# ENUMCLAW RECYCLE CENTER <br> TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS 

King County, WA



Prepared for: Ron Shear<br>BRC<br>PO Box 2330<br>Buckley, WA 98321

Revised
April 2018

Subject: Revisions to Buckley Recycle Enumclaw Traffic Impact Analysis

This letter is in response to the memo from King County dated February 9, 2018 regarding the TIA for the Buckley Recycle Enumclaw project. The following addresses each comment.

1. Analysis of the SR-169 \& Enumclaw Franklin Road SE and SR-169 \& SE 385th Street/ SE 383rd Street intersections is now included in the revised TIA.
2. The above intersections were included in LOS and queuing analysis in the revised TIA.
3. The site will operate similar to the studied facility in Auburn. Two additional counts were performed at the Auburn location and less trips than the original January 1, 2015 PM peak hour count were observed. A similar site in Maple Valley was also counted and was found to have less trips.
4. See above comment and section 4.1 of the revised TIA.
5. See comment 3.
6. An AM peak hour count was performed at SR-169 \& Enumclaw Franklin Road SE. The AM peak hour was found to be 43 percent less the PM peak hour count at this intersection and was therefore not analyzed.
7. See section 3.7 of the revised TIA.
8. Comment acknowledged.

Please call if you require anything further.

Sincerely,

Gregary B. Heath, P.E.
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# ENUMCLAW RECYCLE CENTER <br> TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS 

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The main goals of this study focus on the assessment of existing roadway conditions and forecasts of newly generated project traffic. The first task includes the collection of general roadway information, road improvement information, entering sight distance data, and current delays. Forecasts of future traffic and dispersion patterns on the street system are then determined using established trip generation and distribution techniques. Next, future traffic delays are calculated and significant impacts, if any, are identified. As a final step, appropriate conclusions and mitigation measures are defined if needed.

## 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project will turn 102.9 acres of undeveloped land into a material processing facility in Unincorporated King County on parcel numbers 3621069-004, -013, -014. On site will be primarily a material holding area with provisions for an office trailer and equipment maintenance building. Plans are for the site to operate 7 AM to 5 PM seven days a week (with the opening time on Sundays being a bit later). The site has property on both sides of Enumclaw Franklin Road SE, just north of the SE 384th Street intersection. Primary access will be located on the northwestern portion of the property. A second driveway on the southeastern end will be used for office access. There is also an easement access road on the southwest end of the property. Surrounding the site is sparsely residential land uses. Buildout of the project is expected by 2018, which was used as a horizon analysis year. Figure 1 on the following page shows the general site location and surrounding arterial network. A site plan outlining the overall lot configuration and internal roadway is shown in Figure 2.

## 3. EXISTING CONDITIONS

### 3.1 Surrounding Roadway System

The site is primarily served by Enumclaw Franklin Road SE, which is a north-south, two lane collector arterial that will provide access to the project. The speed limit is posted at 45 mph . Paving is asphalt and lane widths are approximately 11 feet. Shoulders are grass/gravel and approximately 4 feet in width or wider. The roadway appears to meet the King County Road Design and Construction Standards for a low volume collector arterial. Some shoulder repair work might be required to accommodate the county requirement.



### 3.2 Existing Peak Hour Volumes

Field data for this study was collected in June of 2016 and August of 2017. The traffic counts were taken during the evening peak period between the hours of 4 PM and 6 PM. This specific peak period is targeted for analysis purposes since it generally represents a worst-case scenario for commercial developments with respect to traffic congestion. This busiest time of the day is primarily due to the common 8 AM to 5 PM work schedule and the greater number of recreation and shopping trips associated with the early evening period. Drivers often travel home after work at approximately the same time of day, typically between 5 PM and 6 PM , which translates to a natural peak in intersection and arterial traffic loads. Figure 3, on the following page, shows the evening peak hour count taken at 264th Avenue SE \& SE 385th Street/SE383rd Street, Enumclaw Franklin Road SE \& 264th Avenue SE, and Enumclaw Franklin Road SE \& SE 384th Street. Count data can be found in the appendix.

An AM peak hour count was also performed at the Enumclaw Franklin Road SE \& 264th Avenue SE intersection during the 7 AM to 9 AM peak period in April of 2018. The AM peak hour of travel was found to support about 43 percent less traffic compared to the PM peak hour and was therefore not analyzed. The AM peak period count can be found in the appendix for reference.

