

Following submittal of the Riverview Meadows Traffic Impact Study dated October 7, 2022, a question was raised regarding whether the proposed development would operate safely and efficiently if only the existing (northerly) access formed by River View Meadows Lane was utilized for site access. This supplemental analysis memorandum is written to provide updated analysis and recommendations for this "single-access" development scenario.

This updated analysis assumes that the "South Site Access" will remain in place, but that site trips from the proposed development will not access this existing roadway. Rather, the southerly access would serve existing users and emergency access only. As such, all site trips from the 20 homes which will completed within Phase 1 as well as the future trips associated with the 74 homes within Phases 2 and 3 were assumed to exclusively use River View Meadows Lane for access under this analysis scenario.

A diagram showing the assignment of site trips from the future homes within the proposed Phase 2 and 3 development is provided in Figure 1 of the attached technical appendix. Figures 2 and 3 show the projected turning movement volumes at the study intersections under year 2025 background conditions and year 2025 background plus site trips conditions respectively, again assuming a single point of access for the proposed development.

OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS UPDATE

The operational analysis for the updated traffic volumes was again conducted using Synchro 11 software, with outputs based on the methodologies identified in the *HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL*, 6th Edition, published by the Transportation Research Board.

The results of the operational analysis are summarized in Table 3 on the following page. Detailed analysis worksheets are also included in the technical appendix.



Riverview Meadows - Single Access Update October 13, 2022 Page 2 of 3

Intersection	AM	1 Peak Ho	our	PN	1 Peak Ho	our
Intersection	Delay	LOS	v/c	Delay	LOS	v/c
Northfork Rd at South Site Access						
2025 Background Conditions	8.9	А	0.01	8.6	А	0.01
2025 Background plus Site	9.1	А	0.01	8.7	А	0.01
Northfork Rd at McDonald Dike Rd		Sector Sec				
2025 Background Conditions	9.2	А	0.03	9.2	А	0.04
2025 Background Plus Site	9.5	А	0.04	9.5	А	0.05
Northfork Rd at Riverview Meadows Ln						
2025 Background Conditions	8.8	А	0.02	8.6	А	0.01
2025 Background plus Site	9.0	А	0.07	8.8	А	0.04

Table 3 - Operational Analysis Summary: Year 2025 Future Conditions

Based on the results of the updated operational analysis, again the study intersections are projected to operate acceptably with a single point of access either with or without the addition of site trips from the proposed development. This result is not surprising given that the intersections are projected to operate at well below 10 percent of capacity, indicating that there will be no vehicles waiting to make turning movements during the vast majority of the peak hours. No operational mitigations are necessary or recommended in conjunction with the single-access scenario for the proposed development.

WARRANT ANALYSIS UPDATE

The traffic signal and turn-lane warrants analyses were also updated for the study intersections. Based on the updated analysis, again no traffic signal or turn lane warrants are projected to be satisfied upon completion of the proposed development. Accordingly, no new traffic signals or turn lanes are recommended. Detailed analysis worksheets are included in the attached technical appendix.

OPERATIONAL IMPACTS OF SIGHT DISTANCE UPDATE

The calculated delays associated with limited sight lines at the site access intersection remain applicable when considering analysis with a single point of access. Since the delays are a function of sight distance and roadway geometry, the maximum induced delay would remain at 1.07 seconds per vehicle when a conflict occurs.

Based on the increased volume of traffic entering Northfork Road from River View Meadows Lane as well as the traffic volumes on Northfork Road, the expected total induced delay per day would be approximately 4 seconds per day. The total induced delays remain very low because the amount of induced delay per vehicle is low (between 0.0 and 1.07 seconds) and because the odds of a conflict



Riverview Meadows - Single Access Update October 13, 2022 Page 3 of 3

occurring with a vehicle just beyond the limits of the available sight distance are also low (approximately 1.5 percent of exiting vehicles would be expected to turn onto Northfork Road while a vehicle is approaching and may be subject to delay.

Based on the negligible calculated induced delays of 4 seconds per day, again any requirement for mitigation for the limited sight distance would be expected to result in costs exceeding the resulting benefits. Accordingly, the available intersection sight distance is adequate for the River View Meadows Lane approach to Northfork Road and no operational or safety mitigations are recommended.

LOCAL STREET TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Using a single point of access, the projected traffic volumes on River View Meadows Lane would be expected to increase as compared to a two-access scenario. Based on the updated analysis, the average daily traffic volume on this roadway is projected to be 940 vehicles per day if River View Meadows Lane is the only roadway that serves daily traffic traveling to and from the proposed development. This traffic volume remains within the nominal capacity of a local residential queueing street since it is fewer than 1,000 vehicles per day.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the updated operational analysis, the study intersections are again projected to continue to operate acceptably under year 2025 traffic conditions with the addition of all site trips from the proposed development using River View Meadows Lane for site access.

