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## EXECUTIVE SUMMMARY

The services of DeShazo Group, Inc. (DeShazo) were retained by WRH Realty Services, Inc., to conduct a traffic impact analysis (TIA) for the proposed residential development in League City, Texas. The subject property will be located west of existing Bahia Cove Apartments located at 901 FM 517 Rd W in League City, Texas. The TIA also analyzed the impact of the proposed site if it were to be developed with gas station, bank, fast-food restaurant or shopping center. The TIA analyzed several combinations of land uses to provide a comparison of the impact due to the other specified land uses. The table below shows the land uses assumed for the comparison.

| Other Land Uses | Quantity | Buildout Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drive-in Bank | 2,500 SF | 2021 |
| Fast-food with Drive-Thru | $4,000 \mathrm{SF}$ | 2021 |
| Gas Station with Market | 10 Pumps | 2021 |
| Retail | 28,000 SF | 2021 |

The proposed project is planned to be fully constructed by 2021. Table $\mathbf{1}$ shows the development program summary for the site development.

Table 1. Development Program Summary

| Use | Quantity | Buildout Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Multifamily development | 78 dwelling units | 2021 |

The analysis of the traffic generated by the proposed development resulted in no significant impact on the local roadway system. Below is a summary of findings from this TIA.

FINDING: All the study intersections currently operate at LOS D or better during both the peak periods.
FINDING: All intersections analyzed for the full buildout condition in the study are expected to operate at $L O S D$ or better during the peak hour periods with the exception.

- Bahia Cove Driveway at FM 517: The SB movement is expected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour period. The highest $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue is expected to be about one (1) vehicle.

FINDING: The comparison of the impact considering the other land uses is provided on Page 13 under the LOS table. The results show that the SB movement on the proposed Driveway 1 at FM 517 that will serve Bahia Cove Phase 2 is expected to operate at $\operatorname{LOS} D$ under the proposed multifamily development. By comparison, the SB movement is expected to operate at LOS E or F for all the other general commercial land use combinations evaluated in this study. The analysis shows that the multifamily units have the least impact on the adjacent roadway system and intersections.

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Bahia Cove Driveway at FM 517: The SB movement is expected to operate an LOS E during the PM peak hour, but with the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue being less than one (1) vehicle. The expected queueing
is higher for this movement if the development were to consist of other land uses. The multifamily development has the minimum impact on this existing driveway. In Phase 2, there will be cutthrough traffic entering in and exiting out of the proposed Bahia Cove. The additional cut-through traffic is not significant enough to consider any major changes on the driveway.

Driveway 1 at FM 517: The proposed Driveway 1 is expected to operate at LOS D or better at site buildout conditions. The expected queue is not significant; therefore, no improvements are needed.

FINDING: Based upon the roadway link analysis, the proposed development has no significant impact on FM 517. The volume-capacity ratio increased by only 0.02 . For the purpose of this analysis and to be conservative, FM 517 was assumed to be a two-lane roadway with a divided median.

RECOMMENDATION: The proposed site has no significant impact on FM 517. No improvements are necessary due to the very low site traffic.

RECOMMENDATION: Based upon the projected volumes derived in this study, installation of an auxiliary deceleration does not meet TxDOT's threshold for the proposed site driveway.

FINDING: The distance between proposed Driveway 1 and the Bahia Cove Driveway will be less than 425 feet.

RECOMMENDATION: Driveway 1 is expected to operate at accepatble conditions at buildout conditions and beyond. An exception to the access criteria may be pursued with TxDOT to request a lower spacing requirement based upon the operational conditions. The estimated distance between Driveway 1 and the existing Bahia Cove Driveway is about 350 ft . The available distance is significant and a greater distance between the two driveways is not necessary due to the very low site traffic that will be generated by the existing Bahia Cove and future Bahia Cove Phase 2.

FINDING: Based upon a cursory review on Google Earth, the proposed site driveway meets the required intersection sight distance.

CONCLUSION: Based on a detailed comparative analysis, it is evident that the 78 multi-family units generate the lowest number of trips and also have the least impact compared to other land uses like shopping center, fast food restaurant, gas station etc. The Project's site-generated traffic can be accommodated with the existing roadway network. Therefore, it is DeShazo's recommendation that the site plan and the development program be approved.

END OF SUMMARY

## INTRODUCTION

The services of DeShazo Group, Inc. (DeShazo) were retained by WRH Realty Services, Inc., to conduct a traffic impact analysis (TIA) for the proposed residential development in League City, Texas. The subject property will be located west of existing Bahia Cove Apartments located at 901 FM 517 Rd W in League City, Texas. The proposed project is planned to be fully built by 2021.

A site location map and preliminary site plan are provided in Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2, respectively.

## PURPOSE

TxDOT is requiring that a TIA be completed for the subject site as part of permit application. The purpose of the TIA is to determine if any improvements to the adjacent transportation system are needed in order to maintain a satisfactory level of service, an acceptable level of safety, and appropriate access for the proposed development.

## TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS - METHODOLOGY

To achieve this objective, this analysis summarizes the traffic operational characteristics of the background conditions within a designated study area and the projected incremental impact of the Project as determined through standardized engineering analyses. The standard methodology used to conduct the traffic impact analysis is described below.

