\bigcirc$ | poner Pole W／Transforner |
|  | － | wropmaton sicn | 区 | telephone junctov box（UG） |
|  | 4 | Street Trafgic sin | $\bigcirc$ | Telermone pole |
|  | $0^{\text {cos }}$ | Santray sewer clean out | Q | free hroant |
|  | ［1］ | storm doan catch masm | － | Hose big |
|  | $0^{\circ}$ | storn dran clean out | 田 | vater meter |
|  | H | storm pre mlet／Outlet | $\infty$ | vater valve |
|  | © | Storm dran manhole | ＊ | WTIER well |
| Soubiemine |  | roof dran | － | found reatr \＆cap |
|  | m | yaro dran |  | creek or stream cenitraline |
|  |  | Yaro loht（nneer 10．Tall） | － | 100－varar flood plan |
|  | © | Gas Stug marker post |  | FENCE，BARB－WIRE |
| RITICAL AREA BUFFER97．36＇｜｜E $33.93^{\prime}$ | － | Gut Anctor | － | FENCE，Chanv－link |
|  | 0 | Elecrical conout risers | － | fence hoc wre |
| ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | ${ }^{\otimes}$ | Electrocal metrer | － | power，overheap |
|  |  | Power Pole w／rop line \＆transfoner |  | STORM DRAINAGE |
|  |  |  | Wilu | WELLMNS |
|  |  |  |  | 1997H |
|  |  | PARC | 6 | I AVE |





|  |
| :---: |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |






[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ For this study, a gap is defined as the space between two vehicles.
    ${ }^{2}$ Headway is defined as the time between two successive vehicles as they pass a point on the roadway measured from the same common feature of both vehicles (for example from the front bumper).

[^1]:    ${ }^{8}$ Per King County Road Design and Construction Standards - 2016: Section 2.06 G8- Private Roads "Not needed as public roads to meet the minimum road spacing requirements of these Standards".
    ${ }^{9}$ The trip generation was estimated based on ITE's Trip Generation Manual (10th Edition, 2017) for Single Family Detached Housing (LU \# 210), consistent with the proposed development.