Based on the updated warrant analysis, again no new traffic signals or turn lanes are recommended in conjunction with the proposed development.

The available sight distances remain adequate to ensure safe operation of the area intersections. Delays to through traffic on Northfork Road at River View Meadows Lane would be projected to increase from 3 seconds per day to 4 seconds per day if River View Meadows Lane serves as the sole access for the proposed development. Regardless, the delays to through traffic remain negligible. Accordingly, no sight distance improvements are necessary or recommended in conjunction with the proposed development.

Based on the prior analysis of River View Meadows Lane's road width and geometry, large vehicles may have difficulty navigating the roadway and require both travel lanes to negotiate the curves in the vicinity of Northfork Road. Very large trucks may also trailer off the roadway surface. However, the road width is sufficient to approximately 1,000 passenger vehicles per day despite the narrow width, similar to the capacity of a residential queuing street. The projected future traffic volumes on this roadway remain within this effective roadway capacity.

Appendix







Intersection		1			100	
Int Delay, s/veh	0.5					THE OWNER AND A DESIGN OF
Movement	EBI	FBR	NBI	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	W	LUIT		1	1	ODIT
Traffic Vol. veh/h	T	5	1	38	57	٥
Future Vol. veh/h	0	5	1	20	57	0
Conflicting Pode #/hr	0	0	1	30	57	0
Sign Control	Cton	Cton	- U	U Eroo	U Eroo	U
DT Channelized	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
Storogo Longth	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	4 0	-	-	-	-	-
Ven in Wedian Storage	,# U		-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	87	87	87	87	87	87
Heavy Vehicles, %	33	33	13	13	9	9
Mvmt Flow	0	6	1	44	66	0
Major/Minor	Minor2		Maior1	N	Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	112	66	66	0	najorz	0
Stare 1	66	00	00	U		U
Stage 2	16	-			4.45	
Critical Liduar	6 72	6 52	1 0 2	-		
Critical House Sta 1	0.73	0.00	4.23			
Critical Howy Stg 1	5.73	-		. . 8114-8311-68	-	
Critical Howy Stg 2	5./3	-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Hdwy	3.797	3.597	2.317	-	-	
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	815	918	1469	-	- 1010 -	-
Stage 1	884		-	-	(#)	-
Stage 2	903	-		-	-	- 11 T
Platoon blocked, %				-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	814	918	1469	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	814	-	-		-	-
Stage 1	883	11.00-	-		-	-
Stage 2	903	-	-	-	-	10
Approach	EP		NP		CD	
HCM Control Dolov	20					
HOW CONTROL Delay, S	0.9		0.2		U	
HUMLUS	A					
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	t	NBL	NBTE	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)		1469		918		
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.001		0.006		-
HCM Control Delay (c)		7 5	0	8.0		
HCM Lane LOS		Λ.Ο	٥ ٨	٥.٥	-	
		7	Ч	~	-	

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	2.7		5			
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations	W		1.		and the second second	£
Traffic Vol. veh/h	22	3	30	10	6	32
Future Vol, veh/h	22	3	30	10	6	32
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	Ő	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None		None	_	None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage	e,# 0	-	0		_	0
Grade, %	0	-	0		-	0
Peak Hour Factor	87	87	87	87	87	87
Heavy Vehicles, %	14	14	8	8	7	7
Mvmt Flow	25	3	34	11	7	37
A ANALYZY - OF CONTRACTOR IN AND IN THE REAL PROPERTY OF CONTRACTOR OF CONT	- Netty					
Major/Minor	Minor1	A	Iniort		Voiera	
Conflicting Flow All		10		0	viajorz	
Store 1	91	40	U	U	45	0
Stage 1	40		10	21	-	-
Stage 2	51	-		-	-	
Critical Howy	6.54	6.34	100		4.17	말 화장 속의
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.54	-	-	-		7
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.54		*(+)	-		- 1 () () () () () () () () () (
Follow-up Hdwy	3.626	3.426		-	2.263	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	881	998		- -	1531	-
Stage 1	952		-	-		-
Stage 2	942		-		-	
Platoon blocked, %			-			-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	877	998	-	-	1531	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	877	18	-		-	3
Stage 1	952	-	105.20		-	-
Stage 2	937) -	-	-	-	
Approach	W/P		NP		CD	
HCM Control Dolog	0.2		IND 0		10	
HCM LOS	9.2	i stantik	U		1.2	
HOW LOS	А					
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	t	NBT	NBRW	/BLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)		- -		890	1531	
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		-	-	0.032	0.005	-
HCM Control Delay (s)		nias logra		9.2	7.4	0
HCM Lane LOS		-	-	A	Α	Δ
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)			_	01	0	-