1. Collect current traffic volume data on a typical day throughout the study area to represent existing traffic conditions.
2. Apply growth factors to the existing volumes to project future background traffic at the site buildout year conditions.
3. Project traffic generated by the proposed development using trip generation, trip distribution and traffic assignment as described below.
a. Trip generation is calculated in terms of "trip ends" - a trip end is a one-way vehicular trip entering or exiting a site driveway (i.e., a single vehicle entering and exiting a site represents two trip ends).
b. Trip distribution and assignment of site-generated trips to the surrounding roadway system is determined by proportionally estimating the orientation of travel via various travel routes. This is a subjective exercise based upon professional judgment considering such factors as directional characteristics of existing local traffic; trip attributes (e.g., trip purpose, trip length, travel time, etc.), roadway features (e.g., capacity, operational conditions, character of environment), regional demographics, etc.
4. Determine site-plus-background traffic by adding the projected site-generated traffic to the background traffic.
5. Analyze existing, background and background-plus-site traffic volumes to evaluate the roadway conditions in the vicinity of the proposed development.
6. Recommend mitigation measures to improve roadway operational conditions, if needed, based upon the analysis.

## ANALYSIS SCENARIOS

This TIA analyzed the following peak hour periods that were considered the most critical conditions on the public roadway system related to the proposed Project. The proposed development is to be fully built by 2021.

## Roadway Intersections:

- Weekday: AM peak hour of adjacent street traffic (7:00-8:00)
- Weekday: PM peak hour of adjacent street traffic (5:00-6:00)

Development scenarios analyzed and considered in this analysis are summarized in Table 2.
Table 2. Development Scenarios Analyzed

| Scenario | Development Program | Traffic Volumes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2019 Existing | None Added | Existing 2019 Volumes |
| 2021 Background | None Added | Existing 2019 volumes grown at 3\% per <br> year for 2 years |
| 2021 Background + Site | Residential development | Existing 2019 volumes grown at 3\% per <br> year for 2 years plus site traffic |
| 2026 Horizon | None Added | Background 2021 volumes grown at 1\% <br> per year for 5 years |
| 2026 Horizon + Site | Residential development | Background 2021 volumes grown at 1\% <br> per year for 5 years plus site traffic |




## EXISTING AND PROPOSED LAND USE

The study parameters used in this TIA are based upon TxDOT requirements and are consistent with the standard industry practices used in similar studies.

## SITE LOCATION AND STUDY AREA

The proposed residential development will be located west of existing Bahia Cove Apartments located at 901 FM 517 Rd W in League City, Texas.

## Roadway Intersections:

- Bahia Cove Driveway at FM 517: Stop Controlled on Bahia Cove Driveway
- Driveway 1 at FM 517: Stop Controlled on Driveway 1


## EXISTING SITE AND DEVELOPMENT

The site is currently vacant. The proposed development will consist of 78 dwelling units. The estimated buildout year is 2021.

## EXISTING AND PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

## Thoroughfare System

- FM 517:
- Existing operation and cross-section: two lanes with TWLT, two-way
- Speed Limit: 50 mph (posted speed limit)
- Functional Classification: Major Arterial

A summary of the existing and proposed intersection/roadway geometries and traffic control devices are shown in Exhibit 3 and Exhibit 4.

## Existing Traffic Volumes

Current traffic volumes were collected during the analysis periods at the study area intersections on Wednesday, May 29, 2019. Traffic volumes are graphically summarized in Appendix A and detailed 15-minute-count data sheets are provided in Appendix B.

## Projected Background Traffic Volumes

Background traffic growth is defined as the normal traffic growth that is not directly related to the subject development of this study. Table 3 depicts historical traffic volumes near the site, from which DeShazo calculated an annual growth rate.

Historical traffic volumes in the area have fluctuated in the last several years. A growth rate of 3\% per year was used in this analysis until the buildout year (2021) and 1\% per year was used from 2021 to the 2026 horizon year.

Table 3. Historical Daily Traffic Volume Growth Trend

| I 30 FR WB ( East of S Buckner Blvd) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Volume | Growth Rate |  |  |
| 2017 | 18,653 | $0 \%$ |  |  |
| 2016 | 18,653 | $6 \%$ |  |  |
| 2015 | 17,661 |  |  |  |
|  | Average: |  |  | $3 \%$ |

Data Source: TxDOT

Future background traffic volumes estimated for the buildout years were calculated by applying the assumed growth rate for the study area intersections. These volumes are graphically summarized in Appendix A.

## SITE-TRAFFIC CHARACTERISTICS

Traffic generated by the Project is projected by first determining the number of trips generated by the planned land use, then distributing and assigning projected site-related trips to the roadway system.

## TRIP GENERATION

The Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual (10th Edition) is an accepted source for calculating trip generation for common land uses for which sufficient published data is available.

Trip generation is summarized in trip ends - a trip end is a one-way vehicular trip entering or leaving a site (i.e., one vehicle arriving and departing represents two trip ends). This analysis evaluates typical weekday AM and PM peak hour conditions of the local street traffic.

Table 4A provides a summary of the calculated trip ends generated by the project. Excerpts from ITE Trip Generation Manual data are provided in the Appendix section of this report. Tables 4B - 4G show the trips generated by the various combination of land uses that were analyzed. Supplemental information used in the trip generation calculations is provided in Appendix C.