### 3.3 Level of Service

Existing peak hour delays were determined through the use of the Highway Capacity Manual. Capacity analysis is used to determine level of service (LOS) which is an established measure of congestion for transportation facilities. LOS is defined for a variety of facilities including intersections, freeways, arterials, etc. A complete definition of level of service and related criteria can be found in the HCM.

The methodology for determining the LOS at unsignalized intersections strives to determine the potential capacities for the various vehicle movements and ultimately determines the average total delay for each movement. Potential Capacity represents the number of additional vehicles that could effectively utilize a particular movement, which is essentially the equivalent of the difference between the movement capacity and the existing movement volume. Total delay is described as the elapsed time from when a vehicle stops at the end of a queue until the vehicle departs from the stop line. Average total delay is simply the mean total delay over the entire stream. A number of factors influence potential capacity and total delay including the availability/usefulness of gaps.


The range for intersection level of service is LOS A to LOS F with the former indicating the best operating conditions with low control delays and the latter indicating the worst conditions with heavy control delays. Existing LOS is shown below in Table 1. This analysis involved the Synchro program which is based on the Highway Capacity Manual. Refer to the HCM for unsignalized intersection analysis procedures.

TABLE 1
Existing Level of Service
Delays given in seconds per vehicle

| Intersection | Control | Approach | LOS | Delay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br> SE 385th St/SE 383rd St | TWSC | Westbound | C | 16.1 |
|  |  | Southbound LT | A | 8.0 |
|  |  | Northbound LT | A | 9.7 |
|  <br> Enumclaw Franklin Rd SE | TWSC | Westbound | D | 25.9 |
|  |  | Southbound LT | A | 8.2 |
|  <br> Enumclaw Franklin Rd SE | TWSC | Westbound | A | 8.7 |
|  |  | Southbound LT | A | 7.3 |

(TWSC: Two-Way Stop-Controlled)

### 3.4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Traffic

Observations for pedestrian and bicycle activity were made in the vicinity of the project during site visits. Given the nature of the area, there is currently little to no pedestrian traffic. No conflicts between motorist and non-motorist traffic are expected.

### 3.5 Public Transit

A review of the Metro Transit regional bus schedule indicates that transit service is not provided directly to the project. Material processing facilities would not be uses typically associated with any transit use.

### 3.6 Sight Distance at Project Access

The proposed site will have two entrance driveways across from each other onto Enumclaw Franklin Road SE. Assessments of the driveways were made to establish whether sufficient entering sight distance is available. Sight distance requirements were from the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards show that for the 55 mph design speed ( $45 \mathrm{mph}+10 \mathrm{mph}$ ) on Enumclaw Franklin Road SE, 610 feet of ESD is required. Initial field measurements show that sight distance requirements should be met with frontage clearing. The consistent road grade does not impair sight distance. Sight distance should be verified at the time of building permits.

### 3.7 Accident Data

Crash data was provided by WSDOT from 2015 to 2017 for the road segments of:

383rd St from SR-169 to Enumclaw Franklin Road - no reported crashes.
Enumclaw Franklin Road from SR-169 to 380th St - no reported crashes.
SR-169 from Enumclaw Franklin Road to 383rd St - 8 crashes.

Five of the eight crashes were rear-end accidents, which are typically attributed to driver inattentiveness.

## 4. FUTURE TRAFFIC DEMAND

### 4.1 Trip Generation

Trip generation is used to determine the magnitude of project impacts on the surrounding street system. Typically, the Institute of Transportation Engineer's publication Trip Generation, 9th Edition would be used. With the proposed material processing facility use on site, there is not a good land use fit found in ITE data.

To determine suitable trip generation rates, a trip generation count was performed at a similar Buckley Recycle Center in King County. The access count was performed at 28225 W Valley Highway in Auburn, Washington. This center is in use and functions as the proposed material processing facility is expected to. The count was performed from 3 PM to 5:15 PM in order to capture all PM peak traffic with the material processing facility closing at 5 PM .

Table 2, reports the findings of the access study showing the average PM peak hour trips a Buckley/Enumclaw Recycle Center can be expected to support. Daily traffic volumes (AWDT) were determined based on discussions with owner as to the number of transactions that occur on an average day. Large trucks are expected to make up roughly 20 percent of project traffic.

These numbers should be considered conservative. Three additional trip generation counts were performed. One 4 PM to 6 PM count was performed at Pacific Topsoils located at 21700 SE Lake Francis Road SE in Maple Valley. The PM peak hour had 6 total trips. Two additional counts were performed at the Buckley Recycle Center - Auburn mentioned above. The two PM peak hour counts had 16 trips and 19 trips.