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	2.3					
Movement	EBL	. EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	N/			र्दी	î,	
Traffic Vol, veh/h	1	12	9	28	29	0
Future Vol, veh/h	1	12	9	28	29	0
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized		None	- 18 H	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-		-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage	e,# 0		angoli <u>i</u>	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	82	82	82	82	82	82
Heavy Vehicles, %	25	25	13	13	7	7
Mvmt Flow	1	15	11	34	35	0
Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1	1	Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	91	35	35	0	-	0
Stage 1	35			101.021	-	1
Stage 2	56	-	-	-		
Critical Hdwy	6.65	6.45	4.23	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.65	÷	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.65		in and a	-		HERRY &
Follow-up Hdwy	3.725	3.525	2.317			-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	856	976	1508			
Stage 1	931	-	14	-	-	-
Stage 2	911	1		1015		-
Platoon blocked, %				-		-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	850	976	1508	plan -	- 10	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	850	-	-	-	-2	-
Stage 1	924	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	911	-		-	-	
Approach	EB		NB		SB	
HCM Control Delay, s	8.8		1.8		0	
HCM LOS	A					
Minor Lane/Major Mym	nt	NBI	NBTE	-Bl n1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)		1508		965	001	ODIC
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.007	Statistics.	0.016		
HCM Control Delay (c)		7 /	0	2.010	2. 1970 - 198	-
HCM Lane LOS		Δ	Δ	0.0	-	
HCM 95th %tile O(veh))	0	~	01		

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	0.4					
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBI	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	K.			£	1	
Traffic Vol. veh/h	0	4	2	82	52	0
Future Vol. veh/h	0	4	2	82	52	0
Conflicting Peds #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	otop	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	0	-		-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage	- # ∩			0	0	
Grade %	J, // O			0	0	
Peak Hour Factor	89	89	89	89	89	89
Heavy Vehicles %	2	2	1	00	3	3
Mumt Flow	0	1	4	02	58	0
WWHITE IOW	0	4	2	92	00	0
Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	154	58	58	0	-	0
Stage 1	58		- 10			-
Stage 2	96	-	-	84	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.42	6.22	4.14	(put st (<u>p</u>	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.42	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Sto 2	5.42		100_011-1_1		-	
Follow-up Hdwy	3.518	3.318	2.236	and constituting	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	838	1008	1533	1000	-	interna ernet
Stage 1	965	-	-		-	-1
Stage 2	928					
Platoon blocked. %					- 20 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	837	1008	1533			
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	837					
Stage 1	964					
Stage 2	928	Dan ya ku mu L				
Oldye Z	520				-	10.00
Approach	EB		NB		SB	
HCM Control Delay, s	8.6		0.2		0	
HCM LOS	A					
Minor Lang/Major Mum	h.	NDI	NPT		CPT	CPD
Capacity (ush //)	IL STATE	INBL	INB 1		SBI	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)		1533	-	1008		4
HUM Lane V/C Ratio		0.001	-	0.004	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)		1.4	0	8.6	car n a i	
HCM Lane LOS		А	A	А	÷.	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh))	0	-	0	-	-

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	2.4					
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations	¥		î,			ۍ ۲
Traffic Vol, veh/h	22	8	57	17	11	31
Future Vol, veh/h	22	8	57	17	11	31
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized		None	-	None	Stale P	None
Storage Length	0		-	-	-	
Veh in Median Storage	e, # 0	-	0	-		0
Grade, %	0	-	0	-	-	0
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	4	4	3	3	6	6
Mymt Flow	24	9	62	18	12	34
						•
84-1-184	N I' A					
	Minor I		viajori		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	129	/1	0	0	80	0
Stage 1	/1			28.5	-	
Stage 2	58	а. С. с. с. с.	-	2	نی ن ا	-
Critical Hdwy	6.44	6.24	Store -	-	4.16	41
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.44	-	<u>-</u>	2	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.44	-		- 1	-	4a) (1 - 2
Follow-up Hdwy	3.536	3.336	-	-	2.254	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	861	986		-	1493	Billion
Stage 1	947	225 Marine - Marine - Marine Marine - Marine - Mari	-	-	-	Ξ.
Stage 2	959	-	-	1	-	- 1. H
Platoon blocked, %			-	15		÷.
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	854	986	- 1	-	1493	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	854	27	14	-	-	-
Stage 1	947		4	-	-	
Stage 2	951	4		-	-	- .
Approach	WB		NB		SB	
HCM Control Delay	92		0		10	
HCM LOS	Δ		U		1.5	
	A					
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	t	NBT	NBRW	BLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)			÷.	886	1493	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		(7	-	0.037	0.008	9 2
HCM Control Delay (s)		1	+	9.2	7.4	0
HCM Lane LOS		-	-	A	А	А
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)			-	0.1	0	