Table 4A. Projected Trip Generation (Full Buildout)

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { ITE } \\ \text { Code } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ITE } \\ \text { Land Use } \end{gathered}$ | Quantity | Weekday Trips | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| 220 | Multi-family Housing | 78 DU | 549 | 38 | 9 | 29 | 47 | 30 | 17 |
|  |  | Subtotals: | 549 | 38 | 9 | 29 | 47 | 30 | 17 |
|  |  | Totals: | 549 | 38 | 9 | 29 | 47 | 30 | 17 |

Table 4B. Projected Trip Generation (Bank and Fast-food)

| $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { ITE } \\ \text { Code } \end{array}$ | ITE <br> Land Use | Quantity | Weekday Trips | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| 912 | Drive-in Bank | 2,500 SF | 250 | 24 | 14 | 10 | 51 | 26 | 25 |
| 934 | Fast Food with Drive-Thru | 4,000 SF | 1,884 | 161 | 82 | 79 | 131 | 68 | 63 |
|  |  | Subtotals: | 2,134 | 185 | 96 | 89 | 182 | 94 | 88 |
|  |  | Totals: | 2,134 | 185 | 96 | 89 | 182 | 94 | 88 |

Table 4C. Projected Trip Generation (Fast-food and Gas Station)

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ITE } \\ \text { Code } \end{gathered}$ | ITE <br> Land Use | Quantity | Weekday Trips | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| 934 | Fast Food with Drive-Thru | 4,000 SF | 1,884 | 161 | 82 | 79 | 131 | 68 | 63 |
| 945 | Gas Station w/Market | 10 Pumps | 1,528 | 119 | 61 | 58 | 139 | 71 | 68 |
|  |  | Subtotals: | 3,412 | 280 | 143 | 137 | 270 | 139 | 131 |
|  |  | Totals: | 3,412 | 280 | 143 | 137 | 270 | 139 | 131 |

Table 4D. Projected Trip Generation (Retail and Gas Station)

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ITE } \\ \text { Code } \end{gathered}$ | ITE <br> Land Use | Quantity | Weekday Trips | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| 820 | Shopping Center | 28,000 SF | 2,530 | 166 | 103 | 63 | 212 | 102 | 110 |
| 945 | Gas Station w/Market | 10 Pumps | 1,528 | 119 | 61 | 58 | 139 | 71 | 68 |
|  | O\% Pubtotals: |  | 4,058 | 285 | 164 | 121 | 351 | 173 | 178 |
|  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Totals: |  | 4,058 | 285 | 164 | 121 | 351 | 173 | 178 |

Table 4E. Projected Trip Generation (Retail and Bank)

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ITE } \\ \text { Code } \end{gathered}$ | ITE <br> Land Use | Quantity | Weekday Trips | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| 820 | Shopping Center | 28,000 SF | 2,530 | 166 | 103 | 63 | 212 | 102 | 110 |
| 912 | Drive-in Bank - Generator | 2,500 lanes | 250 | 24 | 14 | 10 | 51 | 26 | 25 |
|  |  | Subtotals: | 2,780 | 190 | 117 | 73 | 263 | 128 | 135 |
|  |  | Totals: | 2,780 | 190 | 117 | 73 | 263 | 128 | 135 |

Table 4F. Projected Trip Generation (Bank and Gas Station)

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | ITE <br> Land Use | Quantity | Weekday Trips | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| 912 | Drive-in Bank | 2,500 SF | 250 | 24 | 14 | 10 | 51 | 26 | 25 |
| 945 | Gas Station w/Market | 10 Pumps | 1,528 | 119 | 61 | 58 | 139 | 71 | 68 |
|  |  | Subtotals: | 1,778 | 143 | 75 | 68 | 190 | 97 | 93 |
|  |  | Totals: | 1,778 | 143 | 75 | 68 | 190 | 97 | 93 |

Table 4G. Projected Trip Generation (Bank and Gas Station)

| $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { ITE } \\ \text { Code } \end{array}$ | ITE <br> Land Use | Quantity | Weekday Trips | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| 820 | Shopping Center | 28,000 SF | 2,530 | 166 | 103 | 63 | 212 | 102 | 110 |
| 934 | Fast Food with Drive-Thru | 4,000 SF | 1,884 | 161 | 82 | 79 | 131 | 68 | 63 |
|  |  | Subtotals: | 4,414 | 327 | 185 | 142 | 343 | 170 | 173 |
|  |  | Totals: | 4,414 | 327 | 185 | 142 | 343 | 170 | 173 |

## TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

Traffic for the proposed development was distributed and assigned to the study area roadway network based upon the roadway network and regional travel flow [or existing traffic patterns]. Detailed trip distribution and traffic assignment calculations and results are summarized in Appendix C.

## SITE-GENERATED TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Site-generated traffic is calculated by multiplying the trip generation value (from Tables 4) by the corresponding traffic assignments (from Appendix C). The resulting cumulative (for all uses) peak period site-generated traffic volumes at buildout of the Project are graphically summarized in Appendix A.

## ROADWAY INTERSECTION ANALYSIS

## INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS - METHODOLGY

The level of performance of infrastructure can often be measured through an analysis of volume and capacity that considers various physical and operational characteristics of the system. For vehicular traffic, an operational analysis of roadway intersection capacity is the most detailed type of analysis. An industry-standardized methodology for this type of analysis is presented in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). HCM uses the term "level of service" (LOS) to qualitatively describe the efficiency using a letter grade of $A$ through $F$. Generally, LOS is described as follows.

```
\(\operatorname{LOS} A=\) free, unobstructed flow
LOS \(B=\) reasonably free flow
LOS C = stable flow
LOS \(D=\) approaching unstable flow
LOS \(E=\) unstable flow, operating at design capacity
LOS F = operating over design capacity
```

Traffic operational analysis is typically measured in one-hour periods during day-to-day peak conditions. In most urban settings, LOS C (or better) is desirable, although LOS D is considered to be acceptable. Nevertheless, periods of LOS E or $F$ conditions are not uncommon for brief periods of time at major transportation facilities. In some cases, measures to add more capacity-either through operational changes and/or physical improvements-can be identified to increase efficiency and sometimes improve the level of service.