TABLE 2
Project Trip Generation

| Time Period | $\frac{\text { Volume }}{}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| AWDT (est) | 164 vpd |
| PM Peak Enter | 10 vph |
| PM Peak Exit | 12 vph |
| PM Peak Total | 22 vph |

### 4.2 Trip Distribution and Assignment

Trip distribution describes the process by which project generated trips are dispersed on the street network surrounding the site. Site generated trips are expected to follow the trip pattern shown in Figure 4. This figure reflects work-based and home-based trips taken by project traffic during the PM peak hour. Distribution percentages are roughly based on the roadway network configuration and major nearby residential areas.

As shown, all project traffic at the project entrance(s) is modeled as a single intersection with all inbound/outbound movements as left-turns as they are the highest turn delay. In reality, most outbound trips will be right-out and the entrances are not directly across from each other. LOS is not of primary concern at the entrance(s) given the negligible through volumes on Enumclaw Franklin Road SE.

### 4.3 Roadway Improvements

A review of the latest King County Capital Improvement Program shows that no roadway improvement projects are planned in the immediate vicinity of the site.





### 4.4 Peak Hour Volumes With and Without the Project

For forecasting purposes, future traffic volumes for the 2018 buildout year were targeted for analysis. Baseline 2018 PM peak hour volumes without the project were derived by applying a 3 percent growth rate per year to the existing volumes of Figure 3. Data from the 2015 Annual Traffic Report from WSDOT shows SR-169 in the area has seen around a 2.3 percent growth rate per year over the past four years. Pipeline volumes (see Figure 5) from Hyde Gravel were also included for future traffic estimations. Future 2018 PM peak volumes without project traffic are shown in Figure 6, while future 2018 volumes with the project are shown on Figure 7.

### 4.5 Future Level of Service

A level of service analysis was made of the future peak hour volumes without and with project generated trips. The results are summarized below in Table 3.

TABLE 3
Future 2018 Level of Service
Delays given in seconds per vehicle

| Intersection | Control | Approach | Without Project |  | With Project |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
|  <br> SE 385th/383rd St | TWSC | Eastbound | D | 28.4 | D | 28.6 |
|  |  | Westbound | B | 14.4 | B | 13.8 |
|  |  | Southbound LT | A | 8.1 | A | 8.1 |
|  |  | Northbound LT | A | 9.8 | A | 9.8 |
|  <br> Enumclaw Franklin | TWSC | Westbound | D | 30.2 | D | 32.6 |
|  |  | Southbound LT | A | 8.3 | A | 8.3 |
| SE 384th St \& Enumclaw Franklin | TWSC | Westbound | A | 8.8 | A | 8.9 |
|  |  | Southbound LT | A | 7.3 | A | 7.3 |
| Entrance \& Enumclaw Franklin | TWSC | Eastbound | -- | -- | A | 9.1 |
|  |  | Westbound | -- | -- | A | 9.1 |
|  |  | Southbound LT | -- | -- | A | 7.4 |
|  |  | Northbound LT | -- | -- | A | 7.4 |

Future delays will be in the LOS A to LOS D range. Per WSDOT request, a queuing analysis was performed at 264th Avenue SE \& Enumclaw Franklin Road SE and 264th Avenue SE \& SE 385th Street/SE 383rd Street. Table 4 below summarizes the 95th percentile queuing results. Results are based on 2018 PM peak hour volumes with project traffic included. Queuing analysis was done using HMC methodologies in Synchro, and SimTraffic with 5 simulations used for modeling.

TABLE 4
Queuing Summary
Queue Lengths Given in Feet

| Intersection | Movement | 95th Percentile Queue |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | HCM | SimTraffic |
|  <br> SE 385th/383rd St | Westbound | $3^{\prime}$ | $9^{\prime}$ |
|  | Eastbound | $15^{\prime}$ | $27^{\prime}$ |
|  <br> Enumclaw Franklin | Westbound | $20 \prime$ | $47^{\prime}$ |

### 4.6 Left Turn Warrant Analysis

Left turn lanes are a means of providing necessary storage space for left turning vehicles at intersections. For a two-lane or four-lane highway with no left turn storage, delays are often created by vehicles waiting to complete the desired left turn movement. These turning vehicles typically block the heavier through movement, thereby causing some disruption to traffic flow and subsequent congestion. Methods have been developed by various agencies to determine under what circumstances a left turn lane would be needed. For this impact study, procedures described by WSDOT Design Manual (Figure 1310-15a) were used to ascertain storage requirements on Enumclaw Franklin Road SE at the project entrance(s) based on 2018 PM peak hour volumes with all inbound project traffic modeled as left turns. The results of this assessment indicate that a left turn lane would not be warranted. Refer to the appendix for input values and the WSDOT left turn warrant chart.

