Over the course of the creation of the Rogue River Transportation System Plan, some alternatives or options were combined or dismissed:

Dismissed Alternatives/Options:

| Alternative/ <br> Option | Reason | Action |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| OS1 | For clarity and better investigation | Split into OS5 and OS7 |
| OS2 | No measured deficiencies to recognize need | Dismissed |
| OS6 | Combined, as same intersection | Combined and exists as OS4 |
| OS9 | Combined with appropriate location | Combined with OS3 and OS4 |
| OS10 | Combined, as same intersection | Combined and exists as OS8 |
| OS11 | Emergency turn around better fit/not in city | Deferred to future Refinement <br> Plan |
| OS12 | Too complicated and large for TSP | Deferred to future Refinement <br> Plan |
| C1 | Additional crossings of the Rogue River <br> shouldn’t be in TSP | Deferred to future Refinement <br> Plan |
| C3 | Combined as Evans Creek crossing in C2 | Combined into C2 |
| C8 | Frontage/backage roadway would be in <br> flood plain | Dismissed |
| C9 | Powerline crossing combined into C2 | Combined into C2 |
| OS7 | Combined into single interchange project; <br> issues too great for TSP analysis to handle | Combined into OS5 |

## Changes to Alternatives/Options:

| Alternative/ <br> Option | Reason | Other Action |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| B4 | Split into two segments as roadside character changes <br> at creek crossing | Created B4W and <br> B4E |
| OS4 | Requested to add new through street options in TM7 <br> comments | Created OS4G \& H |
| P13 | Requested in TM7 comments to add OR99 pedestrian <br> deficiency and related project | P13 created |
| B8 | Requested in TM7 comments to add mixed <br> bike/shared lane concept for uphill sections | B8E created |
| B9 | Requested in TM7 comments to add additional OR99 <br> bicycle project consistent with HDM standards | B9C created |

## SITE LAYOUT

둥 Site: 110 [EMainStPineSt]
E Main St at Pine St (All-Way Stop Control)
Stop (All-Way)
(N
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 110 [EMainStPineSt]

E Main St at Pine St (All-Way Stop Control)
Stop (All-Way)

Volume Display Method: Total and \%


|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Pine St | 405 | 397 | 8 |
| E: E Main St | 365 | 358 | 7 |
| N: Pine St | 375 | 368 | 8 |
| W: W Main St | 225 | 221 | 5 |
| Total | 1370 | 1343 | 27 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 110 [EMainStPineSt]
E Main St at Pine St (All-Way Stop Control)
Stop (All-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. <br> Satn <br> v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 140 | 2.0 | 0.819 | 35.5 | LOS E | 7.2 | 182.9 | 1.00 | 1.95 | 17.7 |
| 8 | T1 | 250 | 2.0 | 0.819 | 35.5 | LOS E | 7.2 | 182.9 | 1.00 | 1.95 | 17.7 |
| 18 | R2 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.819 | 35.5 | LOS E | 7.2 | 182.9 | 1.00 | 1.95 | 9.9 |
| Appr |  | 405 | 2.0 | 0.819 | 35.5 | LOS E | 7.2 | 182.9 | 1.00 | 1.95 | 17.5 |
| East: E Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 85 | 2.0 | 0.313 | 15.2 | LOS C | 1.3 | 32.0 | 0.98 | 1.30 | 15.0 |
| 6 | T1 | 95 | 2.0 | 0.918 | 62.9 | LOS F | 9.3 | 235.5 | 1.00 | 2.11 | 13.1 |
| 16 | R2 | 185 | 2.0 | 0.918 | 62.9 | LOS F | 9.3 | 235.5 | 1.00 | 2.11 | 13.2 |
| Appr |  | 365 | 2.0 | 0.918 | 51.8 | LOS F | 9.3 | 235.5 | 1.00 | 1.92 | 13.3 |
| North: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 135 | 2.0 | 0.854 | 41.2 | LOS E | 8.0 | 202.9 | 1.00 | 2.02 | 16.5 |
| 4 | T1 | 220 | 2.0 | 0.854 | 41.2 | LOS E | 8.0 | 202.9 | 1.00 | 2.02 | 16.5 |
| 14 | R2 | 20 | 2.0 | 0.054 | 8.1 | LOS A | 0.2 | 4.4 | 0.88 | 1.12 | 30.7 |
| Approach |  | 375 | 2.0 | 0.854 | 39.4 | LOS E | 8.0 | 202.9 | 0.99 | 1.97 | 17.2 |
| West: W Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 20 | 2.0 | 0.038 | 6.2 | LOS A | 0.1 | 3.0 | 0.79 | 1.02 | 31.4 |
| 2 | T1 | 70 | 2.0 | 0.285 | 7.9 | LOS A | 1.0 | 25.8 | 0.74 | 1.06 | 27.0 |
| 12 | R2 | 135 | 2.0 | 0.285 | 7.9 | LOS A | 1.0 | 25.8 | 0.74 | 1.06 | 27.0 |
| Appr |  | 225 | 2.0 | 0.285 | 7.7 | LOS A | 1.0 | 25.8 | 0.75 | 1.05 | 27.6 |
| All V | cles | 1370 | 2.0 | 0.918 | 36.4 | LOS E | 9.3 | 235.5 | 0.96 | 1.80 | 17.3 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement. LOS F will result if v/c>1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010). HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

둥 Site: 110 [EMainStPineSt]
E Main St at Pine St (All-Way Stop Control)
Stop (All-Way)
(N
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 110 [EMainStPineSt]

E Main St at Pine St (All-Way Stop Control)
Stop (All-Way)

Volume Display Method: Total and \%


|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Pine St | 405 | 397 | 8 |
| E: E Main St | 400 | 392 | 8 |
| N: Pine St | 370 | 363 | 7 |
| W: W Main St | 265 | 260 | 5 |
| Total | 1440 | 1411 | 29 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 110 [EMainStPineSt]
E Main St at Pine St (All-Way Stop Control)
Stop (All-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 170 | 2.0 | 0.885 | 46.7 | LOS E | 9.2 | 233.1 | 1.00 | 2.15 | 15.5 |
| 8 | T1 | 220 | 2.0 | 0.885 | 46.7 | LOSE | 9.2 | 233.1 | 1.00 | 2.15 | 15.5 |
| 18 | R2 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.885 | 46.7 | LOS E | 9.2 | 233.1 | 1.00 | 2.15 | 8.3 |
| Appr |  | 405 | 2.0 | 0.885 | 46.7 | LOS E | 9.2 | 233.1 | 1.00 | 2.15 | 15.3 |
| East: E Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 85 | 2.0 | 0.316 | 15.4 | LOS C | 1.3 | 32.5 | 0.98 | 1.30 | 14.9 |
| 6 | T1 | 135 | 2.0 | 1.045 | 95.1 | LOS F | 13.9 | 353.9 | 1.00 | 2.54 | 10.1 |
| 16 | R2 | 180 | 2.0 | 1.045 | 95.1 | LOS F | 13.9 | 353.9 | 1.00 | 2.54 | 10.1 |
| Appro |  | 400 | 2.0 | 1.045 | 78.2 | LOS F | 13.9 | 353.9 | 1.00 | 2.28 | 10.4 |
| North: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 130 | 2.0 | 0.894 | 50.3 | LOS F | 9.1 | 230.3 | 1.00 | 2.12 | 14.9 |
| 4 | T1 | 210 | 2.0 | 0.894 | 50.3 | LOS F | 9.1 | 230.3 | 1.00 | 2.12 | 14.9 |
| 14 | R2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.089 | 9.0 | LOS A | 0.3 | 7.6 | 0.91 | 1.15 | 30.3 |
| Approach |  | 370 | 2.0 | 0.894 | 46.9 | LOS E | 9.1 | 230.3 | 0.99 | 2.04 | 15.9 |
| West: W Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.057 | 6.3 | LOS A | 0.2 | 4.5 | 0.79 | 1.03 | 31.4 |
| 2 | T1 | 100 | 2.0 | 0.326 | 8.3 | LOS A | 1.2 | 30.9 | 0.76 | 1.09 | 26.8 |
| 12 | R2 | 135 | 2.0 | 0.326 | 8.3 | LOS A | 1.2 | 30.9 | 0.76 | 1.09 | 26.8 |
| Appr |  | 265 | 2.0 | 0.326 | 8.1 | LOS A | 1.2 | 30.9 | 0.76 | 1.08 | 27.5 |
| All V | cles | 1440 | 2.0 | 1.045 | 48.4 | LOS E | 13.9 | 353.9 | 0.95 | 1.96 | 15.1 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement. LOS F will result if v/c>1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010). HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

## sTof Site: 1 [DepotSt99]

Depot St at 99 (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes
Site: 1 [DepotSt99]
Depot St at 99 (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)

Volume Display Method: Total and \%


|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Minor Road | 24 | 24 | 0 |
| E: 99 | 189 | 185 | 4 |
| N: Depot St | 570 | 559 | 11 |
| W: 99 | 450 | 441 | 9 |
| Total | 1233 | 1208 | 25 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 104 [DepotSt99 - Conversion]

Depot St at 99 (Stop control)
Stop (All-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles $\qquad$ | f Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: minor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 5 | 2.0 | 0.089 | 17.7 | LOS C | 0.3 | 7.7 | 0.95 | 1.19 | 25.6 |
| 6 | T1 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.089 | 17.7 | LOS C | 0.3 | 7.7 | 0.95 | 1.19 | 23.5 |
| 16 | R2 | 4 | 2.0 | 0.089 | 17.7 | LOS C | 0.3 | 7.7 | 0.95 | 1.19 | 27.3 |
| Appr |  | 24 | 2.0 | 0.089 | 17.7 | LOS C | 0.3 | 7.7 | 0.95 | 1.19 | 24.7 |
| East: 99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 4 | 2.0 | 0.669 | 40.9 | LOS E | 4.1 | 103.4 | 1.00 | 1.58 | 21.1 |
| 4 | T1 | 50 | 2.0 | 0.669 | 40.9 | LOS E | 4.1 | 103.4 | 1.00 | 1.58 | 19.4 |
| 14 | R2 | 120 | 2.0 | 0.669 | 40.9 | LOS E | 4.1 | 103.4 | 1.00 | 1.58 | 17.3 |
| Appr |  | 174 | 2.0 | 0.669 | 40.9 | LOS E | 4.1 | 103.4 | 1.00 | 1.58 | 18.0 |
| North: Depot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 165 | 2.0 | 0.243 | 7.4 | LOS A | 0.8 | 21.1 | 0.73 | 1.03 | 27.7 |
| 2 | T1 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.243 | 7.4 | LOS A | 0.8 | 21.1 | 0.73 | 1.03 | 27.8 |
| 12 | R2 | 355 | 2.0 | 0.631 | 16.1 | LOS C | 3.7 | 93.7 | 0.94 | 1.51 | 21.5 |
| Approach |  | 530 | 2.0 | 0.631 | 13.2 | LOS B | 3.7 | 93.7 | 0.87 | 1.35 | 23.6 |
| West: 99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 340 | 2.0 | 0.658 | 19.1 | LOS C | 4.0 | 102.8 | 0.97 | 1.58 | 20.4 |
| 8 | T1 | 70 | 2.0 | 0.161 | 8.1 | LOS A | 0.5 | 13.9 | 0.85 | 1.12 | 29.5 |
| 18 | R2 | 5 | 2.0 | 0.161 | 8.1 | LOS A | 0.5 | 13.9 | 0.85 | 1.12 | 29.6 |
| Appr |  | 415 | 2.0 | 0.658 | 17.1 | LOS C | 4.0 | 102.8 | 0.95 | 1.49 | 22.2 |
| All V | cles | 1143 | 2.0 | 0.669 | 19.0 | LOS C | 4.1 | 103.4 | 0.92 | 1.44 | 21.9 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement. LOS F will result if v/c>1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010). HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

## STop Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)

Volume Display Method: Total and \%


|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Depot St | 365 | 358 | 7 |
| E: Main St | 540 | 529 | 11 |
| N: OakSt | 55 | 54 | 1 |
| W: Major Road | 245 | 240 | 5 |
| Total | 1205 | 1181 | 24 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 70 | 2.0 | 0.249 | 22.0 | LOS C | 1.1 | 26.7 | 0.77 | 0.80 | 12.1 |
| 18 | R2 | 295 | 2.0 | 0.374 | 12.3 | LOS B | 2.4 | 60.9 | 0.50 | 0.41 | 13.9 |
| Appr |  | 365 | 2.0 | 0.374 | 14.1 | LOS B | 2.4 | 60.9 | 0.55 | 0.48 | 13.5 |
| East: Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 220 | 2.0 | 0.348 | 5.8 | LOS A | 1.9 | 47.8 | 0.36 | 0.10 | 21.2 |
| 6 | T1 | 320 | 2.0 | 0.348 | 4.8 | LOS A | 1.9 | 47.8 | 0.36 | 0.10 | 25.2 |
| Appr |  | 540 | 2.0 | 0.348 | 5.2 | NA | 1.9 | 47.8 | 0.36 | 0.10 | 23.5 |
| North: OakSt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.226 | 28.6 | LOS D | 0.8 | 21.5 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 19.7 |
| 4 | T1 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.226 | 21.2 | LOS C | 0.8 | 21.5 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 20.1 |
| 14 | R2 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.226 | 14.5 | LOS B | 0.8 | 21.5 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 20.6 |
| Approach |  | 55 | 2.0 | 0.226 | 24.0 | LOS C | 0.8 | 21.5 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 20.0 |
| West: Major Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | T1 | 215 | 2.0 | 0.134 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 37.8 |
|  | R2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.134 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 31.3 |
| Approach |  | 245 | 2.0 | 0.134 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 36.8 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1205 | 2.0 | 0.374 | 7.7 | NA | 2.4 | 60.9 | 0.36 | 0.22 | 20.3 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if v/c>1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com
Organisation: OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | Processed: Thursday, March 29, 2018 5:45:02 PM
Project: Z:\County\Jackson\RogueRiver\TSP_Update_Analysis\17_Narrative_Technical_MemolTM7\TM7appendix\20180329_OS3_B_2040.sip7