For traffic-signal-controlled ("signalized") intersections and STOP-controlled ("unsignalized") intersections, LOS is determined based upon the calculated average seconds of delay per vehicle. For signalized intersections, the average delay per vehicle can be effectively calculated for the entire intersection. However, the average delay per vehicle for unsignalized intersections is calculated by only approach or by individual traffic maneuvers that must stop or yield right-of-way. For unsignalized intersections of a minor street or driveway and a major roadway, the analysis methodology often breaks down and yields low levels of service (often, LOS F) that cannot be mitigated unless a traffic signal is installed. However, for a traffic signal to be installed, the responsible agency that governs the right-of-way must issue its approval subject to very specific warrant criteria being met and several other operational considerations being satisfied. Neither level of service nor delay is considered a criterion for traffic signal installation.

The following table summarizes the LOS criteria for signalized and unsignalized intersections as defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual.

|  | Signalized Intersection <br> (Average Delay per Vehicle) | Unsignalized Intersection <br> (Average Delay per Vehicle) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| LOS A | $\leq 10$ | $\leq 10$ |
| LOS B | $>10-\leq 20$ | $>10-\leq 15$ |
| LOS C | $>20-\leq 35$ | $>15-\leq 25$ |
| LOS D | $>35-\leq 55$ | $>25-\leq 35$ |
| LOS E | $>55-\leq 80$ | $>35-\leq 50$ |
| LOS F | $>80$ | $>50$ |

NOTE: Signalized intersection operational parameters and operational results in this TIA were obtained directly from the optimized software output and may differ slightly from actual traffic signal operations.

## 2019 EXISTING - INTERSECTION ANALYSIS

Existing traffic volumes were analyzed to determine current operational conditions. Intersection capacity analyses presented in this study were performed using the SYNCHRO software package. Table 5 provides a summary of peak period intersection operational conditions. The detailed traffic volumes and software output for all intersection analysis are provided in Appendix A and Appendix D, respectively.

Table 5. Existing Intersection Analysis

|  |  |  | 2019 Existing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersections | Traffic <br> Movement |  | AM | PM |
|  |  |  | LOS Delay | LOS Delay |
| Bahia Cove Driveway at |  |  |  |  |
| FM 517 | EBL | $\stackrel{ \pm}{ \pm}$ | A (0.0) | B (12.0) |
|  | SBLR | 寺 | C (20.1) | D (31.9) |
| Driveway 1 |  |  |  |  |
| FM 517 | EBL | $\overline{0}$ | -- | -- |
|  | SBL | $\overline{\overline{0}}$ | -- | -- |
|  | SBR | $\stackrel{ \pm}{\Sigma}$ | -- | -- |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

Based upon the existing 2019 analysis, all study intersections are currently operating at LOS D or better during the peak hour periods.

Table 6. 2021 BACKGROUND AND BACKGROUND PLUS SITE - INTERSECTION ANALYSIS


Based upon the 2021 background and 2021 background plus site anlysis, all the study intersection operate at LOS D of better during the peak hour period with the exception of:

| For Housing Only | For Bank \& Fastfood | For Bank \& Fastfood | For Bank \& Retail | For Gas \& Fastfood | For Gas \& Retail | For Retail \& Fastfood |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Bahia Cove Driveway at FM 517: <br> The SB movement is expected to operate at LOS E during PM peak hour for background and background plus site conditions. | 1. Bahia Cove Driveway at FM 517: <br> The SB movement is expected to operate at LOS E during PM peak hour for background and background plus site conditions. | 1. Bahia Cove Driveway at FM 517: <br> The SB movement is expected to operate at LOS E during PM peak hour for background and background plus site conditions. | 1. Bahia Cove Driveway at FM 517: <br> The SB movement is expected to operate at LOS F during PM peak hour for background plus site condition. | 1. Bahia Cove Driveway at FM 517: <br> The SB movement is expected to operate at LOS F during PM peak hour for background plus site condition. | 1. Bahia Cove Driveway at FM 517: <br> The SB movement is expected to operate at LOS F during PM peak hour for background plus site condition. | 1. Bahia Cove Driveway at FM 517: <br> The SB movement is expected to operate at LOS F during PM peak hour for background plus site condition. |
|  | 2. Driveway 1 at FM 517: The SB left turn movement is expected to operate at LOS E during PM peak hour for background plus site condition. | 2. Driveway 1 at FM 517 : <br> The SB left turn movement is expected to operate at LOS E during PM peak hour for background plus site condition. | 2. Driveway 1 at FM 517: The SB left turn movement is expected to operate at LOS F during PM peak hour for background plus site condition. | 2. Driveway 1 at FM 517: <br> The SB left turn movement is expected to operate at LOS F during PM peak hour for background plus site condition. | 2. Driveway 1 at FM 517: <br> $\Rightarrow$ The SB left turn movement is expected to operate at LOS F during PM peak hour for background plus site condition. | 2. Driveway 1 at FM 517: The SB left turn movement is expected to operate at LOS F during AM and PM peak hour for background plus site condition. |
|  |  |  |  |  | The SB right turn movement is expected to operate at LOS E during PM peak hour for background plus site condition. |  |

## 2026 HORIZON AND HORIZON PLUS SITE - INTERSECTION ANALYSIS

A five-year horizon period and site buildout (build) was considered to account for additional traffic that may result from other potential development in the area. The LOS results are provided in Table 7.