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	1.6					
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	N/			¢.	1.	
Traffic Vol, veh/h	1	8	14	51	37	1
Future Vol, veh/h	1	8	14	51	37	1
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None		None
Storage Length	0		2002	-		-
Veh in Median Storage	e,# 0	-	1	0	0	
Grade, %	0	1	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	81	81	81	81	81	81
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	3	3	7	7
Mvmt Flow	1	10	17	63	46	1
Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1	N	Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	144	47	47	0	-	0
Stage 1	47	- 10	-	neu di Su	-	
Stage 2	97	-	÷	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.42	6.22	4.13		-	1.1.1
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.42	-		-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.42				sing	adles_
Follow-up Hdwy	3.518	3.318	2.227		-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	849	1022	1554		-	
Stage 1	975	÷	÷	Ŧ	-	-
Stage 2	927	-		-		-
Platoon blocked, %						-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	840	1022	1554			
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	840	÷	-			
Stage 1	964	-	4	-		
Stage 2	927	-	(.	-	-	35 -5
Approach	EB		NB		SB	
HCM Control Delay, s	8.6		1.6		0	
HCM LOS	А					
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	it	NBL	NBTE	BLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)		1554	-	998		
HCM Lano V/C Patio		0.011		0.011	dense fi i	men S

HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.011	-	0.011		(H .)	
HCM Control Delay (s)	7.3	0	8.6	_	-	
HCM Lane LOS	А	А	А	-		
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0		0	-	-	

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	0.4	S				
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	W			e	î,	
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	5	1	49	87	0
Future Vol, veh/h	0	5	1	49	87	0
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized		None	-	None		None
Storage Length	0	-	-		-	-
Veh in Median Storage	e,# 0	nichulin -	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	3 <u>9</u> 0	0	0	()
Peak Hour Factor	87	87	87	87	87	87
Heavy Vehicles, %	33	33	13	13	9	9
Mvmt Flow	0	6	1	56	100	0
	110011					
Major/Minor	Minor?		Majort	N	Anior?	
Conflicting Flow All	150	100	100	0	vidjui Z	0
Stage 1	100	100	100	U	-	U
Stage 2	100	-	(011) (011 -)	1111111-1	-	
Critical House	6 70	6 50	4.00	-	-	-
Critical Hours Sta 1	0.73	0.03	4.23	-		
Critical House Ote 2	5.73)) (1991): 1111): 11940	-	-	-	-
Gliacal Huwy Stg 2	0.73	-	-	-	-	-
Pollow-up Hawy	3.191	3.59/	2.317	-		-
Por Cap- i Maneuver	/60	8//	1426			1000
Stage 1	852	-	-	-		-
Stage 2	891	-	101 - 1			-
Platoon blocked, %		0.77	1100		-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	765	877	1426		-	
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	765		-	-		-
Stage 1	851	-		-	-	
Stage 2	891	-	-	-	-	-
Approach	EB		NB		SB	
HCM Control Delay s	9.1		0.2		0	
HCM LOS	Δ		0.2		U	
	~					
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	t	NBL	NBTE	BLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)		1426		877		-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.001	-	0.007	-	023
HCM Control Delay (s)		7.5	0	9.1	-	
HCM Lane LOS		А	А	А	12	14
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)		0	- II.	0		-

Intersection			n seelle			
Int Delay, s/veh	2.3					
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations	W		î.			î.
Traffic Vol. veh/h	22	5	41	10	12	62
Future Vol. veh/h	22	5	41	10	12	62
Conflicting Peds #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized		None	-	None	1100	None
Storage Length	0		-	110110		NONC
Veh in Median Storage	a # 0		0			0
Grade %	, π O		0	ter de Ta		0
Dook Hour Easter	07	07	07	07	07	07
Hogy Wohislos	0/	0/	0/	0/	0/	0/
Mumt Flour	14	14	0	0	1	74
IVIVITIL FIOW	20	0	47	11	14	/1
Major/Minor	Minor1	١	Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	152	53	0	0	58	0
Stage 1	53		-		-	1-12
Stage 2	99	-	2	12	72	-
Critical Hdwy	6.54	6.34			4 17	U. Transfer
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5 54	-	1/21/18/91.102	12	1.17	
Critical Hdwy Sto 2	5 54		11-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1			
Follow-up Hdwy	3 626	3 426	2		2 263	
Pot Can-1 Maneuvor	812	0.420	1993 - 1911 1993 - 1911		1515	Andre andre andre andre
Stare 1	012	501	2		1010	
Stage 2	940 80c		u nicat	1997) 1997 - 1997 - 1997		
Diage Z	090				-	1
May Cap 1 Manual	004	004	-	-	AFAF	
May Cap-1 Maneuver	804	981	-		1515	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	804	-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	940	-		-		-
Stage 2	887	۳/		-	-	-
Approach	WB		NB		SB	
HCM Control Delay s	9.5	maile	0		12	
HCM LOS	Δ		U		1.2	
	Л					
		Dianica)(Sincia din		
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	t	NBT	NBRW	/BLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)		1	-	832	1515	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		÷	-	0.037	0.009	
HCM Control Delay (s)				9.5	7.4	0
HCM Lane LOS		-	-	A	A	Ă
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)				01	0	