## SITE LAYOUT

## sTof Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)

Volume Display Method: Total and \%


|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Depot St | 365 | 358 | 7 |
| E: Main St | 540 | 529 | 11 |
| W: Major Road | 245 | 240 | 5 |
| Total | 1150 | 1127 | 23 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema <br> Total <br> veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 70 | 2.0 | 0.204 | 18.2 | LOS C | 0.8 | 19.4 | 0.70 | 0.71 | 13.2 |
| 18 | R2 | 295 | 2.0 | 0.374 | 12.3 | LOS B | 2.4 | 60.9 | 0.50 | 0.41 | 13.9 |
| Appr |  | 365 | 2.0 | 0.374 | 13.4 | LOS B | 2.4 | 60.9 | 0.54 | 0.47 | 13.7 |
| East: Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 220 | 2.0 | 0.348 | 5.8 | LOS A | 1.9 | 47.8 | 0.36 | 0.10 | 21.2 |
| 6 | T1 | 320 | 2.0 | 0.348 | 4.8 | LOS A | 1.9 | 47.8 | 0.36 | 0.10 | 25.2 |
| Approach |  | 540 | 2.0 | 0.348 | 5.2 | NA | 1.9 | 47.8 | 0.36 | 0.10 | 23.5 |
| West: Major Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 212 | T1 | 215 | 2.0 | 0.134 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 37.8 |
|  | R2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.134 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 31.3 |
| Approach |  | 245 | 2.0 | 0.134 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 36.8 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1150 | 2.0 | 0.374 | 6.7 | NA | 2.4 | 60.9 | 0.34 | 0.19 | 20.6 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

## STop Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)

Volume Display Method: Total and \%


|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Depot St | 365 | 358 | 7 |
| E: Main St | 560 | 549 | 11 |
| N: OakSt | 55 | 54 | 1 |
| W: Major Road | 215 | 211 | 4 |
| Total | 1195 | 1171 | 24 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 70 | 2.0 | 0.292 | 22.5 | LOS C | 1.3 | 32.8 | 0.76 | 0.81 | 11.9 |
| 8 | T1 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.292 | 21.8 | LOS C | 1.3 | 32.8 | 0.76 | 0.81 | 20.8 |
| 18 | R2 | 280 | 2.0 | 0.353 | 12.0 | LOS B | 1.9 | 47.3 | 0.49 | 0.37 | 14.0 |
| Appr |  | 365 | 2.0 | 0.353 | 14.4 | LOS B | 1.9 | 47.3 | 0.55 | 0.47 | 14.0 |
| East: Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | T1 | 540 | 2.0 | 0.303 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 39.3 |
| 16 | R2 | 20 | 2.0 | 0.303 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 37.2 |
| Appr |  | 560 | 2.0 | 0.303 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 39.1 |
| North: OakSt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.213 | 28.4 | LOS D | 0.8 | 20.5 | 0.75 | 0.76 | 20.2 |
| 14 | R2 | 25 | 2.0 | 0.213 | 15.8 | LOS C | 0.8 | 20.5 | 0.75 | 0.76 | 21.0 |
| Approach |  | 55 | 2.0 | 0.213 | 22.7 | LOS C | 0.8 | 20.5 | 0.75 | 0.76 | 20.6 |
| West: Major Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 5 | 2.0 | 0.118 | 4.6 | LOS A | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 35.9 |
| 2 | T1 | 210 | 2.0 | 0.118 | 1.0 | LOS A | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 36.4 |
| Approach |  | 215 | 2.0 | 0.118 | 1.1 | NA | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 36.4 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1195 | 2.0 | 0.353 | 5.6 | NA | 1.9 | 47.3 | 0.21 | 0.18 | 24.1 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if v/c>1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

## STITF Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)

Volume Display Method: Total and \%


|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Depot St | 365 | 358 | 7 |
| E: Main St | 560 | 549 | 11 |
| N: OakSt | 55 | 54 | 1 |
| W: Major Road | 245 | 240 | 5 |
| Total | 1225 | 1201 | 25 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 105v [DepotStMainSt - Conversion]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (All-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles $\qquad$ | f Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 70 | 2.0 | 0.420 | 23.7 | LOS C | 1.9 | 47.7 | 1.00 | 1.37 | 11.7 |
| 8 | T1 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.420 | 23.7 | LOS C | 1.9 | 47.7 | 1.00 | 1.37 | 20.5 |
| 18 | R2 | 280 | 2.0 | 1.239 | 173.5 | LOS F | 19.3 | 490.2 | 1.00 | 2.84 | 2.5 |
| Appr |  | 365 | 2.0 | 1.239 | 138.6 | LOS F | 19.3 | 490.2 | 1.00 | 2.50 | 3.3 |
| East: Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 220 | 2.0 | 0.671 | 15.6 | LOS C | 4.2 | 106.4 | 0.86 | 1.50 | 13.0 |
| 6 | T1 | 320 | 2.0 | 0.671 | 15.6 | LOS C | 4.2 | 106.4 | 0.86 | 1.50 | 13.9 |
| 16 | R2 | 20 | 2.0 | 0.671 | 15.6 | LOS C | 4.2 | 106.4 | 0.86 | 1.50 | 23.3 |
| Appr |  | 560 | 2.0 | 0.671 | 15.6 | LOS C | 4.2 | 106.4 | 0.86 | 1.50 | 14.0 |
| North: OakSt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.197 | 19.1 | LOS C | 0.7 | 18.4 | 0.96 | 1.24 | 21.5 |
| 4 | T1 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.197 | 19.1 | LOS C | 0.7 | 18.4 | 0.96 | 1.24 | 21.9 |
| 14 | R2 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.197 | 19.1 | LOS C | 0.7 | 18.4 | 0.96 | 1.24 | 22.4 |
| Approach |  | 55 | 2.0 | 0.197 | 19.1 | LOS C | 0.7 | 18.4 | 0.96 | 1.24 | 21.8 |
| West: Major Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 2 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | L2 | 5 | 2.0 | 0.387 | 12.2 | LOS B | 1.6 | 40.1 | 0.83 | 1.19 | 24.9 |
|  | T1 | 210 | 2.0 | 0.387 | 12.2 | LOS B | 1.6 | 40.1 | 0.83 | 1.19 | 14.8 |
|  | R2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.387 | 12.2 | LOS B | 1.6 | 40.1 | 0.83 | 1.19 | 15.4 |
| Approach |  | 245 | 2.0 | 0.387 | 12.2 | LOS B | 1.6 | 40.1 | 0.83 | 1.19 | 15.2 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1225 | 2.0 | 1.239 | 51.8 | LOS F | 19.3 | 490.2 | 0.90 | 1.73 | 7.5 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement. LOS F will result if v/c>1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010). HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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${ }^{1}$ Capacity obtained from unsignalized intersection analysis
For guidance on preliminary signal warrant analysis, refer to the Analysis Procedures Manual.
Last Updated: February 2009

| Oregon Department of Transportation <br> Transportation Development Branch <br> Transportation Planning Analysis Unit |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Preliminary Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major Street: Main |  |  | Minor Street: Pine St |  |  |
| Project: | Rogue River TSP |  | City/County: Jackson |  |  |
| Year: | 2040 |  | Alternative: existing |  |  |
| Preliminary Signal Warrant Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Approach lanes |  | ADT on major street approaching from both directions |  | ADT on minor street, highest approaching volume |  |
| Major | Minor | Percent of standard warrants |  | Percent of standard warrants |  |
| Street | Street | 100 | 70 | 100 | 70 |
| Case A: Minimum Vehicular Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 8850 | 6200 | 2650 | 1850 |
| 2 or more | 1 | 10600 | 7400 | 2650 | 1850 |
| 2 or more | 2 or more | 10600 | 7400 | 3550 | 2500 |
| 1 | 2 or more | 8850 | 6200 | 3550 | 2500 |
| Case B: Interruption of Continuous Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 13300 | 9300 | 1350 | 950 |
| 2 or more | 1 | 15900 | 11100 | 1350 | 950 |
| 2 or more | 2 or more | 15900 | 11100 | 1750 | 1250 |
| 1 | 2 or more | 13300 | 9300 | 1750 | 1250 |
| X | 100 percent of standard warrants |  |  |  |  |
| 70 percent of standard warrants ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preliminary Signal Warrant Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Street | Number of Lanes | Warrant Volumes | Approach Volumes | Warrant Met |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Case } \\ \text { A } \end{gathered}$ | Major | 1 | 8850 | 9250 | Y |
|  | Minor | 1 | 2650 | 3300 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Case } \\ \text { B } \end{gathered}$ | Major | 1 | 13300 | 9250 | N |
|  | Minor | 1 | 1350 | 3300 |  |
| Analyst and Date: | Reviewer and Date: |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Meeting preliminary signal warrants does not guarantee that a signal will be installed. When preliminary signal warrants are met, project analysts need to coordinate with Region Traffic to initiate the traffic signal engineering investigation as outlined in the Traffic Manual. Before a signal can be installed, the engineering investigation must be conducted or reviewed by the Region Traffic Manager who will forward signal recommendations to headquarters. Traffic signal warrants must be met and the State Traffic Engineer's approval obtained before a traffic signal can be installed on a state highway.
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## SITE LAYOUT

## stof Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)

Volume Display Method: Total and \%


|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: Main St | 560 | 549 | 11 |
| N: OakSt | 55 | 54 | 1 |
| W: Major Road | 215 | 211 | 4 |
| Total | 830 | 813 | 17 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 105v [DepotStMainSt - Conversion]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (All-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles $\qquad$ | f Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 70 | 2.0 | 0.420 | 23.7 | LOS C | 1.9 | 47.7 | 1.00 | 1.37 | 11.7 |
| 8 | T1 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.420 | 23.7 | LOS C | 1.9 | 47.7 | 1.00 | 1.37 | 20.5 |
| 18 | R2 | 280 | 2.0 | 1.239 | 173.5 | LOS F | 19.3 | 490.2 | 1.00 | 2.84 | 2.5 |
| Appr |  | 365 | 2.0 | 1.239 | 138.6 | LOS F | 19.3 | 490.2 | 1.00 | 2.50 | 3.3 |
| East: Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 220 | 2.0 | 0.671 | 15.6 | LOS C | 4.2 | 106.4 | 0.86 | 1.50 | 13.0 |
| 6 | T1 | 320 | 2.0 | 0.671 | 15.6 | LOS C | 4.2 | 106.4 | 0.86 | 1.50 | 13.9 |
| 16 | R2 | 20 | 2.0 | 0.671 | 15.6 | LOS C | 4.2 | 106.4 | 0.86 | 1.50 | 23.3 |
| Appr |  | 560 | 2.0 | 0.671 | 15.6 | LOS C | 4.2 | 106.4 | 0.86 | 1.50 | 14.0 |
| North: OakSt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.197 | 19.1 | LOS C | 0.7 | 18.4 | 0.96 | 1.24 | 21.5 |
| 4 | T1 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.197 | 19.1 | LOS C | 0.7 | 18.4 | 0.96 | 1.24 | 21.9 |
| 14 | R2 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.197 | 19.1 | LOS C | 0.7 | 18.4 | 0.96 | 1.24 | 22.4 |
| Approach |  | 55 | 2.0 | 0.197 | 19.1 | LOS C | 0.7 | 18.4 | 0.96 | 1.24 | 21.8 |
| West: Major Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 2 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | L2 | 5 | 2.0 | 0.387 | 12.2 | LOS B | 1.6 | 40.1 | 0.83 | 1.19 | 24.9 |
|  | T1 | 210 | 2.0 | 0.387 | 12.2 | LOS B | 1.6 | 40.1 | 0.83 | 1.19 | 14.8 |
|  | R2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.387 | 12.2 | LOS B | 1.6 | 40.1 | 0.83 | 1.19 | 15.4 |
| Approach |  | 245 | 2.0 | 0.387 | 12.2 | LOS B | 1.6 | 40.1 | 0.83 | 1.19 | 15.2 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1225 | 2.0 | 1.239 | 51.8 | LOS F | 19.3 | 490.2 | 0.90 | 1.73 | 7.5 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement. LOS F will result if v/c>1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010). HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

## stof Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)


SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com
Organisation: OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | Created: Thursday, May 17, 2018 2:30:46 PM
Project: Z:ICounty\Jackson\RogueRiver|TSP_Update_Analysis\17_Narrative_Technical_MemolTM71TM7appendix\20180330_OS3_F_2040.sip7

## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)

Volume Display Method: Total and \%


|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: Main St | 560 | 549 | 11 |
| N: OakSt | 55 | 54 | 1 |
| W: Major Road | 215 | 211 | 4 |
| Total | 830 | 813 | 17 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema <br> Total <br> veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| East: Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | T1 | 540 | 2.0 | 0.303 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 39.3 |
| 16 | R2 | 20 | 2.0 | 0.303 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 37.2 |
| Appro |  | 560 | 2.0 | 0.303 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 39.1 |
| North: OakSt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.136 | 16.8 | LOS C | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.62 | 0.61 | 22.7 |
| 14 | R2 | 25 | 2.0 | 0.136 | 13.5 | LOS B | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.62 | 0.61 | 23.6 |
| Approach |  | 55 | 2.0 | 0.136 | 15.3 | LOS C | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.62 | 0.61 | 23.1 |
| West: Major Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2T1 | 5 | 2.0 | 0.118 | 4.6 | LOS A | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 35.9 |
|  |  | 210 | 2.0 | 0.118 | 1.0 | LOS A | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 36.4 |
| Approach |  | 215 | 2.0 | 0.118 | 1.1 | NA | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 36.4 |
| All Vehicles |  | 830 | 2.0 | 0.303 | 1.3 | NA | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 34.8 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if v/c>1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com Organisation: OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | Processed: Friday, March 30, 2018 11:29:42 AM
Project: Z:ICounty\Jackson\RogueRiver\TSP_Update_Analysis\17_Narrative_Technical_MemolTM7\TM7appendix\20180330_OS3_F_2040.sip7