Table 7. 2026 Intersection Analysis

|  |  |  | 2026 | orizon | 2026 Horizo | on Plus Site |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersections | Traffic Movement |  | AM | PM | AM | PM |
|  |  |  | LOS Delay | LOS Delay | LOS Delay | LOS Delay |
| Bahia Cove Driveway at | EBL SBLR |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (13.2) } \\ & \text { E (42.6) } \end{aligned}$ |
| FM 517 |  |  | A (0.0) | B (12.9) | A (0.0) |  |
|  |  |  | C (22.6) | E (39.0) | C (24.3) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Driveway 1 |  | ¢ |  |  |  | B (12.5) |
| FM 517 | EBL | 응 | -- | -- | A (9.4) |  |
|  |  |  | -- | -- | C (22.3) | D (32.0) |
|  | SBR | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ i \end{array}$ |  |  | B (14.4) | D (26.1) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Based upon the 2026 horizon and 2026 horizon-plus-site buildout analysis, all study intersections are expected to operate at LOS D, or better during the peak hour periods with the following exceptions.

- Bahia Cove Driveway at FM 517: The SB movement is expected to operate at LOS E during AM and PM peak hours for the 2026 Horizon and Horizon+Site conditions.


## ROADWAY LINK ANALYSIS - METHODOLGY

A roadway link is a roadway segment between two intersections. Roadway link capacity analysis is a comparison of actual or forecasted traffic volumes to the theoretically roadway capacity. The capacity of the roadway link is a function of the roadway's cross-section (i.e., number of lanes, lane widths, type of center divider, etc.). However, other more theoretical factors also apply, such as the character of environment and the functional classification of the roadway. Roadway link capacity is less critical than intersection capacity; however, it can provide a gauge of the utilization of given roadway.

A specific industry standard for roadway link capacity does not exist, but the typical concept is derived from a base saturation flow rate (i.e., the maximum theoretical rate of continuous flow under ideal, unobstructed conditions). In the traffic engineering industry, this value is generally considered to range between 1,900-2,100 vehicles per lane per hour). A series of adjustment factors are then applied to the saturation flow rate to reflect the characteristics of a given location.

The North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG), the metropolitan planning agency for the Dallas-Fort Worth region, has derived internal "hourly service volume" guidelines used for transportation modelling purposes. The NCTCOG values were based upon the principles presented in the Highway Capacity Manual with "regional calibration" factors applied. Though these per-lane capacities, or "Service Volumes" (summarized in the table below), are intended for modelling purposes, they do provide a reasonable gauge of theoretical capacity.

| Area Type | Hourly Service Volumes by Roadway Function |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Principal Arterial |  |  <br> Frontage Road |  |  <br> Local Street |  |
|  | Median- <br> Divided or <br> One-Way | Undivided <br> Two-Way | Median- <br> Divided or <br> One-Way | Undivided <br> Two-Way | Median- <br> Divided or <br> One-Way | Undivided <br> Two-Way |
| CBD | 725 | 650 | 725 | 650 | 475 | 425 |
| Urban/ <br> Commercial | 850 | 775 | 825 | 750 | 525 | 475 |
| Suburban <br> Residential | 925 | 8,75 | 900 | 825 | 575 | 525 |
| Rural | 1,025 | 925 | 975 | 875 | 600 | 550 |

To determine the utilization of a roadway, the volume to capacity ratio is calculated -av/c ratio of less than 1.0 indicates that the roadway is operating under capacity. NCTCOG's level of service denominations are as follows.

```
Volume: Capacity Ratio \leq45% is LOS A/B
Volume: Capacity Ratio > 45% and \leq65% is LOS C
Volume: Capacity Ratio > 65% and < 80% is LOS D
Volume: Capacity Ratio < 80% and \leq 100% is LOS E
Volume: Capacity Ratio \geq100% is LOS F
```


## ROADWAY LINK ANALYSIS - RESULTS

For purpose of the roadway link analysis, the area is considered suburban residential. The roadway link analysis is summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. Roadway Link Capacity Analysis Results Summary

| Roadway | Classification for Analysis | *Hourly Volume | \# LANES | MEDIAN DIVIDED? | CAPACITY |  | v/C | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Per Lane | Roadway |  |  |
| 2019 Existing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FM 517 (Between Existing Bahia Cove Drive and Driveway 1) | Major Arterial | 1,942 | 2 | Y | 925 | 1,850 | 1.05 | F |
| 2021 Background: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FM 517 (Between Existing Bahia Cove Drive and Driveway 1) | Major Arterial | 2,059 | 2 | Y | 925 | 1,850 | 1.11 | F |
| 2021 Background + Site: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FM 517 (Between Existing Bahia Cove Drive and Driveway 1) | Major Arterial | 2,087 | 2 | Y | 925 | 1,850 | 1.13 | F |
| 2026 Horizon: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FM 517 (Between Existing Bahia Cove Drive and Driveway 1) | Major Arterial | 2,164 | 2 | Y | 925 | 1,850 | 1.17 | F |
| 2026 Horizon + Site: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FM 517 (Between Existing Bahia Cove Drive and Driveway 1) | Major Arterial | 2,192 | 2 | Y | 925 | 1,850 | 1.18 | F |

Based upon the roadway link analysis, the following results were determined for FM 517.
FM 517:

- Currently operates at LOS F for the 2019 Existing conditions
- Expected to operate at LOS F for the 2021 Background and Background+Site conditions
- Expected to operate at LOS F for the 2026 Horizon and Horizon+Site conditions


## STTE ACCESS REVIEW

Intersection sight distance, driveway spacing and deceleration lane requirements were also evaluated as part of this TIA.