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	4.8					
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	W			f.	1.	P.T. 11
Traffic Vol, veh/h	3	48	22	28	29	1
Future Vol, veh/h	3	48	22	28	29	1
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized		None	-	None		None
Storage Length	0	-	-	÷	÷	-
Veh in Median Storage	e,# 0			0	0	
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	
Peak Hour Factor	82	82	82	82	82	82
Heavy Vehicles, %	25	25	13	13	7	7
Mvmt Flow	4	59	27	34	35	1
Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1	1	Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	124	36	36	0		0
Stage 1	36			, i		
Stage 2	88	-	-	18.01811840 	-	10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 -
Critical Hdwy	6.65	6.45	4.23	-		
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.65	-			-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.65	1	-			
Follow-up Hdwy	3.725	3.525	2.317	-		-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	819	974	1507		- 1 N	s.
Stage 1	930	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	881	-				_
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	<u>a</u> .)
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	804	974	1507	-	1	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	804	-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	913	-	-			-
Stage 2	881	2	1	3 <u>9</u> 4	-	-
Approach	FB		NB		SB	
HCM Control Delay s	9		33		0	en Evintsiano
HCM LOS	A		0.0		U	
Minor Lano/Major Mar		NDL	NDTE	DIed	ODT	000
Capacity (yob/b)	t -	1507	INDIE	DLN I	381	SBK
HCM Lane V/C Patio		0.010		902	111 - 113 7 13	
HCM Control Dolou (a)		0.010	-	0.005	-	
HCM Long LOS		1.4	0	9	linnic <u>a</u> n	-
HCM 95th %tile O(uch)		A 0.1	А	A	-	-

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	0.2					
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	¥.1			£	ţ,	01.1
Traffic Vol. veh/h	0	4	2	117	72	0
Future Vol. veh/h	0	4	2	117	72	0
Conflicting Peds #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Ston	Ston	Free	Froo	Free	Free
RT Channelized	otop	None	TICC	None	TICC	None
Storage Length	0	None	-7-0 000 	NULIC		NUILE
Veh in Median Storage	# 0		7	0	0	-
Grado %	, π Ο			0	0	5
Dook Hour Footor	00	00	-	0	00	-
Hearry Vahialas	09	09	09	89	89	89
Heavy vehicles, %	2	2	4	4	3	3
WIVITLE FIOW	0	4	2	131	81	0
Major/Minor 1	Minor2		Major1	٨	Aaior2	
Conflicting Flow All	216	81	81	0	-	0
Stage 1	81		-			
Stage 2	135				n san sa	
Critical Hdwy	6.42	6.22	4 14			
Critical Hdwy Sta 1	5.42	0.22	4,14		ar mail i	
Critical House Sta 2	5.42	-	at a constant	-	Itatimena	-
Childen nuwy Sig Z	2.42	-	- 0.000	aninain - h	111 - - -	(1997) 1997
Pollow-up Hdwy	3.518	3.318	2.236	-	-	1
Pol Cap-1 Maneuver	112	979	1504	-		
Stage 1	942	-		-	-	-
Stage 2	891				-	
Platoon blocked, %				-	÷.	8
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	771	979	1504			-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	771	-	89 4 2	<u>194</u>		÷
Stage 1	941	- 				
Stage 2	891	2	14	-	-	1112 I I I I I I E
Approach	ED		ND		CD	
HCM Control Dolov o	0.7		0.1		SD	
HOM LOC	0./		0.1		U	
HUM LUS	A					
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	t	NBL	NBTE	BLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)		1504	-	979	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.001	-	0.005	2	2
HCM Control Delay (s)		7.4	0	87		4
HCM Lane LOS		Δ	Δ	Δ	2 STELLER	
HCM 95th %tile O(veh)		0	-	0		100