### 4.7 Right Turn Warrants

Investigations of right turn warrants were conducted to assess whether right turn channelization would be needed at the project entrance(s) on Enumclaw Franklin Road

SE. The warrant procedure involves using the WSDOT nomograph, Figure 1310-11, which utilizes right turn volumes and approach traffic. Based on 2018 PM peak hour volumes with all inbound project traffic modeled as right turns, it was determined that a right turn taper or right turn lane is not warranted for consideration at the entrance(s). See the appendix for the attached nomograph and input volumes.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS AND MITIGATION

The Enumclaw Recycle Center project will turn 102.9 acres of undeveloped land into a material processing facility in Unincorporated King County. On site will be primarily a material holding area with provisions for an office trailer and equipment maintenance building. Plans are for the site to operate 7 AM to 5 PM seven days a week with the opening time on Sundays reduced.

This project is expected to be a mild generator of new trips in the area with an estimated 22 PM peak hour trips destined to and from the site based on a trip generation study performed at the Enumclaw Recycle Center in operation in the City of Auburn. The daily traffic is estimated at 164 trips for the project.

Mild volumes are currently supported in the area along Enumclaw Franklin Road SE. Existing LOS results show LOS A delays at the Enumclaw Franklin Road SE \& SE 384th Street intersection and delays at the buildout year of 2018 will remain at LOS A without or with project traffic. The intersections of Enumclaw Franklin Road SE and SE 385th Street/SE 383rd Street on 264th Avenue SE will operate at LOS D or better. A left turn warrant analysis found no left turn is needed at the project entrances. A right turn warrant analysis also found a right turn lane or radius is not needed. Overall, the project is not expected to have any impact on the local roadway system.

Per the KCRDCS the shoulders are required to be gravel and four feet in width. Some minor repair might be needed along the frontage to accommodate this requirement.

Based on the findings of this report, no additional mitigation is required for increases in traffic associated with the Enumclaw Recycle Center project.
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The following are excerpts from the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual - Transportation Research Board Special Report 209.

Quality of service requires quantitative measures to characterize operational conditions within a traffic stream. Level of service (LOS) is a quality measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, generally in terms of such service measures as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, and comfort and convenience.

Six LOS are defined for each type of facility that has analysis procedures available. Letters designate each level, from A to $F$, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F the worst. Each level of service represents a range of operating conditions and the driver's perception of those conditions.

## Level-of-Service definitions

The following definitions generally define the various levels of service for arterials.

Level of service A represents primarily free-flow operations at average travel speeds, usually about 90 percent of the free-flow speed for the arterial classification. Vehicles are seldom impeded in their ability to maneuver in the traffic stream. Delay at signalized intersections is minimal.

Level of service $B$ represents reasonably unimpeded operations at average travel speeds, usually about 70 percent of the free-flow speed for the arterial classification. The ability to maneuver in the traffic stream is only slightly restricted and delays are not bothersome.

Level of service C represents stable operations; however, ability to maneuver and change lanes in midblock locations may be more restricted than in LOS B, and longer queues, adverse signal coordination, or both may contribute to lower average travel speeds of about 50 percent of the average free-flow speed for the arterial classification.

Level of service $D$ borders on a range in which small increases in flow may cause substantial increases in approach delay and hence decreases in arterial speed. LOS D may be due to adverse signal progression, inappropriate signal timing, high volumes, or some combination of these. Average travel speeds are about 40 percent of free-flow speed.

Level of service $E$ is characterized by significant delays and average travel speeds of onethird the free-flow speed or less. Such operations are caused by some combination of
adverse progression, high signal density, high volumes, extensive delays at critical intersections, and inappropriate signal timing.

Level of service $F$ characterizes arterial flow at extremely low speeds, from less than onethird to one-quarter of the free-flow speed. Intersection congestion is likely at critical signalized locations, with long delays and extensive queuing.

These definitions are general and conceptual in nature, and they apply primarily to uninterrupted flow. Levels of service for interrupted flow facilities vary widely in terms of both the user's perception of service quality and the operational variables used to describe them.