## INTERSECTION SIGHT DISTANCE

## INTERSECTION SIGHT CRITERIA:

Sight distance is the metric used to describe the ability of a motorist to physically see (via a direct line of sight) objects and/or other vehicles to a degree sufficient to allow safe and efficient use of a roadway in the intended manner. The sight distance is a function of the major roadway's geometric characteristics and $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed.

## INTERSECTION SIGHT DISTANCE REVIEW FOR PROJECT

A cursory review of the proposed driveways with Google Earth found that the proposed driveway satisfies the intersection sight distance criteria.

Table 9. Intersection Sight Distance Summary

| Intersections | Required SSD (Ft) |  | Provided SSD (Ft) |  | Meets <br> Requirements |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right Turn | Left Turn | Right Turn | Left Turn |  |
| Driveway 1 and FM 517 | 480 | 555 | $>480$ | $>555$ | Yes |

[NOTE: This does not rule out the potential that other impediments such and landscaping, signage, etc. may exist.]

## DRIVEWAY SPACING REVIEW

## TXDOT SPACING CRITERIA:

The TxDOT Access Management Manual provides guidelines for new driveways along roadways based upon the posted speed limit. Based upon Tables 2-1, 2-2 (Appendix E) from TxDOT's Access Management Manual, the minimum driveway connection spacing is 425 feet for a speed limit of 50 mph such as FM 517. TxDOT considers the spacing between access points as inside-edge-(of driveway pavement)-to-inside-edge.

- TxDOT's criteria for Other State Highway Connection:
- For 50 MPH: 425 feet


## LEAGUE CITY DRIVEWAY SPACING CRITERIA:

The driveway spacing parameters for the League City are summarized in the City's Access Management Policy. The City determines the driveway spacing distance from centerline spacing for driveways and from the edge of the property line when considering the distance from intersections. The City requires the following spacing relative to the Project.

- Minimum Driveway-Driveway Spacing:
- Major Arterial: 425 feet

DRIVEWAY SPACING REVIEW FOR PROJECT: A summary of the driveway spacing provided for each of the proposed site access points is presented in Table 10.

Table10. Driveway Spacing Summary

| Spacing Between | Required <br> (Ft) | Provided <br> (Ft) | Meets <br> Requirements |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Driveway 1 and Bahia Cove Driveway | 425 | $\sim 350$ | No |
| Driveway 1 and Nearest West Driveway | 425 | $\sim 425$ | Yes |

The proposed Driveway 1 doesn't meet TxDOT's Driveway spacing criteria with the existing Bahia Cove Driveway.

## DECELERATION LANE ANALYSIS

## DECELERATION LANE CRITERIA:

The TxDOT criteria for providing right-turn deceleration auxiliary lanes are outlined in Table 2-3 (Appendix E) of the Access Management Manual. The threshold for roadways with a posted speed limit greater than 45 MPH is 50 vehicles per hour (or, 60 vehicles per hour for posted speed limit of 45 MPH or lower). Additionally, Table 3-11 from the TxDOT Roadway Design Manual was used in the determination of left-turn deceleration auxiliary lanes.

A summary of the projected peak hour driveway volumes is included in Appendix A for each scenario analyzed.

## DECELERATION LANE RECOMMENDATIONS:

Based upon the projected volumes derived in this study, installation of an auxiliary deceleration does not meet TxDOT's threshold for the proposed site driveway.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The services of DeShazo Group, Inc. (DeShazo) were retained by WRH Realty Services, Inc., to conduct a traffic impact analysis (TIA) for the proposed residential development in League City, Texas. The subject property will be located west of existing Bahia Cove Apartments located at 901 FM 517 Rd W. in League City, Texas. The TIA also analyzed the impact of the proposed site if it were to be developed with gas station, bank, fast-food restaurant or shopping center. The TIA analyzed several combinations of land uses to provide a comparison of the impact due to the other specified land uses. The table below shows the land uses assumed for the comparison.

| Other Land Uses | Quantity | Buildout Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drive-in Bank | $2,500 \mathrm{SF}$ | 2021 |
| Fast-food with Drive-Thru | $4,000 \mathrm{SF}$ | 2021 |
| Gas Station with Market | 10 Pumps | 2021 |
| Retail | $28,000 \mathrm{SF}$ | 2021 |

The proposed project is planned to be fully constructed by 2021. Table 1 shows the development program summary for the site development.

Table 1. Development Program Summary

| Use | Quantity | Buildout Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Multifamily development | 78 dwelling units | 2021 |

The analysis of the traffic generated by the proposed development resulted in no significant impact on the local roadway system. Below is a summary of findings from this TIA.

FINDING: All the study intersections currently operate at $\operatorname{LOS} D$ or better during both the peak periods.
FINDING: All intersections analyzed for the full buildout condition in the study are expected to operate at $L O S D$ or better during the peak hour periods with the exception.

- Bahia Cove Driveway at FM 517: The SB movement is expected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour period. The highest $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue is expected to be about one (1) vehicle.

FINDING: The comparison of the impact considering the other land uses is provided on Page 13 under the LOS table. The results show that the SB movement on the proposed Driveway 1 at FM 517 that will serve Bahia Cove Phase 2 is expected to operate at $\operatorname{LOS} D$ under the proposed multifamily development. By comparison, the SB movement is expected to operate at LOS E or F for all the other general commercial land use combinations evaluated in this study. The analysis shows that the multifamily units have the least impact on the adjacent roadway system and intersections.

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Bahia Cove Driveway at FM 517: The SB movement is expected to operate an LOS E during the PM peak hour, but with the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue being less than one (1) vehicle. The expected queueing is higher for this movement if the development were to consist of other land uses. The multifamily
development has the minimum impact on this existing driveway. In Phase 2, there will be cutthrough traffic entering in and exiting out of the proposed Bahia Cove. The additional cut-through traffic is not significant enough to consider any major changes on the driveway.