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	2.2					
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations	K.F		Ť.			100
Traffic Vol. veh/h	22	14	92	17	15	51
Future Vol. veh/h	22	14	92	17	15	51
Conflicting Peds #/hr	0	0	0	0	10	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Froo	Froo	Eroo
RT Channelized	Otop	None	1100	None	Tice	Nono
Storage Length	0	None		NUTIC		None
Veh in Median Storage	× # 0		0			0
Grade %	,π 0		0			0
Deak Hour Eactor	02	02	02	02	02	02
Heavy Vehicles %	52	52	32	92	92	92
Mumt Flow	24	4	100	10	16	0 EE
WINHIL FIOW	24	10	100	10	10	55
Major/Minor I	Minor1	N	Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	196	109	0	0	118	0
Stage 1	109	-		-	-	
Stage 2	87	-		-		
Critical Hdwy	6 4 4	6 24		en la l	4 16	ethalas <u>e</u> e
Critical Hdwy Sta 1	5 44	0.21		200 - <u>200</u>	1.10	
Critical Hdwy Sto 2	5 44					
Follow-up Hdwy	3 536	3 3 3 6		ospinie	2 254	
Pot Cap 1 Manauvor	700	0.000	-		1//6	imelat
Stage 1	011	202	tea a Th		1440	
Stage 7	024		-			-
Stage 2	931			-	LITE OF	
Platoon blocked, %	770	000	-		1.1.1.0	2
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	//9	939			1446	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	779	94). 191	-	22 	120	
Stage 1	911	-	a de la composición de la comp			el mier
Stage 2	921	1 4 52	2	3 2 0	-	-
Approach	WB		NR		SR	
HCM Control Delay	0.5		0		17	
HOM CONTO Delay, S	9.J A		U		1.1	
	А				1	
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	t	NBT	NBRW	/BLn1	SBL	SBT
Capacity (veh/h)			-	834	1446	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		2	-	0.047	0.011	-
HCM Control Delay (s)		-	E. 1999	9.5	7.5	0
HCM Lane LOS		-	-22	A	A	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)			-	0.1	0	-

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	4					
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	W			â	î.	
Traffic Vol. veh/h	3	32	55	51	37	4
Future Vol. veh/h	3	32	55	51	37	4
Conflicting Peds. #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized		None		None		None
Storage Length	0	-	-	-		-
Veh in Median Storage	e,# 0		-	0	0	
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	81	81	81	81	81	81
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	3	3	7	7
Mymt Flow	4	40	68	63	46	5
• • • • •		and the state of the		Configuration.		
Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1		Major2	
Conflicting Flow All	248	49	51	0	-	0
Stage 1	49	-	C III.	-	-	
Stage 2	199	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	6.42	6.22	4.13	- 1	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.42	-	-	38	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.42	-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Hdwy	3.518	3.318	2.227		-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	740	1020	1549	-	- 11	[] :: [] i : :::::::::::::::::::::::::::
Stage 1	973	<u> -</u>	12	-	-	Ξ.
Stage 2	835		-	- 1	- 10	-
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	7
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	707	1020	1549			in dia 🖵
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	707	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	929	-		-	-	enire <u>e</u> s
Stage 2	835	-	-	-		-
Approach	ED		NP		CD	
HCM Control Dolou	0.0		2.0		SD	
HOW CONTROL Delay, S	0.0		3.9		0	
	А					Cheer of the late
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	t	NBL	NBTE	BLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)		1549	-	983		
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.044	-	0.044	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)		7.4	0	8.8		
HCM Lane LOS		A	A	A	-	
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)		0.1	-	0.1	do 1011	

Preliminary Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis



Project Name: Riverview Meadows Intersection: Northfork Road at South Site Access Scenario: 2025 Background Plus Site Trips Number of Major Street Lanes: 1 PM Peak Hour Volume 191 (sum of both approaches) Number of Minor Street Lanes PM Peak Hour Volume 3 (highest-volume approach)^a 1 Posted or 85th percentile speed > 40 mph: Yes Isolated Population Less than 10,000: Yes

Warrant 1, Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume

		Cor	ndition A -	Minimum	Vehicular '	Volume			
Number of la	nes for moving	Vehicl	Vehicles per hour on major street			Vehicles per hour on minor street			
traffic on ea	ach approach	(total of both approaches)			(total of both approaches)				
Major Street	Minor Street	100%	80%	70%	56%	100%	80%	70%	56%
1	1	500	400	350	280	150	120	105	84
2 or more	1	600	480	420	336	150	120	105	84
2 or more	2 or more	600	480	420	336	200	160	140	112
1	2 or more	500	400	350	280	200	160	140	112

Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic

Number of lanes for moving		Vehicles per hour on major street				Vehicles per hour on minor street			
traffic on ea	ach approach	(10	otal of both	n approach	pproaches) (total of both			n approach	es)
Major Street	Minor Street	100%	80%	70%	56%	100%	80%	70%	56%
1	1	750	600	525	420	75	60	53	42
2 or more	1	900	720	630	504	75	60	53	42
2 or more	2 or more	900	720	630	504	100	80	70	56
1	2 or more	750	600	525	420	100	80	70	56
Warrant Anaylsis Calculations			8th Highest Hour ^b		Minimum Volume		Warrant Satisfied?		
Major Street Volume Minor Street Volume			108 2		350 105		No		
Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic Major Street Volume Minor Street Volume			108 2		525 53		No		
Combination	Warrant ^c								
Major Street Volume			10	08	42	20			
Minor Str	eet Volume			2		84		N	o

^a Minor-Street right turn volumes are reduced to account for the impact of right-turns on red.