## SITE LAYOUT

## stof Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)

Volume Display Method: Total and \%


|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: Main St | 560 | 549 | 11 |
| N: OakSt | 55 | 54 | 1 |
| W: Major Road | 215 | 211 | 4 |
| Total | 830 | 813 | 17 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 105 [DepotStMainSt]

Depot St at Main St (Stop control)
Stop (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema <br> Total <br> veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| East: Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | T1 | 540 | 2.0 | 0.303 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 39.3 |
| 16 | R2 | 20 | 2.0 | 0.303 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 37.2 |
| Appro |  | 560 | 2.0 | 0.303 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 39.1 |
| North: OakSt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.136 | 16.8 | LOS C | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.62 | 0.61 | 22.7 |
| 14 | R2 | 25 | 2.0 | 0.136 | 13.5 | LOS B | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.62 | 0.61 | 23.6 |
| Approach |  | 55 | 2.0 | 0.136 | 15.3 | LOS C | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.62 | 0.61 | 23.1 |
| West: Major Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2T1 | 5 | 2.0 | 0.118 | 4.6 | LOS A | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 35.9 |
|  |  | 210 | 2.0 | 0.118 | 1.0 | LOS A | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 36.4 |
| Approach |  | 215 | 2.0 | 0.118 | 1.1 | NA | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 36.4 |
| All Vehicles |  | 830 | 2.0 | 0.303 | 1.3 | NA | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 34.8 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if v/c>1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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${ }^{1}$ Capacity obtained from unsignalized intersection analysis
For guidance on preliminary signal warrant analysis, refer to the Analysis Procedures Manual.
Last Updated: February 2009

| Oregon Department of Transportation <br> Transportation Development Branch <br> Transportation Planning Analysis Unit |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Preliminary Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major Street: Main |  |  | Minor Street: Pine St |  |  |
| Project: | Rogue River TSP |  | City/County: Jackson |  |  |
| Year: | 2040 |  | Alternative: existing |  |  |
| Preliminary Signal Warrant Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Approach lanes |  | ADT on major street approaching from both directions |  | ADT on minor street, highest approaching volume |  |
| Major | Minor | Percent of standard warrants |  | Percent of standard warrants |  |
| Street | Street | 100 | 70 | 100 | 70 |
| Case A: Minimum Vehicular Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 8850 | 6200 | 2650 | 1850 |
| 2 or more | 1 | 10600 | 7400 | 2650 | 1850 |
| 2 or more | 2 or more | 10600 | 7400 | 3550 | 2500 |
| 1 | 2 or more | 8850 | 6200 | 3550 | 2500 |
| Case B: Interruption of Continuous Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 13300 | 9300 | 1350 | 950 |
| 2 or more | 1 | 15900 | 11100 | 1350 | 950 |
| 2 or more | 2 or more | 15900 | 11100 | 1750 | 1250 |
| 1 | 2 or more | 13300 | 9300 | 1750 | 1250 |
| X | 100 percent of standard warrants |  |  |  |  |
| 70 percent of standard warrants ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preliminary Signal Warrant Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Street | Number of Lanes | Warrant Volumes | Approach Volumes | Warrant Met |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Case } \\ \text { A } \end{gathered}$ | Major | 1 | 8850 | 9550 | Y |
|  | Minor | 1 | 2650 | 3580 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Case } \\ \text { B } \end{gathered}$ | Major | 1 | 13300 | 9550 | N |
|  | Minor | 1 | 1350 | 3580 |  |
| Analyst and Date: | Reviewer and Date: |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Meeting preliminary signal warrants does not guarantee that a signal will be installed. When preliminary signal warrants are met, project analysts need to coordinate with Region Traffic to initiate the traffic signal engineering investigation as outlined in the Traffic Manual. Before a signal can be installed, the engineering investigation must be conducted or reviewed by the Region Traffic Manager who will forward signal recommendations to headquarters. Traffic signal warrants must be met and the State Traffic Engineer's approval obtained before a traffic signal can be installed on a state highway.

[^1]V/C OS3


| 145 | $=$ | 360 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 165 | $=$ | 595 |
| 300 | $=$ | 610 |
| 205 | $=$ | 520 |

## V/C OS3

| $0.066+$ | 0.335 | $=$ | 0.401 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.236 | +0.164 | $=$ | 0.4 |  |
| V/C | $=\frac{150}{150-8}$ |  |  |  |

## SITE LAYOUT

## SToF Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

## Volume Display Method: Total and \%



|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Depot St | 735 | 720 | 15 |
| N: Depot St | 349 | 342 | 7 |
| W: Pine St | 410 | 402 | 8 |
| Total | 1494 | 1464 | 30 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Mov } \\ \text { ID } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | queue <br> Distance | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 380 | 2.0 | 0.439 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 27.9 |
| 8 | T1 | 355 | 2.0 | 0.439 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 34.6 |
| Appro |  | 735 | 2.0 | 0.439 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 30.8 |
| North: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | T1 | 345 | 2.0 | 0.703 | 27.7 | LOS D | 7.9 | 200.2 | 0.78 | 1.26 | 7.6 |
| 14 | R2 | 4 | 2.0 | 0.703 | 25.9 | LOS D | 7.9 | 200.2 | 0.78 | 1.26 | 11.4 |
| Approach |  | 349 | 2.0 | 0.703 | 27.7 | LOS D | 7.9 | 200.2 | 0.78 | 1.26 | 7.7 |
| West: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 5 | 2.0 | 0.608 | 28.3 | LOS D | 8.9 | 226.5 | 0.73 | 1.07 | 13.7 |
| 12 | R2 | 405 | 2.0 | 0.608 | 18.1 | LOS C | 8.9 | 226.5 | 0.73 | 1.07 | 9.8 |
| Appro |  | 410 | 2.0 | 0.608 | 18.3 | LOS C | 8.9 | 226.5 | 0.73 | 1.07 | 9.9 |
| All Ve | cles | 1494 | 2.0 | 0.703 | 11.5 | NA | 8.9 | 226.5 | 0.38 | 0.59 | 13.5 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

## ssor Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

## Volume Display Method: Total and \%



|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Depot St | 480 | 470 | 10 |
| E: Classick Dr | 105 | 103 | 2 |
| W: Pine St | 675 | 662 | 14 |
| Total | 1260 | 1235 | 25 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 380 | 2.0 | 0.331 | 5.1 | LOS A | 2.1 | 52.7 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 18.2 |
| 18 | R2 | 100 | 2.0 | 0.331 | 6.3 | LOS A | 2.1 | 52.7 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 29.6 |
| Appro |  | 480 | 2.0 | 0.331 | 5.4 | NA | 2.1 | 52.7 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 22.2 |
| East: Classick Dr |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 85 | 2.0 | 0.411 | 30.3 | LOS D | 1.9 | 47.7 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 17.7 |
| 6 | T1 | 20 | 2.0 | 0.411 | 21.6 | LOS C | 1.9 | 47.7 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 19.3 |
| Approach |  | 105 | 2.0 | 0.411 | 28.6 | LOS D | 1.9 | 47.7 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 18.0 |
| West: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | T1 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.463 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 34.2 |
| 12 | R2 | 665 | 2.0 | 0.463 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 21.8 |
| Appro |  | 675 | 2.0 | 0.463 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 22.3 |
| All Ve | cles | 1260 | 2.0 | 0.463 | 4.4 | NA | 2.1 | 52.7 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 21.2 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

## SToF Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

Volume Display Method: Total and \%


|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Depot St | 835 | 818 | 17 |
| N: Depot St | 353 | 346 | 7 |
| W: Pine St | 420 | 412 | 8 |
| Total | 1608 | 1576 | 32 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles <br> veh | f Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 380 | 2.0 | 0.508 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 27.6 |
| 8 | T1 | 355 | 2.0 | 0.508 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 34.1 |
| 18 | R2 | 100 | 2.0 | 0.508 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 35.4 |
| Appro |  | 835 | 2.0 | 0.508 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 31.8 |
| North: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 4 | 2.0 | 0.583 | 19.3 | LOS C | 6.6 | 166.6 | 0.68 | 1.02 | 22.1 |
| 4 | T1 | 345 | 2.0 | 0.583 | 18.9 | LOS C | 6.6 | 166.6 | 0.68 | 1.02 | 9.5 |
| 14 | R2 | 4 | 2.0 | 0.583 | 18.4 | LOS C | 6.6 | 166.6 | 0.68 | 1.02 | 13.7 |
| Approach |  | 353 | 2.0 | 0.583 | 18.9 | LOS C | 6.6 | 166.6 | 0.68 | 1.02 | 9.8 |
| West: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L2 | 5 | 2.0 | 0.637 | 29.5 | LOS D | 9.8 | 248.7 | 0.75 | 1.14 | 13.4 |
|  | T1 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.637 | 24.3 | LOS C | 9.8 | 248.7 | 0.75 | 1.14 | 22.0 |
|  | R2 | 405 | 2.0 | 0.637 | 19.3 | LOS C | 9.8 | 248.7 | 0.75 | 1.14 | 9.5 |
| Approach |  | 420 | 2.0 | 0.637 | 19.5 | LOS C | 9.8 | 248.7 | 0.75 | 1.14 | 10.1 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1608 | 2.0 | 0.637 | 9.2 | NA | 9.8 | 248.7 | 0.34 | 0.52 | 16.3 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS $F$ will result if v/c > 1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

## SToF Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)


SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com Organisation: OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | Created: Thursday, May 17, 2018 2:44:54 PM Project: Z:ICounty\JacksonlRogueRiverlTSP_Update_Analysis\17_Narrative_Technical_MemolTM7ITM7appendix 120180402_OS4_D_2040classick.sip7

## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

## Volume Display Method: Total and \%



|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Depot St | 835 | 818 | 17 |
| E: Classick Dr | 110 | 108 | 2 |
| W: Pine St | 680 | 666 | 14 |
| Total | 1625 | 1593 | 33 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Mov } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 380 | 2.0 | 0.508 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 27.6 |
| 8 | T1 | 355 | 2.0 | 0.508 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 34.1 |
| 18 | R2 | 100 | 2.0 | 0.508 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 35.4 |
| Appr |  | 835 | 2.0 | 0.508 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 31.8 |
| East: Classick Dr |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 85 | 2.0 | 0.700 | 73.0 | LOS F | 3.8 | 96.7 | 0.93 | 1.15 | 11.0 |
| 6 | T1 | 20 | 2.0 | 0.700 | 55.6 | LOS F | 3.8 | 96.7 | 0.93 | 1.15 | 12.4 |
| 16 | R2 | 5 | 2.0 | 0.700 | 51.2 | LOS F | 3.8 | 96.7 | 0.93 | 1.15 | 12.4 |
| Approach |  | 110 | 2.0 | 0.700 | 68.9 | LOS F | 3.8 | 96.7 | 0.93 | 1.15 | 11.3 |
| West: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | L2 | 5 | 2.0 | 0.498 | 17.2 | LOS C | 14.7 | 372.9 | 1.00 | 0.03 | 18.5 |
|  | T1 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.498 | 17.8 | LOS C | 14.7 | 372.9 | 1.00 | 0.03 | 27.3 |
|  | R2 | 665 | 2.0 | 0.498 | 7.6 | LOS A | 14.7 | 372.9 | 1.00 | 0.03 | 14.4 |
| Approach |  | 680 | 2.0 | 0.498 | 7.8 | LOS A | 14.7 | 372.9 | 1.00 | 0.03 | 14.8 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1625 | 2.0 | 0.700 | 7.9 | NA | 14.7 | 372.9 | 0.48 | 0.09 | 18.7 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

## SToF Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

## Q
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

## Volume Display Method: Total and \%



|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Depot St | 835 | 818 | 17 |
| W: Pine St | 751 | 736 | 15 |
| Total | 1586 | 1554 | 32 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

## SToF Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

## Volume Display Method: Total and \%



|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Depot St | 835 | 818 | 17 |
| W: Pine St | 671 | 658 | 13 |
| Total | 1506 | 1476 | 30 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Mov} \\ & \mathrm{ID} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue <br> Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 380 | 2.0 | 0.544 | 7.7 | LOS A | 4.9 | 124.2 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 16.9 |
| 8 | T1 | 355 | 2.0 | 0.544 | 7.5 | LOSA | 4.9 | 124.2 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 19.1 |
| 18 | R2 | 100 | 2.0 | 0.544 | 8.8 | LOS A | 4.9 | 124.2 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 28.6 |
| Approach |  | 835 | 2.0 | 0.544 | 7.8 | NA | 4.9 | 124.2 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 20.3 |
| West: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 5 | 2.0 | 0.464 | 8.6 | LOS A | 0.2 | 5.4 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 20.7 |
| 2 | T1 | 1 | 2.0 | 0.464 | 10.8 | LOS B | 0.2 | 5.4 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 30.8 |
| 12 | R2 | 665 | 2.0 | 0.464 | 4.5 | LOS A | 0.2 | 5.4 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 16.8 |
| Approach |  | 671 | 2.0 | 0.464 | 4.6 | NA | 0.2 | 5.4 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 16.9 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1506 | 2.0 | 0.544 | 6.3 | NA | 4.9 | 124.2 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 18.8 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS $F$ will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