Driveway 1 at FM 517: The proposed Driveway 1 is expected to operate at LOS D or better at site buildout conditions. The expected queue is not significant; therefore, no improvements are needed.

FINDING: Based upon the roadway link analysis, the proposed development has no significant impact on FM 517. The volume-capacity ratio increased by only 0.02 . For the purpose of this analysis and to be conservative, FM 517 was assumed to be a two-lane roadway with a divided median.

RECOMMENDATION: The proposed site has no significant impact on FM 517. No improvements are necessary due to the very low site traffic.

RECOMMENDATION: Based upon the projected volumes derived in this study, installation of an auxiliary deceleration does not meet TxDOT's threshold for the proposed site driveway.

FINDING: The distance between proposed Driveway 1 and the Bahia Cove Driveway will be less than 425 feet.

RECOMMENDATION: Driveway 1 is expected to operate at accepatble conditions at buildout conditions and beyond. An exception to the access criteria may be pursued with TxDOT to request a lower spacing requirement based upon the operational conditions. The estimated distance between Driveway 1 and the existing Bahia Cove Driveway is about 350 ft . The available distance is significant and a greater distance between the two driveways is not necessary due to the very low site traffic that will be generated by the existing Bahia Cove and future Bahia Cove Phase 2.

FINDING: Based upon a cursory review on Google Earth, the proposed site driveway meets the required intersection sight distance.

CONCLUSION: Based on a detailed comparative analysis, it is evident that the 78 multi-family units generate the lowest number of trips and also have the least impact compared to other land uses like shopping center, fast food restaurant, gas station etc. The Project's site-generated traffic can be accommodated with the existing roadway network. Therefore, it is DeShazo's recommendation that the site plan and the development program be approved.

END OF MEMO



## Appendix A. Traffic Volume Exhibits
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## Appendix B. Existing Traffic Count Data



## Appendix C. Site-Generated Traffic Supplement





Appendix D. Detailed Intersection Capacity Analysis Results
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, siveh | 2.7 |  |  | WBR | SBL |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT |  |  | SBR |  |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\dagger$ |  | * | F |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, velVh | 38 | 848 | 1213 | 64 | 68 | 41 |  |  |
| Future Vol, vehh | 38 | 848 | 1213 | 64 | 68 | 41 |  |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |  |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, | , \# | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |  |  |
| Grade, \% | - | o | 0 | - | 0 | - |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Munt How | 41 | 922 | 1318 | 70 | 74 | 45 |  |  |
| Major/Minor Mander | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Aow All | 1388 | 0 | - | 0 | 2357 | 1353 |  |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 1353 | - |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 1004 | - |  |  |
| Critical Howy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |  |  |
| Critical Howy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |  |  |
| Critical Howy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |  |  |
| Follow-up Havy | 2.218 | - | - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |  |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Manewer | 493 | - | - | - | -39 | 183 |  |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 241 | - |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 354 | - |  |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Manewner | 493 | - | - | - | -32 | 183 |  |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Manewer | - | - | - | - | 130 | - |  |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 200 | - |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 354 | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.6 |  | 0 |  | 51.6 |  |  |  |
| HCMLOS |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mmit |  | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBLn1S | BLn2 |  |
| Capacity (vehlh) |  | 493 | - | - | - | 130 | 183 |  |
| HCMLane V/C Ratio |  | 0.084 | - | - | - | 0.569 | 0.244 |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 13 | - | - | - | 64.1 | 30.9 |  |
| HCMLane LOS |  | B | - | - | - | F | D |  |
| HCM 95th \% dile Q(veh) |  | 0.3 | - | - | - | 2.8 | 0.9 |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -: Volume exceeds capacity |  | \$: Delay exceeds 300s |  |  |  | +: Comp | utation Not Defined | *: All major volume in platoon |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Appendix E. TxDOT Deceleration Lane Criteria


Figure 2-3. Frontage Road U-Turn Spacing Diagram

Table 2-1: Frontage Road Connection Spacing Criteria

| Minimum Connection Spacing Criteria for Frontage Roads ${ }^{(1)(2)}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Minimum Connection Spacing (feet) |  |
| Posted Speed (mph) | One-Way Frontage Roads | Two-Way Frontage Roads |
| $\leq 30$ | 200 | 200 |
| 35 | 250 | 300 |
| 40 | 305 | 360 |
| 45 | 360 | 435 |
| $\geq 50$ | 425 | 510 |
| (1) Distances are for passenger cars on level grade. These distances may be adjusted for downgrades and/or significant truck traffic. Where present or projected traffic operations indicate specific needs, consideration may be given to intersection sight distance and operational gap acceptance measurement adjustments. <br> (2) When these values are not attainable, refer to the variance process as described in Chapter 2, Section 5. |  |  |

## Other State System Highways

This section applies to all state highway system routes that are not new highways on new alignments, freeway mainlanes, or frontage roads.

Table 2-2 provides minimum connection spacing criteria for other state system highways. However, a lesser connection spacing than set forth in this document may be allowed without variance in the situations described in Chapter 2, Section 5.

Table 2-2 does not apply to rural highways outside of metropolitan planning organization boundaries where there is little, if any, potential for development with current ADT volumes below 2000. For those highways, access location and design will be evaluated based on safety and traffic operation considerations. Such considerations may include traffic volumes, posted speed, turning volumes, presence or absence of shoulders, and roadway geometrics.