^b Eighth-highest hour volumes are calculated as 5.65 percent of the expected daily traffic volume.

^c This warrant should be used only after adequate trial of other alternatives has failed to solve traffic problems.

Preliminary Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis



Project Name: Riverview Meadows Intersection: Northfork Road at McDonald Dike Road Scenario: 2025 Background Plus Site Trips Number of Major Street Lanes: 1 PM Peak Hour Volume (sum of both approaches) 175 Number of Minor Street Lanes 1 PM Peak Hour Volume 33 (highest-volume approach)^a Posted or 85th percentile speed > 40 mph: Yes Isolated Population Less than 10,000: Yes

Warrant 1, Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume

		Cor	dition A -	Minimum	Vehicular '	Volume			
Number of la traffic on ea	nes for moving ach approach	Vehicl (tc	Vehicles per hour on major street (total of both approaches)			Vehicles per hour on minor street (total of both approaches)			
Major Street	Minor Street	100%	80%	70%	56%	100%	80%	70%	56%
1	1	500	400	350	280	150	120	105	84
2 or more	1	600	480	420	336	150	120	105	84
2 or more	2 or more	600	480	420	336	200	160	140	112
1	2 or more	500	400	350	280	200	160	140	112

		Condi	tion B - Int	erruption	of Continu	ous Traffic			
Number of la	nes for moving	Vehic	es per hou	ir on major	street	Vehicles per hour on minor street			
traffic on ea	(total of both approaches)				(total of both approaches)				
Major Street	Minor Street	100%	100% 80% 70% 56%			100%	80%	70%	56%
1	1	750	600	525	420	75	60	53	42
2 or more	1	900	720	630	504	75	60	53	42
2 or more	2 or more	900	720	630	504	100	80	70	56
1	2 or more	750	600	525	420	100	80	70	56
Warrant Anaylsis Calculations			8th Highest Hour ^b		Minimum Volume		Warrant Satisfied?		
Condition A - Minimum Vehicular Volume Major Street Volume Minor Street Volume			99 19		350 105		No		
Condition B -	Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic								

99

19

99

19

525

53

420

84

No

No

^a Minor-Street right turn volumes are reduced to account for the impact of right-turns on red.

Major Street Volume

Minor Street Volume

Major Street Volume

Minor Street Volume

Combination Warrant^c

^b Eighth-highest hour volumes are calculated as 5.65 percent of the expected daily traffic volume.

^c This warrant should be used only after adequate trial of other alternatives has failed to solve traffic problems.

Preliminary Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis



Project Name: Riverview Meadows Intersection: Northfork Road at River View Meadows Lane 2025 Background Plus Site Trips Scenario: Number of Major Street Lanes: PM Peak Hour Volume 147 (sum of both approaches) 1 (highest-volume approach)^a Number of Minor Street Lanes 1 PM Peak Hour Volume 27 Posted or 85th percentile speed > 40 mph: Yes Isolated Population Less than 10,000: Yes

Warrant 1, Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume

		COL	iuition A -	wiiminum	venicular	volume			
Number of la traffic on ea	nes for moving ach approach	oving Vehicles per hour on major street ach (total of both approaches)			Vehicles per hour on minor street (total of both approaches)				
Major Street	Minor Street	100%	80%	70%	56%	100%	80%	70%	56%
1	1	500	400	350	280	150	120	105	84
2 or more	1	600	480	420	336	150	120	105	84
2 or more	2 or more	600	480	420	336	200	160	140	112
1	2 or more	500	400	350	280	200	160	140	112

Condition A - Minimum Vehicular Volume

Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic

Number of la traffic on ea	nes for moving ach approach	Vehicles per hour on major street (total of both approaches)				Vehicles per hour on minor street (total of both approaches)			
Major Street	Minor Street	100%	80%	70%	56%	100%	80%	70%	56%
1	1	750	600	525	420	75	60	53	42
2 or more	1	900	720	630	504	75	60	53	42
2 or more	2 or more	900	720	630	504	100	80	70	56
1	2 or more	750	600	525	420	100	80	70	56
<u>Warrant Anaylsis Calculations</u> Condition A - Minimum Vehicular Volume Major Street Volume Minor Street Volume			8th Highest Hour ^b 83 15		Minimum Volume 350 105		Warrant Satisfied? No		
Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic Major Street Volume Minor Street Volume			83 15		525 53		No		
Combination Major Str	Warrant ^c reet Volume			8	3	42	20		
Minor St	reet Volume			1	.5	84		N	lo

^a Minor-Street right turn volumes are reduced to account for the impact of right-turns on red.