## SToF Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

## Volume Display Method: Total and \%



|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Depot St | 480 | 470 | 10 |
| W: Pine St | 666 | 653 | 13 |
| Total | 1146 | 1123 | 23 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 380 | 2.0 | 0.328 | 5.1 | LOS A | 2.1 | 52.6 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 18.2 |
| 18 | R2 | 100 | 2.0 | 0.328 | 6.2 | LOS A | 2.1 | 52.6 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 29.7 |
| Approach |  | 480 | 2.0 | 0.328 | 5.3 | NA | 2.1 | 52.6 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 22.3 |
| West: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | T1 | 1665 | 2.0 | 0.458 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 34.1 |
| 12 | R2 |  | 2.0 | 0.458 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 21.7 |
| Approach |  | 666 | 2.0 | 0.458 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 21.7 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1146 | 2.0 | 0.458 | 2.2 | NA | 2.1 | 52.6 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 22.0 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com
Organisation: OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | Processed: Monday, August 27, 2018 4:47:59 PM
Project: Z:ICounty|JacksonlRogueRiver|TSP_Update_Analysisl10_AlternativelOS4120180827_OS4_G_2040classick.sip7

## SITE LAYOUT

## sTof Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

## Volume Display Method: Total and \%



|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Depot St | 836 | 819 | 17 |
| E: Classick Dr | 21 | 21 | 0 |
| W: Pine St | 675 | 662 | 14 |
| Total | 1532 | 1501 | 31 |

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 101 [DepotStPineSt]

Depot at Pine St
Stop (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Mov } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 835 | 2.0 | 0.522 | 7.3 | LOS A | 4.3 | 110.2 | 0.10 | 0.02 | 16.5 |
| 18 | R2 | 1 | 2.0 | 0.522 | 8.4 | LOS A | 4.3 | 110.2 | 0.10 | 0.02 | 28.3 |
| Appro |  | 836 | 2.0 | 0.522 | 7.3 | NA | 4.3 | 110.2 | 0.10 | 0.02 | 16.5 |
| East: Classick Dr |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 1 | 2.0 | 0.075 | 34.0 | LOS D | 0.2 | 6.0 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 20.7 |
| 6 | T1 | 20 | 2.0 | 0.075 | 18.1 | LOS C | 0.2 | 6.0 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 22.3 |
| Approach |  | 21 | 2.0 | 0.075 | 18.9 | LOS C | 0.2 | 6.0 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 22.2 |
| West: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | T1 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.463 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 34.2 |
| 12 | R2 | 665 | 2.0 | 0.463 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 21.8 |
| Appro |  | 675 | 2.0 | 0.463 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 22.3 |
| All Ve | cles | 1532 | 2.0 | 0.522 | 4.2 | NA | 4.3 | 110.2 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 18.9 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## SITE LAYOUT

STITF) Site: 110 [EMainStPineSt]
E Main St at Pine St (All-Way Stop Control)
Stop (All-Way)
(N
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## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 110 [EMainStPineSt]

E Main St at Pine St (All-Way Stop Control)
Stop (All-Way)

Volume Display Method: Total and \%


|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Pine St | 405 | 397 | 8 |
| E: E Main St | 405 | 397 | 8 |
| N: Pine St | 370 | 363 | 7 |
| W: W Main St | 285 | 279 | 6 |
| Total | 1465 | 1436 | 29 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 110 [EMainStPineSt]
E Main St at Pine St (All-Way Stop Control)
Stop (All-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. <br> Satn <br> v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 180 | 2.0 | 0.901 | 49.9 | LOS E | 9.7 | 247.2 | 1.00 | 2.21 | 15.0 |
| 8 | T1 | 210 | 2.0 | 0.901 | 49.9 | LOS E | 9.7 | 247.2 | 1.00 | 2.21 | 15.0 |
| 18 | R2 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.901 | 49.9 | LOS E | 9.7 | 247.2 | 1.00 | 2.21 | 8.0 |
| Appr |  | 405 | 2.0 | 0.901 | 49.9 | LOS E | 9.7 | 247.2 | 1.00 | 2.21 | 14.8 |
| East: E Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 85 | 2.0 | 0.320 | 15.7 | LOS C | 1.3 | 33.0 | 0.98 | 1.31 | 14.8 |
| 6 | T1 | 145 | 2.0 | 1.075 | 104.7 | LOS F | 15.2 | 384.9 | 1.00 | 2.64 | 9.4 |
| 16 | R2 | 175 | 2.0 | 1.075 | 104.7 | LOS F | 15.2 | 384.9 | 1.00 | 2.64 | 9.4 |
| Appr |  | 405 | 2.0 | 1.075 | 86.0 | LOS F | 15.2 | 384.9 | 1.00 | 2.36 | 9.8 |
| North: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 125 | 2.0 | 0.898 | 52.2 | LOS F | 9.1 | 231.8 | 1.00 | 2.12 | 14.6 |
| 4 | T1 | 205 | 2.0 | 0.898 | 52.2 | LOS F | 9.1 | 231.8 | 1.00 | 2.12 | 14.6 |
| 14 | R2 | 40 | 2.0 | 0.123 | 9.7 | LOS A | 0.4 | 10.7 | 0.92 | 1.18 | 30.1 |
| Approach |  | 370 | 2.0 | 0.898 | 47.6 | LOS E | 9.1 | 231.8 | 0.99 | 2.02 | 15.9 |
| West: W Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 40 | 2.0 | 0.076 | 6.5 | LOS A | 0.2 | 6.1 | 0.80 | 1.04 | 31.3 |
| 2 | T1 | 110 | 2.0 | 0.340 | 8.5 | LOS A | 1.3 | 32.8 | 0.76 | 1.10 | 26.7 |
| 12 | R2 | 135 | 2.0 | 0.340 | 8.5 | LOS A | 1.3 | 32.8 | 0.76 | 1.10 | 26.8 |
| Appr |  | 285 | 2.0 | 0.340 | 8.2 | LOS A | 1.3 | 32.8 | 0.77 | 1.09 | 27.6 |
| All V | cles | 1465 | 2.0 | 1.075 | 51.2 | LOS F | 15.2 | 384.9 | 0.95 | 1.99 | 14.7 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement. LOS F will result if v/c>1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010). HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## SITE LAYOUT

## Site: 110 [EMainStPineSt]

E Main St at Pine St (All-Way Stop Control)
Stop (All-Way)


## INPUT VOLUMES

Vehicles and pedestrians per 60 minutes

## Site: 110 [EMainStPineSt]

E Main St at Pine St (All-Way Stop Control)
Stop (All-Way)

Volume Display Method: Total and \%


|  | All MCs | Light Vehicles (LV) | Heavy Vehicles (HV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S: Pine St | 405 | 397 | 8 |
| E: E Main St | 405 | 397 | 8 |
| N: Pine St | 370 | 363 | 7 |
| W: W Main St | 285 | 279 | 6 |
| Total | 1465 | 1436 | 29 |
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 110 [EMainStPineSt]
E Main St at Pine St (All-Way Stop Control)
Stop (All-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. <br> Satn <br> v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed mph |
| South: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 180 | 2.0 | 1.139 | 119.7 | LOS F | 19.8 | 502.2 | 1.00 | 3.08 | 8.6 |
| 8 | T1 | 210 | 2.0 | 1.139 | 119.7 | LOS F | 19.8 | 502.2 | 1.00 | 3.08 | 8.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.049 | 9.2 | LOS A | 0.2 | 4.1 | 0.92 | 1.16 | 18.0 |
| Appr |  | 405 | 2.0 | 1.139 | 115.6 | LOS F | 19.8 | 502.2 | 1.00 | 3.01 | 8.6 |
| East: E Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 85 | 2.0 | 0.320 | 15.7 | LOS C | 1.3 | 33.0 | 0.98 | 1.31 | 15.0 |
| 6 | T1 | 145 | 2.0 | 1.075 | 104.7 | LOS F | 15.2 | 384.9 | 1.00 | 2.64 | 9.4 |
| 16 | R2 | 175 | 2.0 | 1.075 | 104.7 | LOS F | 15.2 | 384.9 | 1.00 | 2.64 | 9.4 |
| Appr |  | 405 | 2.0 | 1.075 | 86.0 | LOS F | 15.2 | 384.9 | 1.00 | 2.36 | 9.8 |
| North: Pine St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 125 | 2.0 | 1.048 | 94.0 | LOS F | 14.3 | 364.5 | 1.00 | 2.59 | 10.2 |
| 4 | T1 | 205 | 2.0 | 1.048 | 94.0 | LOS F | 14.3 | 364.5 | 1.00 | 2.59 | 10.2 |
| 14 | R2 | 40 | 2.0 | 0.143 | 11.2 | LOS B | 0.5 | 12.8 | 0.95 | 1.21 | 29.5 |
| Approach |  | 370 | 2.0 | 1.048 | 85.0 | LOS F | 14.3 | 364.5 | 0.99 | 2.44 | 11.4 |
| West: W Main St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 40 | 2.0 | 0.076 | 6.5 | LOS A | 0.2 | 6.1 | 0.80 | 1.04 | 31.3 |
| 2 | T1 | 110 | 2.0 | 0.340 | 8.5 | LOS A | 1.3 | 32.8 | 0.76 | 1.10 | 26.7 |
| 12 | R2 | 135 | 2.0 | 0.340 | 8.5 | LOS A | 1.3 | 32.8 | 0.76 | 1.10 | 26.8 |
| Appr |  | 285 | 2.0 | 0.340 | 8.2 | LOS A | 1.3 | 32.8 | 0.77 | 1.09 | 27.6 |
| All V | cles | 1465 | 2.0 | 1.139 | 78.8 | LOS F | 19.8 | 502.2 | 0.95 | 2.32 | 11.4 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement. LOS F will result if v/c>1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010). HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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Transportation Planning Analysis Unit

| General Information |  |  | Passenger Car Equivalents |  |  | Rec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyst: | Joe Meek PE |  | bicycle | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1 | 1 |
| Agency | ODOT |  | medium | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Date: | 3/29/2018 |  | heavy | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | 2 | 2 |
| East leg: | 0 | South leg |  | 0 |  |  |
| Project: | RRTSP |  | Year: | 20yrs |  |  |


| Hour Volumes vph |  | Approaches |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | E | S | W |
| $\frac{n}{x}$ | N | 0 | 171 | 206 | 39 |
|  | E | 123 | 0 | 15 | 108 |
|  | S | 201 | 83 | 0 | 133 |
|  | W | 39 | 142 | 176 | 0 |

## Peak Hour Factor

| PHF |  | N | E | S | W |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{n}{x}$ | N | 0.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
|  | E | 0.95 | 0.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
|  | S | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.00 | 0.95 |
|  | W | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.00 |
| \# of Bicycles |  | Approaches |  |  |  |


| vph |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{n}{x}$ | N |
|  | E |
|  | S |
|  | W |
| \# of Med vph | Trucks |

Changes here do not go to Input tab.

| Roundabout Input |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 or 4 legs <br> Portion of an hour: |  |  | 4 |
| Peak hr 3 30 <br>   PM l |  |  |  |

10/14/15

| Pedestrian |  | Approaches |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| crossings per le | N | E |  |



| $\#$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Flow Rate | Approaches |  |  |



Proportion of Bicycle Approaches

| $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{b}}$ |  | N | E | S | W |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { யx } \end{aligned}$ | N | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | E | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | S | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | W | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |

Proportion of Medium Approaches

| $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{m}}$ |  | N | E | S | W |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{n}{x}$ | N | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | E | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | S | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | W | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Proportion of Heavy |  |  | Approaches |  |  |
|  |  |  | E | S | W |
|  | N | 0.000 | 0.023 | 0.019 | 0.026 |
| 0 | E | 0.016 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.019 |
| 区 | S | 0.020 | 0.024 | 0.000 | 0.015 |
|  | W | 0.026 | 0.021 | 0.023 | 0.000 |


| Output |  | Approaches |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | E | S | W |
| Contlict flow (veh/h) <br> Entry flow (veh/h) <br> Entry capacity (veh/h) <br> Pedestrian impedance <br> Leg v/c ratio <br> Control delay (sec/veh) <br> LOS | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | 421 | 443 | 284 | 428 |
|  | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | 382 | 416 | 417 | 295 |
|  | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | 721 | 703 | 829 | 718 |
|  | $\mathrm{f}_{\text {ped }}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | $\mathrm{xi}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | 0.53 | 0.59 | 0.50 | 0.41 |
|  | $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | 13.1 | 15.2 | 11.1 | 10.5 |
|  | n/a | B | C | B | B |
| HCM 95 ${ }^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (veh) | $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 |


| Int cntrl delay (sec/veh) <br> Intersection LOS | $\mathrm{d}_{\text {int }}$ | 12.62 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | B |

RRTSP
V/C OS8 D

| EBL | + | WBTR | 40 | + | 175 | + |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| WBL | + | EBTR | 320 | + | 110 | + |

$$
0.249+0.164=0.413
$$

$V / C \quad=\frac{150}{150-8} \quad[\quad 0 \quad+\quad 0.413]$

```
    145
                            3 6 0
```

165
$165=$ 595

2040 Bridge movements

about 40 homes below where bridge would be

3rd Street bridge
Wovements SB left 140
EB thru 155
WB right
SB right
approximately
\% uses 3rd \#cars

| 0.4 | 60 turned onto bridge | 80 remain |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 0.2 | 30 turn into lefts | 125 remain |
| 0.2 | 40 now use Pine | 160 remain |

$0.4 \quad 60$ turned onto bridge
80 remain
$0.2 \quad 30$ turn into lefts
160 remain