For each type of facility, levels of service are defined based on one or more operational parameters that best describe operating quality for the subject facility type. While the concept of level of service attempts to address a wide range of operating conditions, limitations on data collection and availability make it impractical to treat the full range of operational parameters for every type of facility. The parameters selected to define levels of service for each facility type are called "measures of effectiveness" or "MOE's", and represent available measures that best describe the quality of operation on the subject facility type.

Each level of service represents a range of conditions, as defined by a range in the parameters given. Thus, a level of service is not a discrete condition, but rather a range of conditions for which boundaries are established.

The following tables describe levels of service for signalized and unsignalized intersections. Level of service for signalized intersections is defined in terms of average control delay. Delay is a measure of driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption and lost travel time, as well as time from movements at slower speeds and stops on intersection approaches as vehicles move up in queue position or slow down upstream of an intersection. Level of service for unsignalized intersections is determined by the computed or measured control delay and is determined for each minor movement.

## Signalized Intersections - Level of Service



As described in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual, level of service breakpoints for allway stop controlled (AWSC) intersections are somewhat different than the criteria used for signalized intersections. The primary reason for this difference is that drivers expect different levels of performance from distinct kinds of transportation facilities. The expectation is that a signalized intersection is designed to carry higher traffic volumes than an AWSC intersection. Thus a higher level of control delay is acceptable at a signalized intersection for the same level of service.

## AWSC Intersections - Level of Service

| Level of Service | Average Total Delay <br> per Vehicle $(\mathrm{sec})$ |
| :---: | :--- |
| A | $\leq 10$ |
| B | $>10$ and $\leq 15$ |
| C | $>15$ and $\leq 25$ |
| D | $>25$ and $\leq 35$ |
| E | $>35$ and $\leq 50$ |
| F | $>50$ |

Heath \& Associates, Inc.
2214 Tacoma Road
Puyallup, WA 98371
File Name : 3586b
Site Code : 00003586
Start Date : 1/27/2015
Page No : 1
Groups Printed- Group 1

|  | Southbound |  |  | RECYCLE CENTER IN Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | RECYCLE CENTER OUT Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | Right | Thru | Left | Right | Thru | Left | Right | Thru | Left | Int. Total |
| Factor | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| 03:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 03:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| 03:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| 03:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 19 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { *** BREAK *** } \\ \text { 04:00 PM } \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 04:30 PM } \\ \text { *** BREAK *** } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| 05:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 28 |
| Apprch \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.1 | 0.0 |  |



Heath \& Associates, Inc.
2214 Tacoma Road
Puyallup, WA 98371
File Name : 3586b
Site Code : 00003586
Start Date : 1/27/2015
Page No : 2

|  | Southbound |  |  |  | RECYCLE CENTER IN Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | RECYCLE CENTER OUT Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Int. } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ |
| Peak Hour From 03:00 PM to 05:00 PM - Peak 1 of 1 l |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Volume | $\begin{gathered} 03: 15 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 22 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | $\begin{array}{r} 100 . \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 100 0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| 03:45 <br> Volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.786 |
| High Int. Volume | 2:45:0 | PM | 0 | 0 | 03:30 | M 4 | 0 | 4 | 2:45:00 0 | PM | 0 | 0 | 03:15 | $\mathrm{M}_{4}$ | 0 | 4 |  |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.625 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.750 |  |





King County
Heath \& Associates, Inc. Puyallup, WA 98371
Project Name: Buckley Recycle Enumclaw
Intersection: 264th Avenue SE \& SE 385th Street
Date of Count: 8/17/2017 Project Number: 3805


Total | 15 | 43 | 1,502 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 754 | 23 | 0 | 26 | 8 | 25 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |






STATE OF WASHINGTON - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



[^0]| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 9 | 362 | 0 | 3 | 808 | 21 | 11 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 4 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 9 | 362 | 0 | 3 | 808 | 21 | 11 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 4 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 381 | 0 | 3 | 851 | 22 | 12 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 4 |  |



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


| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1320 | 438 | 0 | 0 | 445 | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | 438 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 882 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 175 | 623 | - | - | 1126 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 655 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 408 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 171 | 623 | - | - | 1126 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 171 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 641 | - | - |  | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 408 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 25.9 |  | 0 |  | 0.1 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvm |  | NBT | NBR1 | BLn1 | SBL | SBT |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 189 | 1126 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.087 | 0.012 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 25.9 | 8.2 | 0 |  |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | D | A | A |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.3 | 0 | - |  |