Table 2-2: Other State Highways Connection Spacing Criteria

| Other State Highways Minimum Connection Spacing ${ }^{(1)(2)(3)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Posted Speed (mph) | Distance (ft) |
| $\leq 30$ | 200 |
| 35 | 250 |
| 40 | 305 |
| 45 | 360 |
| 20 |  |

Corner clearance refers to the separation of access connections from roadway intersections. Table 2-2 provides minimum corner clearance criteria.

Where adequate access connection spacing cannot be achieved, the permitting authority may allow for a lesser spacing when shared access is established with an abutting property. Where no other alternatives exist, construction of an access connection may be allowed along the property line farthest from the intersection. To provide reasonable access under these conditions but also provide the safest operation, consideration should be given to designing the driveway connection to allow only the right-in turning movement or only the right-in/right out turning movements if feasible.

## Auxiliary Lanes

This subsection describes the basic use and functional criteria associated with auxiliary lanes. Auxiliary lanes consist of left-turn and right-turn movements, deceleration, acceleration, and their associated transitions and storage requirements. Left-turn movements may pose challenges at driveways and street intersections. They may increase conflicts, delays, and crashes and often complicate traffic signal timing. These problems are especially acute at major highway intersections
where heavy left-turn movements take place, but also occur where left-turn movements enter or leave driveways serving adjacent land development. As with left-turn movements, right-turn movements pose problems at both driveways and street intersections. Right-turn movements increase conflicts, delays, and crashes, particularly where a speed differential of 10 mph or more exists between the speed of through traffic and the vehicles that are turning right.

Table 2-3 presents thresholds for auxiliary lanes. These thresholds represent examples of where left turn and right turn lanes should be considered. Refer to the TxDOT Roadway Design Manual, Chapter 3, for proper acceleration and deceleration lengths.

Table 2-3: Auxiliary Lane Thresholds

| Median Type | Left Turn to or from Property |  | Right Turn to or from Property (5) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

(1) Refer to Table 3-11, TxDOT Roadway Design Manual, for alternative left-turn-bay operational considerations.
(2) A left-turn acceleration lane may be required if it would provide a benefit to the safety and operation of the roadway. A left-turn acceleration lane would interfere with the left-turn ingress movements to any other access connection.
(3) Additional right-turn considerations:

- Conditions for providing an exclusive right-turn lane when the right-turn traffic volume projections are less than indicated in Table 2-3:
- High crash experience
- Heavier than normal peak flow movements on the main roadway
- Large volume of truck traffic
- Highways where sight distance is limited
- Conditions for NOT requiring a right-turn lane where right-turn volumes are more than indicated in Table 2-3:
- Dense or built-out corridor where space is limited
- Where queues of stopped vehicles would block the access to the right turn lane
- Where sufficient length of property width is not available for the appropriate design
(4) The acceleration lane should not interfere with any downstream access connection.
- The distance from the end of the acceleration lane taper to the next unsignalized downstream access connection should be equal to or greater than the distances found in Table 2-2.
- Additionally, if the next access connection is signalized, the distance from the end of the acceleration lane taper to the back of the 90th percentile queue should be greater than or equal to the distances found Table 2-2.
(5) Continuous right-turn lanes can provide mobility benefits both for through movements and for the turning vehicles. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Access connections within a continuous right turn lane should meet the spacing requirements found in Table 22. However, when combined with crossing left in movements, a continuous right-turn lane can introduce additional operational conflicts.

Table 3-11: Guide for Left-Turn Lanes on Two-Lane Highways

| Opposing Volume (vph) | Advancing Volume (vph) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 5 \% Left Turns | 10 \% Left Turns | 20 \% Left Turns | 30 \% Left Turns |
| 40 mph [60 km/h] Design Speed |  |  |  |  |
| 800 | 330 | 240 | 180 | 160 |
| 600 | 410 | 305 | 225 | 200 |
| 400 | 510 | 380 | 275 | 245 |
| 200 | 640 | 470 | 350 | 305 |
| 100 | 720 | 515 | 390 | 340 |
| 50 mph [80 km/h] Design Speed |  |  |  |  |
| 800 | 280 | 210 | 165 | 135 |
| 600 | 350 | 260 | 195 | 170 |
| 400 | 430 | 320 | 240 | 210 |
| 200 | 550 | 400 | 300 | 270 |
| 100 | 615 | 445 | 335 | 295 |
| 60 mph [100 km/h] Design Speed |  |  |  |  |
| 800 | 230 | 170 | 125 | 115 |
| 600 | 290 | 210 | 160 | 140 |
| 400 | 365 | 270 | 200 | 175 |
| 200 | 450 | 330 | 250 | 215 |
| 100 | 505 | 370 | 275 | 240 |

Right-Turn Deceleration Lanes. Shoulders 10 ft [ 3.0 m ] wide alongside the traffic lanes generally provide sufficient area for acceleration or deceleration of right-turning vehicles. Where the right turn lane is being constructed in addition to the through lanes and shoulders, the minimum right turn lane width is 10 ft [ 3.0 m ] with a 2 ft [ 0.6 m ] surfaced shoulder. Where speed change lanes are used, they should be provided symmetrically along both sides of the highway for both directions of traffic, thus presenting drivers with a balanced section.

A deceleration-acceleration lane on one side of a two-lane highway, such as at a "tee" intersection, results in the appearance of a three-lane highway and may result in driver confusion. In this regard, right-turn speed change lanes are generally inappropriate for "tee" intersection design except where a four lane ( 2 through, 1 median left turn, 1 right acceleration/deceleration) section is provided.
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