Pine and W Main

| EB left | 40 |  | 0.5 | 20 now turn on W Evans east side of bridge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB thru | 110 |  | 0.35 | 40 now use bridge | 70 remain |
| WB thru | 145 |  | 0.35 | 50 now use bridge | 95 |
|  |  |  |  | 10 right turns | 85 remain |
| WB right | 175 increses | to |  | 185 | 185 remain |
| SB left | 125 increses | to |  | 135 | 135 |
| SB thru | 205 increses | to |  | 220 | 220 |
| SB right | 40 |  | 0.5 | 20 now use bridge | 20 remain |
| $N B$ left | 180 reduces |  | 0.2 | 40 turned onto bridge | 140 remain |
| NB thru | 210 increases |  |  | 40 were lefts now thru | 250 remain |


| 7th Street bridge |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| movements | 2040 no build | \% uses 3 rd | \#cars |  |
| W Evans Creek and W Main |  |  |  |  |
| SB left | 140 | 0.15 | 20 turned onto bridge | 120 remain |
| EB thru | 155 | 0.05 | 10 turn into lefts | 145 remain |
| WB right | 200 | 0.05 | 10 now use Pine | 190 remain |
| SB right | 10 increases | to |  | 15 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Pine and W Main |  |  |  |  |
| EB left | 110 |  | 0.25 | 10 now turn on W Evans |

## No effects for a bridge further north



| Solution Element Curren | Current/Approx 2017 costs | Units | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROADWAY |  |  |  |
| New Pavement | \$85 | sq ft |  |
| Streetscape Peripherials | \$800 | ft | Assume for both sides |
| 2" Overlay (with Modernization) | \$7 | sq ft | In conjuction with otheı |
| 2" Overlay - Preservation Only | \$9 | sq ft | Maintenance only |
| Chip Seal | \$0.61 | sq ft |  |
| Slurry Seal Coat | \$0.26 | sq ft |  |
| Crack Seal | \$0.07 | sq ft |  |
| Guardrail | \$35 | ft | When slope is > 1:3 ( |
| Guardrail terminals | \$5,400 | ea | Assume 2 for each iso |
| Durable Striping | \$5 | ft | Lane lines, crosswalk s |
| Streetlights | \$6,100 | ea | assume 200' spacing |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |
| Bridge widening - single span | \$350 | sq ft |  |
| Bridge widening - multi-span | \$450 | sq ft |  |
| New bridge - up to 80 ft span | \$175 | sq ft |  |
| New bridge - from 80 to 175 ft span | \$250 | sq ft |  |
| Retaining wall | \$180 | sq ft |  |
| INTERSECTION |  |  |  |
| Urban traffic signal | \$1,000,000 | ea |  |
| Rural traffic signal | \$1,500,000 | ea |  |
| Single-lane roundabout | \$2,000,000 | ea |  |
| Multi-lane roundabout | \$3,000,000 | ea |  |
| Mini-roundabout | \$240,000 | ea | Assumes no ROW neє |
| Turn lane | \$300,000 | ea |  |
| Stop/Yield sign | \$350 | ea |  |
| MULTIMODAL |  |  |  |
| New crosswalk | \$5,000 | ea | Includes signs, stop bo |
| Ped- activated beacon (pair) | \$40,000 | pair |  |
| Pedestrian refuge with beacon | \$25,000 | ea | For crossings wider the |
| Enhanced crossing (complete) | \$100,000 | ea | Signing, marking, illum |
| Transit stop (sign+pole) installed | \$2,300 | ea |  |
| Transit shelter, installed stop (sign+pole) | \$23,000 | ea |  |
| Sidewalk, Islands, etc | \$11 | sq ft |  |
| ADA ramp | \$15,000 | ea | Per single ramp; inters |
| Multiuse path | \$16 | sq ft |  |
| Curb extension | \$27,000 | ea |  |
| Shared Lane/Bicycle marking | \$225 | ea | Assume 250' spacing |
| Demand-responsive or fixed route transit | \$60 | service hour per route |  |
| Paratransit service (req. for fixed route) | \$80 | service hour | Must use same service |
| SEISMIC |  |  |  |
| Site specific - below are Rogue River structures: |  |  |  |
| Hwy 1/ Depot | \$4,900,000 | ea |  |
| Hwy 1/Evans Creek | \$14,200,000 | ea |  |
| Hwy 1 /Foothills/CORP | \$26,000,000 | ea |  |

Need to show "math" for each solution documentation (subtotals and grand total) that

| Solution Element Current/Approx 2017 costs |  | Units | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROADWAY |  |  |  |
| New Pavement | \$85 | sq ft |  |
| Streetscape Peripherials | \$800 | ft | Assume for both sides |
| 2" Overlay (with Modernization) | \$7 | sq ft | In conjuction with other work |
| 2" Overlay - Preservation Only | \$9 | sq ft | Maintenance only |
| Chip Seal | \$0.61 | sq ft |  |
| Slurry Seal Coat | \$0.26 | sq ft |  |
| Crack Seal | \$0.07 | sq ft |  |
| Guardrail | \$35 | ft | When slope is > 1:3 ( $\sim 20$ degrees) |
| Guardrail terminals | \$5,400 | ea | Assume 2 for each isolated guardrail section |
| Durable Striping | \$5 | ft | Lane lines, striping, etc. (use for bike lanes if no pvt width needed)) |
| Streetlights | \$6,100 | ea | assume 200' spacing |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |
| Bridge widening - single span | \$350 | sq ft |  |
| Bridge widening - multi-span | \$450 | sq ft |  |
| New bridge - up to 80 ft span | \$175 | sq ft |  |
| New bridge - from 80 to 175 ft span | \$250 | sq ft |  |
| Retaining wall | \$180 | sq ft |  |
| INTERSECTION |  |  |  |
| Urban traffic signal | \$1,000,000 | ea |  |
| Rural traffic signal | \$1,500,000 | ea |  |
| Single-lane roundabout | \$2,000,000 | ea |  |
| Multi-lane roundabout | \$3,000,000 | ea |  |
| Mini-roundabout | \$240,000 | ea | Assumes no ROW needed, all work within confines of intersection |
| Turn lane | \$300,000 | ea |  |
| Stop/Yield sign | \$350 | ea |  |
| MULTIMODAL |  |  |  |
| New crosswalk | \$5,000 | ea | Includes signs, stop bars, markings |
| Ped- activated beacon (pair) | \$40,000 | pair |  |
| Pedestrian refuge with beacon | \$25,000 | ea | For crossings wider than two thru lanes |
| Enhanced crossing (complete) | \$100,000 | ea | Signing, marking, illumination, beacons etc. |
| Transit stop (sign+pole) installed | \$2,300 | ea |  |
| Transit shelter, installed stop (sign+pole) | \$23,000 | ea |  |
| Sidewalk, Islands, etc | \$11 | sq ft |  |
| ADA ramp | \$15,000 | ea | Per single ramp; intersection corner is \$30,000 |


| Multiuse path | $\$ 16$ | sq ft |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Curb extension | $\$ 27,000$ | ea |  |
| Shared Lane/Bicycle marking | $\$ 225$ | ea | service hour per route |$\quad$ Assume 250' spacing $\quad$ Must use same service hours/days as fixed route

Need to show "math" for each solution documentation (subtotals and grand total) that contains more than one of the above elements or uses a sq ft calculation.

Preliminary Design Unit And HHPR, Inc

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Project Name |  | Highway Number |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 号 | Highway Name |  | Posted Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | County/City |  | Maint. District | 2 A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Type of Project | Urban Non Freeway | Key No |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cost Complexity | High | Esimated By |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Preliminary Design Unit And HHPR, Inc
National Highway Construction Cost Index (NHCCI) 2.0
National
January 9, 2018

| YEAR | QUARTER | NHCCI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | January 9,2018


| YEAR | QUARTER | NHCCI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2003 | March | 1.0000 |
|  | Jone | 1000 | | 2003 | March | 1.0000 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | June | 1.0096 |
|  | September | 1.0240 |
|  | December | 1.0216 |
|  |  |  | |  | December | 1.0216 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2004 | March | 1.0459 |
|  | June | 1.1009 | | 2004 | March | 1.0459 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | June | 1.1009 |
|  | September | 1.1431 |
|  | D | 1.1492 | |  | Seplember | 1.1431 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | December | 1.1492 |
| 2005 | March | 1.2409 |
|  | Jane | 1.2814 | |  | June | 1.2814 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | September | 1.3718 |
|  | December | 1.4125 | |  | December | 1.4125 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2006 | March | 1.4486 |
|  | June | 1.5213 | |  | June | 1.5213 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | September | 1.6184 |
|  | December | 1.5527 |
|  |  | 1.5636 | | 2007 | March | 1.5636 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | June | 1.5612 | | June | 1.5612 |
| :--- | :--- |
| September | 1.5375 | |  | June | 1.5612 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | September | 1.5375 |
|  | December | 1.5143 |
| 2008 | March | 1.5686 | | 2008 | March | 1.5686 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | June | 1.6441 |
|  | September | 1.7848 |
|  | Den |  | |  | December | 1.6267 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2009 | March | 1.5000 |
|  | S |  |


|  | June | 1.4398 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | September | 1.4292 |
|  | December | 1.4026 |


|  | December | 1.4026 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2010 | March | 1.4419 |
|  | Jun | 1.438 |


|  | June | 1.4384 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | September | 1.4465 |
|  |  |  |


|  | December | 1.4300 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2011 | March | 1.4568 |


|  | June | 1.5006 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | September | 1.5412 |
|  |  |  |


|  | December | 1.5411 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2012 | March | 1.5769 |
|  |  | 1.527 |


| 2012 | March | 1.5769 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | June | 1.6270 |
|  | September | 1.5955 |


|  | Seplember | 1.5955 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | December | 1.6071 |
|  | Jarch | 1.5908 |


| 2013 | March | 1.5908 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | June | 1.6235 |
|  | Se |  | | September | 1.6448 |
| :--- | :--- | |  |  | September |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | December | 1.6448 |
| 2014 | March | 1.69318 | | June | 1.6699 |
| :--- | :--- | September 1.7351


|  | December | 1.6938 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2015 | March | 1.7198 |
|  |  |  |


|  | March | 1.7198 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | June | 1.7048 |
|  | September | 1.7063 |
|  | December | 1.6627 |


|  | December | 1.6627 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2016 | March | 1.6311 |
|  | Junc | 1.6779 |


|  | June | 1.6779 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | September | 1.6798 |
|  | December | 1.6534 |


| 2017 | December | March |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1.6534 |  |
|  | 1.6172 |  |


|  | 1.6854 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Notes. 1

Revised.
Preliminar
Source: Federal Highway
$3.10 \%$ per year
Long term inflation rate (as per Jack Svadlenak) =
1.08
$\begin{array}{ll} & 1.08 \\ & 1.04\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Mid } 2003 \text { to Mid } 2017 \text { cost factor }= & 1.04 \\ \text { Mid } 2012 \text { to Mid } 2017 \text { cost factor }= & 1.70\end{array}$
Mid 2012 to Mid 2017 cost factor $=\quad 1.16$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Short term }(5 \mathrm{yr}) \text { cost factor= } & 1.16 \\ \text { Medium term }(10 \mathrm{yr}) \text { cost factor }= & 1.31\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Medium term }(10 \mathrm{yr}) \text { cost factor }= & 1.31 \\ \text { Long term (20 yr) cost factor }= & 1.62\end{array}$

|  | December | 1.6627 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2016 | March | 1.6311 |
|  | June | 1.6779 |
|  | September | 1.6798 |
|  | December | 1.6534 |
| 2017 | March $^{1}$ | 1.6172 |
|  | June $^{2}$ | 1.6854 |
|  | September $^{2}$ | 1.7430 |

Notes: 1/
Revised.
$2 /$
Preliminar
y.

Source: Federal Highway
\% per year

## P1 West Main Street/Foothills Boulevard Sidewalk

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Build six foot sidewalks | sidewalk | 1625 | 6 | 2 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 214,500$ | Pine to W Evans |
|  | ADAramp |  |  | 58 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 870,000$ |  |
|  | sidewalk | 735 | 6 | 2 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 97,020$ | W Evans to Westbrook |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 1 8 1 , 5 2 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 1 8 2 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Create sidepath | path | 1625 | 10 | 1 | $\$ 16$ | sq ft | $\$ 260,000$ | Pine to W Evans |
|  | path | 735 | 10 | 1 | $\$ 16$ | sq ft | $\$ 117,600$ | W Evans to Westbrook |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 7 7 , 6 0 0}$ <br> $\mathbf{\$ 3 7 8 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Buffered Paved | pavement | 2360 | 9 | 2 | $\$ 85$ | sq ft | $\$ 3,610,800$ |  |
| Shoulder | stripe | 2360 |  | 6 | $\$ 5$ | per ft | $\$ 70,800$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 6 8 1 , 6 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 6 8 2 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |

## P2 E ast Main Street

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Build six foot sidewalks | sidewalk | 170 | 6 | 1 72 | \$11 $\$ 15,000$ | sq ft | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 11,220 \\ \$ 1,080,000 \\ \$ 1,091,220 \\ \$ 1,091,000 \end{array}$ | Total <br> Total |
| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| Create Sidepath | path | 170 | 10 | 1 | \$16 | sq ft | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 27,200 \\ & \$ 27,200 \\ & \$ 27,000 \end{aligned}$ | Total Total |

## P3 Pine Street/E Evans

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Build six foot sidewalk | ADAramp |  |  | 8 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 120,000$ |  |
|  | sidewalk | 4800 | 6 | 2 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 633,600$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 753,600$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 754,000$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Create Sidepath | path | 4800 | 10 | 1 | $\$ 16$ | sq ft | $\$ 768,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 768,000$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 768,000$ | Total |