7: Enumclaw Franklin Rd SE \& SE 384th St

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | r |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 12 | 3 | 11 | 25 | 2 | 7 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 12 | 3 | 11 | 25 | 2 | 7 |
| 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 | 56 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 3 | 12 | 27 | 2 | 13 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 43 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 26 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 17 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.2 |  | - | 4.1 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 |  | - | 2.2 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 973 | 1056 | - | - | 1584 | - |
| Stage 1 | 1002 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 1011 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 972 | 1056 | - | - | 1584 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 972 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 1001 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 1011 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 8.7 |  | 0 |  | 1.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRV | VBLn1 | SBL |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 988 | 1584 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.016 | 0.001 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 8.7 | 7.3 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | * |  |  | \$ |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 9 | 373 | 0 | 5 | 832 | 22 | 11 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 9 | 373 | 0 | 5 | 832 | 22 | 11 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 393 | 0 | 5 | 876 | 23 | 12 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 8 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\boldsymbol{F}$ |  |  | -1 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 2 | 408 | 15 | 12 | 802 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 2 | 408 | 15 | 12 | 802 |
| 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 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 22 | 2 | 448 | 16 | 13 | 881 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1363 | 456 | 0 | 0 | 464 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 456 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 907 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.45 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.45 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.45 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.545 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 160 | 609 | - | - | 1108 | - |
| Stage 1 | 632 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 389 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 156 | 609 | - | - | 1108 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 156 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 617 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 389 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 30.2 |  | 0 |  | 0.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | D |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 167 | 1108 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.145 | 0.012 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 30.2 | 8.3 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | D | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.5 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | -1 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 13 | 3 | 16 | 27 | 2 | 18 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 13 | 3 | 16 | 27 | 2 | 18 |
| 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 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 14 | 3 | 17 | 29 | 2 | 19 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 55 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 32 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 23 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 958 | 1048 | - | - | 1575 | - |
| Stage 1 | 996 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 1005 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 957 | 1048 | - | - | 1575 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 957 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 995 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 1005 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 8.8 |  | 0 |  | 0.7 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 973 | 1575 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.017 | 0.001 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 8.8 | 7.3 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 9 | 373 | 0 | 7 | 832 | 22 | 11 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 9 | 373 | 0 | 7 | 832 | 22 | 11 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 393 | 0 | 7 | 876 | 23 | 12 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 11 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\boldsymbol{F}$ |  |  | -1 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 29 | 2 | 408 | 22 | 12 | 802 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 29 | 2 | 408 | 22 | 12 | 802 |
| 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 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 32 | 2 | 448 | 24 | 13 | 881 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1367 | 460 | 0 | 0 | 472 | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | 460 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 907 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.45 | 6.2 | - | - | 4.1 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.45 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.45 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.545 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 160 | 605 | - | - | 1100 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 629 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 389 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 156 | 605 | - | - | 1100 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 156 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 615 | - | - |  | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 389 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 32.6 |  | 0 |  | 0.1 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvm |  | NBT | NBR1 | BLn1 | SBL | SBT |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 164 | 1100 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.208 | 0.012 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 32.6 | 8.3 | 0 |  |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | D | A | A |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.8 | 0 | - |  |


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



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Intersection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 20 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 20 | 5 | 1 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 0 |  |



Intersection: 3: 264th Ave SE \& SE 385th St/SE 383rd St

| Movement | NB | SB | SE | NW |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 86 | 15 | 56 | 19 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 6 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 36 | 7 | 27 | 9 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 254 | 2953 | 174 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 5: 264th Ave SE \& Enumclaw Franklin Rd SE

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 50 | 28 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 21 | 4 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 47 | 19 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 254 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |



Left-Turn Storage Guidelines: Two-Lane, Unsignalized
Exhibit 1310-7a


## Notes:

[1] For two-lane highways, use the peak hour DDHV (through + right-turn). For multilane, high-speed highways (posted speed 45 mph or above), use the right-lane peak hour approach volume (through + right-turn).
[2] When all three of the following conditions are met, reduce the right-turn DDHV by 20 :

- The posted speed is 45 mph or below
- The right-turn volume is greater than 40 VPH
- The peak hour approach volume (DDHV) is less than 300 VPH
[3] For right-turn corner design, see Exhibit 1310-6.
[4] For right-turn pocket or taper design, see Exhibit 1310-12.
[5] For right-turn lane design, see Exhibit 1310-13.


[^0]:    * BASED ON ACTUAL COUNT
    + SOURCE OF TRUCK PERCENTAGES