## P4-6 Marked Crosswalks

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Install continental | crosswalk |  |  | 1 | \$5,000 | per | \$5,000 |  |
| crosswalk and | ADAramp |  |  | 2 | \$15,000 | per | \$30,000 |  |
| signing | sign |  |  | 4 | \$350 | per | \$1,400 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$36,400 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$36,000 | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Install pedestrian activated beacon and crosswalk | beacon ADAramp crosswalk |  |  | 1 2 1 | \$40,000 $\$ 15,000$ $\$ 5,000$ | for 2 <br> per <br> per | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \$ 40,000 \\ \$ 30,000 \\ \$ 5,000 \\ \$ 75,000 \\ \$ 75,000 \end{array}$ | Total Total |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Install pedestrian refuge | island |  |  | 1 | $\$ 25,000$ | per | $\$ 25,000$ |
| nites |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| island with beacon and | beacon pair |  |  | 1 | $\$ 40,000$ | for 2 | $\$ 40,000$ |
| crosswalk |  |  | 2 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 30,000$ |  |
|  | ADAramp |  |  | 1 | $\$ 5,000$ | per | $\$ 5,000$ |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | wider that 2 lanes |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 100,000$ |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |

## P7 North River Road Curb

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Build sidewalks \& | sidewalk | 4000 | 6 | 2 | $\$ 11$ | sq | ft |
| ADA ramps | ADA ramp |  |  | 6 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\mathbf{\$ 9 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 6 1 8 , 0 0 0}$ |
|  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Add street lighting | light | 4000 |  | 20 | $\$ 6,100$ | per | $\$ 122,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 2 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 2 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Improve pedestrian | refuge |  |  | 3 | $\$ 25,000$ | per | $\$ 75,000$ | need to widen for |
| crossings | beacon |  |  | 3 | $\$ 40,000$ | per 2 | $\$ 120,000$ | island space |
|  | ADA ramp |  |  | 6 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 90,000$ |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 12 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 4,200$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 8 9 , 2 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 8 9 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option D | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Create sidewalk and | sidewalk | 500 | 6 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 33,000$ |  |
| sidepath | ADA ramp |  |  | 6 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 90,000$ |  |
|  | path | 3400 | 10 | 1 | $\$ 16$ | per | $\$ 544,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 6 6 7 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 6 6 7 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option E | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Buffered Paved | pavement | 4000 | 9 | 2 | $\$ 85$ | sq ft | $\$ 6,120,000$ |  |
| Shoulder | stripe | 4000 |  | 6 | $\$ 5$ | per ft | $\$ 120,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 6 , 2 4 0 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 6 , 2 4 0 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |

## P8 Classick Drive

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Build sidewalks | sidewalk ADAramp | 2200 | 6 | 2 30 | \$11 $\$ 15,000$ | sq ft | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 290,400 \\ & \$ 450,000 \\ & \$ 740,400 \\ & \$ 740,000 \end{aligned}$ | Total <br> Total |
| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| Create sidepath | path | 2200 | 10 | 1 | \$16 | per | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 352,000 \\ & \$ 352,000 \\ & \$ 352,000 \end{aligned}$ | Total Total |
| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| Add street lighting | light | 2200 |  | 11 | \$6,100 | per | $\begin{array}{l\|} \hline \$ 67,100 \\ \$ 67,100 \\ \$ 67,000 \end{array}$ | Total Total |

## P9 3rd Street

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Build six foot sidewalk | sidewalk | 2400 | 6 | 2 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 316,800$ |  |
|  | ADAramp |  |  | 82 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 1,230,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 1,546,800$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 1,547,000$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Create sidepath | path | 2400 | 10 | ${ }^{1}$ | \$16 | per | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \$ 384,000 \\ & \$ 384,000 \\ & \$ 384,000 \end{aligned}$ | Total Total |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Add street lighting | light | 700 |  | 4 | \$6,100 | per | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 24,400 \\ & \$ 24,400 \\ & \$ 24,000 \end{aligned}$ | Total Total |

## P10 Pine Street Downtown

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Build six foot sidewalk | sidewalk <br> ADAramp | 300 | 6 | 2 6 | \$11 $\$ 15,000$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { sq ft } \\ & \text { per }\end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \$ 39,600 \\ \$ 90,000 \\ \mathbf{\$ 1 2 9 , 6 0 0} \\ \mathbf{\$ 1 3 0 , 0 0 0} \end{array}$ | Total <br> Total |
| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| Install crosswalks at Pine/Depot Street | crosswalk ADAramp |  |  | 3 6 | \$5,000 $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\begin{array}{r} \text { \$15,000 } \\ \$ 90,000 \\ \mathbf{\$ 1 0 5 , 0 0 0} \\ \mathbf{\$ 1 0 5 , 0 0 0} \end{array}$ | Total <br> Total |

## P11 Wards Creek Road

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Build six foot sidewal | ADAramp |  |  | 24 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 360,000$ |  |
|  | sidewalk | 600 | 6 | 2 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 79,200$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 3 9 , 2 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 3 9 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Create a sidepath | path | 600 | 10 | 1 | $\$ 16$ | sq | ft | $\$ 96,000$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 9 6 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 9 6 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |  |  |  |  |  |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Buffered Paved | pavement | 600 | 9 | 2 | $\$ 85$ | sq ft | $\$ 918,000$ |  |
| Shoulder | stripe | 600 |  | 6 | $\$ 5$ | per ft | $\$ 18,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 9 3 6 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 9 3 6 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |

P12 Safe Routes to School

| Sidewalk Option | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Ramps | Unit Cost | Subtotal |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a: West Evans Creek Rd south of |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Palmerton | 2000 | 6 | 2 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | 24 | $\$ 15,000$ | $\$ 624,000$ |
| b: 1st St: Broadway to Cedar St | 350 | 6 | 2 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | 8 | $\$ 15,000$ | $\$ 166,000$ |
| c: 2nd St Cedar to Ward Creek | 300 | 6 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | 4 | $\$ 15,000$ | $\$ 80,000$ |
| d: Berglund St | 700 | 6 | 2 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | 16 | $\$ 15,000$ | $\$ 332,000$ |
| e: Oak St | 1000 | 6 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | 26 | $\$ 15,000$ | $\$ 456,000$ |
| f: Cedar St | 1800 | 6 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | 34 | $\$ 15,000$ | $\$ 629,000$ |
| g: Robbins Ave | 500 | 6 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | 8 | $\$ 15,000$ | $\$ 153,000$ |
| h: Park St | 600 | 6 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | 22 | $\$ 15,000$ | $\$ 370,000$ |
| i: Gardiner St | 500 | 6 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | 14 | $\$ 15,000$ | $\$ 243,000$ |
| j: 4th St off of Berglund St | 350 | 6 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | 10 | $\$ 15,000$ | $\$ 173,000$ |


| Advisory Shoulder Option |  | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units |  |  | Subtotal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d: Berglund St | overlay | 700 | 12 | 1 | \$9 | sq ft |  |  | \$75,600 |
|  | stripe | 700 |  | 0.67 | \$5 | ft |  |  | \$2,345 |
|  | sign | 700 |  | 20 | \$350 | per |  |  | \$7,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$85,000 |
| e: Oak St | overlay | 1000 | 12 | 1 | \$9 | sq ft |  |  | \$108,000 |
|  | stripe | 1000 |  | 0.67 | \$5 | ft |  |  | \$3,350 |
|  | sign |  |  | 20 | \$350 | per |  |  | \$7,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$118,000 |
| f: Cedar St | overlay | 1800 | 12 | 1 | \$9 | sq ft |  |  | \$194,400 |
|  | stripe | 1800 |  | 0.67 | \$5 | ft |  |  | \$6,030 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | per |  |  | \$7,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$207,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$410,000 |


| Sidepath Option | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units |  |  | Subtotal |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| m: West Evans Crk Rd north <br> of Palmerton | 1500 | 10 | 1 | $\$ 16$ | sq ft |  |  | $\$ 240,000$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{\$ 2 4 0 , 0 0 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Notes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | Sidewalk Option | Estimate |
|  | a: West Evans Creek Rd south of Palmerton | \$624,000 |
|  | b: 1st St: Broadway to Cedar St | \$166,000 |
|  | c: 2nd St Cedar to Ward Creek | \$80,000 |
|  | d: Berglund St | \$332,000 |
|  | e: Oak St | \$456,000 |
|  | f: Cedar St | \$629,000 |
|  | g: Robbins Ave | \$153,000 |
|  | h: Park St | \$370,000 |
|  | i: Gardiner St | \$243,000 |
|  | j: 4th St off of Berglund St | \$173,000 |
|  | Advisory Shoulder Option | Estimate |
| Notes | d: Berglund St | \$85,000 |
|  | e: Oak St | \$118,000 |
|  | f: Cedar St | \$207,000 |

|Total

Total

| Sidepath Option | Estimate |
| :--- | :---: |
| m: West Evans Crk Rd north <br> of Palmerton | $\$ 240,000$ |


| Buffered Paved Shoulder Option | Estimate |
| :--- | :---: |
| m: West Evans Crk Rd | $\$ 2,340,000$ |
| Creek Rd <br> north of Palmerton |  |


| Bicycle lane | Estimate |
| :--- | :---: |
| p: Pine St: Depot - E Main St <br> Buffered | $\$ 417,000$ |

Total Notes

Total

## P13 OR99

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Build six foot sidewalk | ADAramp |  |  | 18 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 270,000$ |  |
|  | sidewalk | 3065 | 6 | 2 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 404,580$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 6 7 4 , 5 8 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 6 7 5 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |

## B1 Pine Street

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cos | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Convert paved shoulders <br> to bicycle lanes | stencil | 3000 |  | 24 | $\$ 225$ | per | $\$ 5,400$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 5 , 4 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 5 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cos | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Create full six foot | striping | 3000 |  | 2 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 30,000$ | move stripe a foot |
| bicycle lanes | stencil | 3000 |  | 24 | $\$ 225$ | per | $\$ 5,400$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 5 , 4 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 5 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Add a sidepath | pavement | 3000 | 10 |  | $\$ 16$ | sq | ft | $\$ 48,000$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | new path |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{\$ 4 8 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 8 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |

## B2 East Evans Creek Road

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cos | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Add bicycle lanes | pavement | 4800 | 1 |  | $\$ 85$ | sq ft | $\$ 408,000$ | travel lanes now 11 |
|  | striping | 4800 |  | 2 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 48,000$ |  |
| stencil | 4800 |  | 38 | $\$ 225$ | per | $\$ 8,550$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 6 4 , 5 5 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 6 5 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cos | Unity | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Add buffered bicycle l | pavement | 4800 | 7 |  | $\$ 85$ | sq ft | $\$ 2,856,000$ | widen shoulder |
| lanes | striping | 4800 |  | 2 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 48,000$ |  |
| stencil | 4800 |  | 38 | $\$ 225$ | per | $\$ 8,550$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 9 1 2 , 5 5 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 9 1 3 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Add a sidepath | pavement | 4800 | 8 |  | $\$ 16$ | sq | ft | $\$ 614,400$ |
|  | new path |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | guard rail | 4800 |  | 1 | $\$ 35$ | ft | $\$ 168,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 7 8 2 , 4 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 7 8 2 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |

## B3 West Main Street/Foothills Boulevard

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cos | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Add bicycle lanes | pavement | 1625 | 9 | 1 | $\$ 85$ | sq ft | $\$ 1,243,125$ | Pine to West Evans |
|  | pavement | 735 | 6 | 1 | $\$ 85$ | sqq | ft | $\$ 374,850$ |
| Bicycle Lane Stencil | West Evans to Westbrook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| striping | 2360 |  | 2 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 23,600$ |  |  |
|  | Marking | 2360 |  | 18 | $\$ 225$ | per | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 0 5 0}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 4 5 , 6 2 5}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 4 6 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | UnitS | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Add buffered | pavement | 1625 | 11 | 1 | 85 | sq ft | 1519375 | Pine to West Evans |
| bicycle lanes | pavement | 735 | 8 | 1 | 85 | sq ft | 499800 | West Evans to Westbrook |
|  | striping | 2360 |  | 6 | \$5 | ft | \$70,800 |  |
| Bicycle Lane Stencil | Marking | 2360 |  | 18 | \$225 | per | \$4,050 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,094,025 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,094,000 | Total |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Units | Subtotal | Notes |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Add a sidepath | pavement | 1625 | 8 | 1 | $\$ 16$ | sq | ft | $\$ 208,000$ | new path |
|  | pavement | 735 | 8 | 1 | $\$ 16$ | sq | ft | $\$ 94,080$ |  |
|  | guard rail | 2360 |  | 1 | $\$ 35$ | ft | $\$ 82,600$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 8 4 , 6 8 0}$ | Total |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 8 5 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |  |

## B4 East Main Street

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cos | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Create bicycle lanes | striping | 1000 |  | 2 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 10,000$ |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 1 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 350$ |  |
| 6' Bicycle Lane | Marking | 1100 |  | 8 | $\$ 225$ | en | $\$ 1,800$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 , 1 5 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Unitd | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Shared Lane Markings | Marking | 1100 |  | 8 | $\$ 225$ | ft | $\$ 1,800$ |  |
| Sharrows | sign |  |  | 5 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 1,750$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 5 5 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |

## B4 East Main Street

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cos | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Create bicycle lanes | striping | 1000 |  | 2 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 10,000$ |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 1 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 350$ |  |
| 6' Bicycle Lane | Marking | 1100 |  | 8 | $\$ 225$ | en | $\$ 1,800$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 , 1 5 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Unitd | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Shared Lane Markings | Marking | 1100 |  | 8 | $\$ 225$ | ft | $\$ 1,800$ |  |
| Sharrows | sign |  |  | 5 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 1,750$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 5 5 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Create six foot bicycle lanes | 部的iping | 3000 3000 |  | 2 24 | $\$ 5$ $\$ 225$ | ft per | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \$ 30,000 \\ \$ 5,400 \\ \$ 35,400 \\ \$ 35,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Total } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ |
| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| Create buffered bicycle lanes | striping <br> Stencil | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3000 \\ & 3000 \end{aligned}$ |  | 6 24 | $\$ 5$ $\$ 225$ | ft per | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 90,000 \\ \$ 5,400 \\ \mathbf{\$ 9 5 , 4 0 0} \\ \mathbf{\$ 9 5 , 0 0 0} \end{array}$ | Total <br> Total |


| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Create six foot bicycle lanes | 俍triping | 575 575 |  | 2 4 | $\$ 5$ $\$ 225$ | ft | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \$ 5,750 \\ \$ 900 \\ \mathbf{\$ 6 , 6 5 0} \\ \mathbf{\$ 7 , 0 0 0} \end{array}$ | Total <br> Total |
| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantit ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Unit Cos | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| Create buffered bicycle lanes | striping stencil | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 575 \\ & 575 \end{aligned}$ |  | 6 4 | $\$ 5$ $\$ 225$ | ft | \$17,250 $\$ 900$ $\mathbf{\$ 1 8 , 1 5 0}$ $\mathbf{\$ 1 8 , 0 0 0}$ | Total <br> Total |


| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Convert or create paved shoulders to bicycle lanes | pavemen striping stencil | $\begin{aligned} & 4000 \\ & 4500 \\ & 4500 \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 1 2 36 | $\$ 85$ $\$ 5$ $\$ 225$ | sq ft ft per | \$3,400,000 $\$ 45,000$ $\$ 8,100$ $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 4 5 3 , 1 0 0}$ $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 4 5 3 , 0 0 0}$ | Total <br> Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Create buffered bicycle | pavemen | 4000 | 14 | 1 | $\$ 85$ | sq | ft | 4760000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lanes | striping | 4500 |  | 6 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 135,000$ |  |
|  | stencil | 4500 |  | 36 | $\$ 225$ | per | $\$ 8,100$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 9 0 3 , 1 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 9 0 3 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cos | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Add bicycle lanes | pavement | 3300 | 5 | 1 | $\$ 85$ | sq | ft | $\$ 1,402,500$ |
|  | striping | 3300 |  | 2 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 33,000$ |  |
| Bicycle Lane Stencil | stencil | 3300 |  | 26 | $\$ 225$ | per | $\$ 5,850$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 4 4 1 , \mathbf { 4 5 0 }}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 4 4 1 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Add buffered bicycle | pavement | 3300 | 9 | 1 | \$85 | sq ft | \$2,524,500 |  |
| lane | striping | 3300 |  | 6 | \$5 | ft | \$99,000 |  |
| Bicycle Lane Stencil | stencil | 3300 |  | 26 | \$225 | per | \$5,850 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,629,350 | Total |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cos | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Create a sidepath | pavement | 3300 | 10 | 1 | $\$ 16$ | sq ft | $\$ 528,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 5 2 8 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 5 2 8 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option D | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Shared Lanes Markings | Marking | 3300 |  | 26 | $\$ 225$ | ft | $\$ 5,850$ |  |
| Sharrows | lighting | 3300 |  | 17 | $\$ 6,100$ | per | $\$ 103,700$ |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 32 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 11,200$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 0 , 7 5 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 1 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option E | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Shared Lanes Markings | Marking | 1800 |  | 14 | $\$ 225$ | ft | $\$ 3,150$ |  |
| Sharrows | lighting | 3300 |  | 17 | $\$ 6,100$ | per | $\$ 103,700$ |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 16 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 5,600$ |  |
| Add bicycle lanes | pavement | 1800 | 5 | 1 | $\$ 85$ | sq | ft | $\$ 765,000$ |
|  | striping | 1800 |  | 1 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 9,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 8 8 6 , 4 5 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 8 8 6 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Create a sidepath | pavement | 3065 | 10 | 1 | \$16 | sq ft | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \$ 490,400 \\ & \$ 490,400 \\ & \$ 490,000 \end{aligned}$ | Total <br> Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cos | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Create buffered bicycle | pavement | 3065 | 16 | 1 | $\$ 85$ | sq | ft | $\$ 4,168,400$ |
| lane | striping | 3065 |  | 6 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 91,950$ |  |
| Bicycle Lane Stencil | stencil | 3065 |  | 24 | $\$ 225$ | ft | $\$ 5,400$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 2 6 5 , 7 5 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 2 6 6 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cos 5 Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bicycle Lane | pavement | 3065 | 12 | 1 | 85 sq ft | $\$ 3,126,300$ |  |
| lane | striping | 3065 |  | 6 | 5 ft | $\$ 9,950$ |  |
| Bicycle Lane Stencil | stencil | 3065 |  | 24 | 225 ft | $\$ 5,400$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 3,223,650$ Total |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 3,224,000$ Total |  |  |

## T1 Infrequent Transit

| Option A | Item | Days | Hours | Hourly Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| On-demand service | dial-a-ride | 249 | 12 | $\$ 60$ | per | $\$ 179,280$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 7 9 , 2 8 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 7 9 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Days | Hours | Hourly Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cirulating route | fixed | 249 | 12 | $\$ 80$ | per | $\$ 239,040$ |  |
|  | paratransit | 249 | 12 | $\$ 60$ | per | $\mathbf{\$ 1 7 9 , 2 8 0}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 1 8 , 3 2 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 1 8 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |

Estimates based on weekday service with 12 hours a day.

## T2 Stop placement

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Change location to Ray's Food Place | shelter |  |  | 1 | \$23,000 | per | \$23,000 |  |
|  | sign |  |  |  |  |  | \$23,000 | Total |
|  | pole |  |  |  |  |  | \$23,000 | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Change location to | shelter |  |  | 1 | $\$ 23,000$ | per | $\$ 23,000$ |  |
| Umpqua Bank | sign |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 3 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |
|  | pole |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 3 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stay with Rogue River | existing |  |  | 0 | $\$ 23,000$ | per | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Community Center |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ | \$otal |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 | Total |

## OS3 Depot Street and Main Street

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Move Depot Street northbound left lane left of tree | sidewalk <br> sign <br> crosswalk <br> ADA <br> stripe | 75 $100$ | 6 | 1 2 2 4 1 | $\$ 11$ $\$ 350$ $\$ 5,000$ $\$ 15,000$ $\$ 5$ | sq ft <br> per <br> per <br> per <br> ft | $\$ 4,950$ $\$ 700$ $\$ 10,000$ $\$ 60,000$ $\$ 500$ $\$ 76,150$ $\$ 76,000$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Total } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Close northbound | sidewalk | 15 | 6 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq | $\$ 990$ |  |
| Oak Street access | sign |  |  | 1 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 350$ |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 1 | $\$ 5,000$ | per | $\$ 5,000$ |  |
|  | bulbout |  |  | 1 | $\$ 27,000$ | per | $\$ 27,000$ |  |
|  | ADA |  |  | 1 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 15,000$ |  |
|  | stripe | 15 |  | 1 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 75$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 48,415$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$48,000 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Close Oak Street | bench <br> sidewalk <br> sign <br> crosswalk ADA <br> stripe | 36 <br> 36 | 10 | 1 1 2 2 1 | $\$ 900$ $\$ 11$ $\$ 350$ $\$ 5,000$ $\$ 15,000$ $\$ 5$ | per sq ft per per per ft | $\$ 900$ $\$ 3,960$ $\$ 350$ $\$ 10,000$ $\$ 30,000$ $\$ 180$ $\$ 45,390$ $\$ 45,000$ | Total Total |
| Option D | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| Convert Depot Street to northbound one-way | sign <br> bulbout <br> stripe | 400 |  | 2 1 1 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 350 \\ \$ 27,000 \\ \$ 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { per } \\ & \text { per } \\ & \mathrm{ft} \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 700$ $\$ 27,000$ $\$ 2,000$ $\mathbf{\$ 2 9 , 7 0 0}$ $\mathbf{\$ 3 0 , 0 0 0}$ | Total <br> plus roundabout 240000 |


| Option F | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Close Depot Street | bench |  |  | 2 | \$900 | per | \$1,800 |  |
|  | sidewalk | 140 | 10 | 1 | \$11 | sq ft | \$15,400 |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 2 | \$350 | per | \$700 |  |
|  | stripe | 300 |  | 1 | \$5 | ft | \$1,500 |  |
|  | turn lane | 300 | 12 | 2 | \$300,000 | per | \$600,000 |  |
|  | siganl |  |  | 1 | \$1,000,000 | per | \$1,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,619,400 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,619,000 | Total |


| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Close Classick Drive | bench |  |  | 1 | $\$ 900$ | per | $\$ 900$ |  |
|  | sidewalk | 50 | 10 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 5,500$ |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 1 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 350$ |  |
|  | ADA |  |  | 1 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 15,000$ |  |
| stripe | 50 |  | 1 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 250$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 2 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 2 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cost | Unit 4 | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Close Depot Street | bench |  |  | 1 | $\$ 900$ | per | $\$ 900$ |  |
|  | sidewalk | 12 | 10 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 1,320$ |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 2 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 700$ |  |
|  | ADA |  |  | 2 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 30,000$ |  |
|  | stripe | 12 |  | 1 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 60$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 2 , 9 8 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 3 , 0 0 0}$ | plus 240000 roundabout |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Classick Drive | pave | 0 | 36 | 0 | $\$ 85$ | sq ft | $\$ 0$ |  |
| right in only | sidewalk | 12 | 10 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 1,320$ |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 2 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 700$ |  |
|  | ADA |  |  | 2 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 30,000$ |  |
|  | stripe | 12 |  | 1 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 60$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 2 , 0 8 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 2 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option D | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depot and Oak Street northbound one-way | sign stripe | 1700 |  | 5 1 | \$350 \$5 | per | $\$ 1,750$ $\$ 8,500$ $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 , 2 5 0}$ $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 , 0 0 0}$ | Total <br> Total |
| Option E | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cost | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| Pine, Depot, and Classick Drive one-way | sidewalk <br> sign <br> stripe | $\begin{gathered} \hline 90 \\ 900 \end{gathered}$ | 6 | 1 6 1 | \$11 $\$ 350$ $\$ 5$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { sq ft } \\ & \text { per } \\ & \mathrm{ft} \\ & \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\$ 5,940$ $\$ 2,100$ $\$ 4,500$ $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 , 5 4 0}$ $\mathbf{\$ 1 3 , 0 0 0}$ | Total Total |


| Option F | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pine Street | sidewalk | 50 | 6 | 1 | \$11 | sq ft | \$3,300 |  |
| through movement | sign |  |  | 4 | \$350 | per | \$1,400 |  |
|  | ADA |  |  | 5 | \$15,000 | per | \$75,000 |  |
|  | stripe | 200 |  | 1 | \$5 | ft | \$1,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$80,700 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$81,000 | Total |


| Option G | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pine Street | sidewalk | 90 |  | 6 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 5,940$ |
| through movement | sign |  |  | 4 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 1,400$ |  |
| Classick right | ADA |  |  | 5 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 75,000$ |  |
|  | stripe | 300 |  | 1 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 1,500$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 8 3 , 8 4 0}$ |
|  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 8 4 , 0 0 0}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Option H | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pine Street | sidewalk | 130 | 6 | 1 | \$11 | sq ft | \$8,580 |  |
| through movement | sign |  |  | 8 | \$350 | per | \$2,800 |  |
| no turn offs | ADA |  |  | 5 | \$15,000 | per | \$75,000 |  |
|  | stripe | 1000 |  | 1 | \$5 | ft | \$5,000 |  |
|  | pavement | 280 | 12 | 6 | \$85 | sq ft | \#\#\#\#\#\#\# |  |
|  | pave | 275 | 50 | 1 | \$85 | sq ft | \#\#\#\#\#\#\# |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 4 | \$5,000 | per | \$20,000 |  |
|  | bulbout |  |  | 5 | \$27,000 | per | \#\#\#\#\#\#\# |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#\#\#\#\#\#\# | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#\#\#\#\#\#\# | Total |

## OS5 Depot Street Interchange

| Option E | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Investigate interchange | plan |  |  | 1 | $\$ 750,000$ | per | $\$ 750,000$ |  |
| alternatives |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 7 5 0 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |
| separate refinement plan |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 7 5 0 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Align West Main Street | pave | 250 | 50 | 1 | $\$ 85$ | sq ft | $\$ 1,062,500$ |  |
| and East Main Street | sidewalk | 250 | 50 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 137,500$ |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 4 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 1,400$ |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 4 | $\$ 5,000$ | per | $\$ 20,000$ |  |
|  | bulbout |  |  | 4 | $\$ 27,000$ | per | $\$ 108,000$ |  |
|  | ADA |  |  | 8 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 120,000$ |  |
|  | stripe | 300 |  | 1 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 1,500$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 4 5 0 , 9 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 4 5 1 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Add SE corner | pave | 60 | 15 | 1 | $\$ 85$ | sq ft | $\$ 76,500$ |  |
| channelization island | concrete | 60 | 6 | 3 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 11,880$ |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 1 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 350$ |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 1 | $\$ 5,000$ | per | $\$ 5,000$ |  |
| ADA |  |  | 3 | $\$ 15,000$ | per | $\$ 45,000$ |  |  |
| stripe | 200 |  | 1 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 1,000$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 3 9 , 7 3 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 0 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Convert to a | Round |  |  | 1 | $\$ 250,000$ | sq ft | $\$ 250,000$ |  |
| Compact Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 5 0 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 5 0 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option D | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cost | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pine/Depot one way | sidewalk | 70 | 6 | 1 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 4,620$ |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 4 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 1,400$ |  |
|  | stripe | 700 |  | 1 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 3,500$ |  |
|  | signal |  |  | 1 | $\$ 1,000,000$ | per | $\$ 1,000,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 0 9 , 5 2 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 1 0 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |

## C2 Connectivity Over Evans Creek

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3rd Street bridge | bridge | 80 | 52 | 1 | \$175 | sq ft | \$728,000 |  |
|  | bridge | 145 | 52 | 1 | \$250 | sq ft | \$1,885,000 | one multi-span structure |
|  | sign |  |  | 3 | \$350 | per | \$1,050 |  |
|  | pavement | 1300 | 40 | 1 | \$85 | sq ft | \$4,420,000 |  |
|  | sidewalk | 1300 | 6 | 2 | \$11 | sq ft | \$171,600 |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 7 | \$5,000 | per | \$35,000 |  |
|  | light | 1300 |  | 7 | \$6,100 | per | \$42,700 |  |
|  | stencil | 1300 |  | 10 | \$225 | ft | \$2,250 |  |
|  | stripe | 1300 |  | 6 | \$5 | ft | \$39,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$7,324,600 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$7,325,000 | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7th Street bridge | bridge | 275 | 52 | 2 | \$250 | sq ft | \$7,150,000 | one multi-span structure |
|  | sign |  |  | 3 | \$350 | per | \$1,050 |  |
|  | pavement | 2200 | 40 | 1 | \$85 | sq ft | \$7,480,000 |  |
|  | sidewalk | 2200 | 6 | 2 | \$11 | sq ft | \$290,400 |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 6 | \$5,000 | per | \$30,000 |  |
|  | light | 2200 |  | 11 | \$6,100 | per | \$67,100 |  |
|  | stencil | 2200 |  | 16 | \$225 | ft | \$3,600 |  |
|  | stripe | 2200 |  | 6 | \$5 | ft | \$66,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$15,088,150 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$15,088,000 | Total |


| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cod | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Blue Ridge Drive | bridge | 80 | 52 | 1 | $\$ 175$ | sq ft | $\$ 728,000$ |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 2 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 700$ |  |
|  | pavement | 1000 | 40 | 1 | $\$ 85$ | sq ft | $\$ 3,400,000$ |  |
|  | sidewalk | 1000 | 6 | 2 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 132,000$ |  |
|  | crosswalk | 1000 |  | 6 | $\$ 5,000$ | per | $\$ 30,000$ |  |
|  | light | 1000 |  | 5 | $\$ 6,100$ | per | $\$ 30,500$ |  |
|  | stencil | 1000 |  | 8 | $\$ 225$ | ft | $\$ 1,800$ |  |
|  | stripe | 1000 |  | 6 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 30,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 3 5 3 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 3 5 3 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantit | Unit Cod | Unit | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| East of | bridge | 80 | 52 | 1 | $\$ 175$ | sq ft | $\$ 728,000$ |  |
| Blue Ridge Drive | sign |  |  | 2 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 700$ |  |
|  | pavement | 2500 | 40 | 1 | $\$ 85$ | sq ft | $\$ 8,500,000$ |  |
|  | sidewalk | 2500 | 6 | 2 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 330,000$ |  |
|  | crosswalk | 2500 |  | 6 | $\$ 5,000$ | per | $\$ 30,000$ |  |
|  | light | 2500 |  | 13 | $\$ 6,100$ | per | $\$ 79,300$ |  |
| stencil | 2500 |  | 20 | $\$ 225$ | ft | $\$ 4,500$ |  |  |
|  | stripe | 2500 |  | 6 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 75,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 9 , 7 4 7 , 5 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 9 , 7 4 8 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |

## C5 Grow with a Grid

| Option | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road for expanding | pavement | 2400 | 40 | 1 | \$85 | sq ft | \$8,160,000 |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 4 | \$350 | per | \$1,400 |  |
|  | walkwalk | 2400 | 6 | 2 | \$11 | sq ft | \$316,800 |  |
|  | crosswalk | 2400 |  | 5 | \$5,000 | per | \$25,000 |  |
|  | light | 2400 |  | 12 | \$6,100 | per | \$73,200 |  |
|  | stencil | 2400 |  | 18 | \$225 | ft | \$4,050 |  |
|  | stripe | 2400 |  | 6 | \$5 | ft | \$72,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$8,652,450 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$8,652,000 | Total |


| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Broadway Extension | pavement | 300 | 40 | 1 | \$85 | sq ft | \$1,020,000 |  |
| to Classick | sidewalk | 300 | 6 | 2 | \$11 | sq ft | \$39,600 |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 4 | \$350 | per | \$1,400 |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 4 | \$5,000 | per | \$20,000 |  |
|  | bulbout |  |  | 3 | \$27,000 | per | \$81,000 |  |
|  | light | 300 |  | 2 | \$6,100 | per | \$12,200 |  |
|  | ADA |  |  | 6 | \$15,000 | per | \$90,000 |  |
|  | stencil | 300 |  | 2 | \$225 | ft | \$450 |  |
|  | stripe | 300 |  | 6 | \$5 | ft | \$9,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,273,650 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,274,000 | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Broadway Extension | pavement | 300 | 40 | 1 | \$85 | sq ft | \$1,020,000 |  |
| to Depot | sidewalk | 300 | 6 | 2 | \$11 | sq ft | \$39,600 |  |
| park | sidewalk | 200 | 6 | 2 | \$11 | sq ft | \$26,400 |  |
| Classick | sidewalk | 250 | 6 | 2 | \$11 | sq ft | \$33,000 |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 10 | \$350 | per | \$3,500 |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 4 | \$5,000 | per | \$20,000 |  |
|  | bulbout |  |  | 7 | \$27,000 | per | \$189,000 |  |
|  | light | 750 |  | 4 | \$6,100 | per | \$24,400 |  |
|  | ADA |  |  | 18 | \$15,000 | per | \$270,000 |  |
|  | stencil | 300 |  | 2 | \$225 | ft | \$450 |  |
|  |  | 750 |  | 6 | \$5 | ft | \$22,500 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,648,850 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,649,000 | Total |

## C7 $7^{\text {th }}$ Street Extensions

| Option A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Extend 7th St | pavement | 1500 | 36 | 1 | $\$ 85$ | sq ft | $\$ 4,590,000$ |  |
| W Evans to C | sidewalk | 1500 | 6 | 2 | $\$ 11$ | sq ft | $\$ 198,000$ |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 2 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 700$ |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 2 | $\$ 5,000$ | per | $\$ 10,000$ |  |
| light | 1500 |  | 8 | $\$ 6,100$ | per | $\$ 48,800$ |  |  |
| ADA |  |  | 4 | $\$ 1,600$ | per | $\$ 6,400$ |  |  |
| stencil | 1500 |  | 12 | $\$ 225$ | ft | $\$ 2,700$ |  |  |
| stripe | 1500 |  | 3 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 22,500$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 4,879,100$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 4,879,000$ | Total |


| Option B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Extend 7th St | pavement | 650 | 36 | 1 | \$85 | sq ft | \$1,989,000 |  |
| Broadway to Pine | sidewalk | 650 | 6 | 2 | \$11 | sq ft | \$85,800 |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 2 | \$350 | per | \$700 |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 6 | \$5,000 | per | \$30,000 |  |
|  | light | 650 |  | 4 | \$6,100 | per | \$24,400 |  |
|  | ADA |  |  | 11 | \$1,600 | per | \$17,600 |  |
|  | stencil | 650 |  | 4 | \$225 | ft | \$900 |  |
|  | stripe | 650 |  | 3 | \$5 | ft | \$9,750 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,158,150 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,158,000 | Total |


| Option C | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Extend 7th St | pavement | 3000 | 36 | 1 | \$85 | sq ft | \$9,180,000 |  |
| Broadway to Scenic D | sidewalk | 3000 | 6 | 2 | \$11 | sq ft | \$396,000 |  |
|  | sign |  |  | 2 | \$350 | per | \$700 |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 2 | \$5,000 | per | \$10,000 |  |
|  | light | 3000 |  | 15 | \$6,100 | per | \$91,500 |  |
|  | ADA |  |  | 4 | \$1,600 | per | \$6,400 |  |
|  | stencil | 3000 |  | 24 | \$225 | ft | \$5,400 |  |
|  | stripe | 3000 |  | 3 | \$5 | ft | \$45,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$9,735,000 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$9,735,000 | Total |


| Option D | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Extend 7th St | pavement | 2500 | 36 | 1 | \$85 | sq ft | \$7,650,000 |  |
| Scenic to Tenney/ | sidewalk | 2500 | 6 | 2 | \$11 | sq ft | \$330,000 |  |
| Burbridge | sign |  |  | 2 | \$350 | per | \$700 |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 2 | \$5,000 | per | \$10,000 |  |
|  | light | 2500 |  | 13 | \$6,100 | per | \$79,300 |  |
|  | ADA |  |  | 4 | \$1,600 | per | \$6,400 |  |
|  | stencil | 2500 |  | 20 | \$225 | ft | \$4,500 |  |
|  | stripe | 2500 |  | 3 | \$5 | ft | \$37,500 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$8,118,400 | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$8,118,000 | Total |


| BR1A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Main St/Wards Creek Bridge |  | 100 |  | 2 2 | \$225 | per | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 450 \\ \$ 700 \\ \$ 1,150 \\ \$ 1,000 \end{array}$ | Too narrow to separate bicycles \& cars Total Total |
| BR1B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| Main St/Wards Creek Bridge | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { bridge } \\ \text { sign } \\ \text { path } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | 100 10 | 8 8 | 2 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \$ 250 \\ \$ 350 \\ \$ 16 \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l\|} \hline \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \\ \mathrm{per} \\ \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \$ 200,000 \\ \$ 700 \\ \$ 2,560 \\ \$ 203,260 \\ \$ 203,000 \end{array}$ | Too narrow to separate bicycles \& cars path:sidewalk to bridge <br> Total <br> Total |


| BR2A | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Classick Dr/Wards | Marking | 50 |  | 2 | $\$ 225$ | per | $\$ 450$ | Too narrow to |
| Creek Bridge | sign |  |  | 2 | $\$ 350$ | per | $\$ 700$ | separate bicycles \& cars |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 1 5 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| BR2B | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Classick Dr/Wards Creek Bridge | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bridge } \\ & \text { sign } \\ & \text { path } \end{aligned}$ | 50 10 | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | 1 2 2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \$ 175 \\ \$ 350 \\ \$ 16 \end{array}$ | sq ft <br> per <br> sq ft | $\$ 87,500$ $\$ 700$ $\$ 3,200$ $\$ 91,400$ $\$ 91,000$ | Too narrow to separate bicycles \& cars path:sidewalk to bridge <br> Total <br> Total |


| BR2C | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Classick Dr/Wards Creek Bridge | bridge | 50 | 24 | 1 | \$350 | sq ft | $\$ 420,000$ $\$ 420,000$ $\$ 420,000$ | Too narrow to separate bicycles \& cars <br> Total <br> Total |


| BR2D | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cos | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Classick Dr/Wards Creek Bridge | bridge | 50 | 50 | 1 | \$175 | sq ft | $\begin{gathered} \hline \$ 437,500 \\ \$ 437,500 \\ \$ 438,000 \end{gathered}$ | Too narrow to accommodate all modes Total |


| BR3 | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Costy Units | Subtotal | Notes |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I-5 Depot St |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 4,900,000$ <br> \$4,900,000 | Total |


| BR4 | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I-5 Evans Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 14,200,000$ | Seismically vulnerable |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 14,200,000$ | Total |

I-5 Foothills Blvd $\left|\left|\left|\left|\left|\left|\left|\begin{array}{l}\$ 26,000,000 \\ \$ 26,000,000\end{array}\right| \begin{array}{l}\text { Seismically vulnerable } \\ \text { Total }\end{array}\right.\right.\right.\right.\right.\right.$

## PV Pavement Conditions

| Project PV1 | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Broadway Street | crack seal | 3700 | 60 | 0.5 | \$0.07 | sq ft | \$7,770 |  |
| Resurfacing | stripe | 3700 |  | 1 | \$5 | ft | \$18,500 |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 8 | \$5,000 | per | \$40,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$66,270 | Total |


| Project PV2 | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Depot Street | Chip seal | 350 | 40 | 1 | $\$ 0.61$ | sqq | $\$ 8,540$ |  |
| Resurfacing | stripe | 350 |  | 2 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 3,500$ |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 3 | $\$ 5,000$ | per | $\$ 15,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 27,040$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 7 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


| Project PV3 | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wards Creek Road | Chip seal | 3000 | 30 | 1 | $\$ 0.61$ | sq ft | $\$ 54,900$ |  |
| Resurfacing | stripe | 3000 |  | 2 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 30,000$ |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 1 | $\$ 5,000$ | per | $\$ 5,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 89,900$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 90,000$ | Total |


| Project PV4 | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Foothill Boulevard | crack seal | 500 | 40 | 1 | $\$ 0.07$ | sq ft | $\$ 1,400$ |  |
| Resurfacing | stripe | 3000 |  | 2 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 30,000$ |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 1 | $\$ 5,000$ | per | $\$ 5,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 36,400$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 36,000$ | Total |


| Project PV5 | Item | Length | Width | Quantity | Unit Cost | Units | Subtotal | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| OR99 | overlay | 5500 | 25 | 1 | $\$ 9$ | sq | ft | $\$ 1,237,500$ |
| Resurfacing | stripe | 5500 |  | 3 | $\$ 5$ | ft | $\$ 82,500$ |  |
|  | crosswalk |  |  | 2 | $\$ 5,000$ | per | $\$ 10,000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 1, \mathbf{3 3 0 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 1, \mathbf{3 3 0 , 0 0 0}$ | Total |


[^0]:    ${ }^{2}$ Used due to 85th percentile speed in excess of 40 mph or isolated community with population of less than 10,000.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Used due to 85th percentile speed in excess of 40 mph or isolated community with population of less than 10,000.