^b Eighth-highest hour volumes are calculated as 5.65 percent of the expected daily traffic volume.

^c This warrant should be used only after adequate trial of other alternatives has failed to solve traffic problems.

Left-Turn Lane Warrant Analysis (ODOT Methodology)



Project Name:Riverview MeadowsApproach:Northbound Northfork Road at South Site AccessScenario:2025 Background Plus Site Trips

Number of Advancing Lanes:	1		
Number of Opposing Lanes:	1		
Major-Street Design Speed:	45	mph	
		AM Volume	PM Volume
Advancing Volume for Design H	50	119	
Opposing Volume for Design Ho	87	72	
Design Hour Volume Per Lane:		137	191
Number of Left Turns per Hour:	1	2	
Left-turn lane warrants satis	fied?	NO	NO

Exhibit 7-1 Left Turn Lane Criterion (TTI)



*(Advancing Volume/Number of Advancing Through Lanes) + (Opposing Volume/Number of Opposing Through Lanes)

Left-Turn Lane Warrant Analysis (ODOT Methodology)



Project Name:Riverview MeadowsApproach:Sourthbound Northfork Road at McDonald Dike RoadScenario:2025 Background Plus Site Trips

Number of Advancing Lanes:	1		
Number of Opposing Lanes:	1		
Major-Street Design Speed:	45	mph	
		AM Volume	PM Volume
Advancing Volume for Design H	74	66	
Opposing Volume for Design He	our:	51	109
Design Hour Volume Per Lane:		125	175
Number of Left Turns per Hour	1	12	15
Left-turn lane warrants satis	tied?	NO	NO

Exhibit 7-1 Left Turn Lane Criterion (TTI)



^{*(}Advancing Volume/Number of Advancing Through Lanes) + (Opposing Volume/Number of Opposing Through Lanes)

Left-Turn Lane Warrant Analysis (ODOT Methodology)



Project Name:Riverview MeadowsApproach:Northbound Northfork Road at River View Meadows LaneScenario:2025 Background Plus Site Trips

1			
1			
45	mph		
	AM Volume	PM Volume	
Advancing Volume for Design Hour:			
our:	30	41	
	80	147	
:	22	55	
fied?	NO	NO	
	1 1 45 Iour: our: : fied?	1 1 45 mph AM Volume lour: 50 our: 30 80 22 fied? NO	1 1 45 mph AM Volume PM Volume lour: 50 106 our: 30 41 . 80 147 . 22 55 fied? NO NO

Exhibit 7-1 Left Turn Lane Criterion (TTI)



*(Advancing Volume/Number of Advancing Through Lanes) + (Opposing Volume/Number of Opposing Through Lanes)

Right-Turn Lane Warrant Analysis (ODOT Methodology)



Project Name:Riverview MeadowsApproach:Southbound Northfork Road at South Site AccessScenario:2025 Background plus Site Trips

45

mph

	AM Volume	PM Volume
Number of Right Turns per Hour:	0	0
Approaching DVH in Outside Lane:	87	72
Calculated Turn Volume Threshold:	101	103
Right Turn Volume Exceeds Threshold?	NO	NO

Criterion 1: Vehicular Volume

Major-Street Design Speed:

The vehicular volume criterion is intended for application where the volume of intersecting traffic is the principal reason for considering installation of a right turn lane. The vehicular volume criteria are determined using the curve in Exhibit 7-2.

Exhibit 7-2 Right Turn Lane Criterion



Note: If there is no right turn lane, a shoulder needs to be provided. If this intersection is in a rural area and is a connection to a public street, a right turn lane is needed.

Right-Turn Lane Warrant Analysis (ODOT Methodology)



Project Name:Riverview MeadowsApproach:Northbound Northfork Road at McDonald Dike RoadScenario:2025 Background plus Site Trips

45

mph

26 B		
	AM Volume	PM Volume
Number of Right Turns per Hour:	10	17
Approaching DVH in Outside Lane:	51	109
Calculated Turn Volume Threshold:	106	99
Right Turn Volume Exceeds Threshold?	NO	NO

Criterion 1: Vehicular Volume

Major-Street Design Speed:

The vehicular volume criterion is intended for application where the volume of intersecting traffic is the principal reason for considering installation of a right turn lane. The vehicular volume criteria are determined using the curve in Exhibit 7-2.

Exhibit 7-2 Right Turn Lane Criterion



Note: If there is no right turn lane, a shoulder needs to be provided. If this intersection is in a rural area and is a connection to a public street, a right turn lane is needed.

Right-Turn Lane Warrant Analysis (ODOT Methodology)



Project Name:Riverview MeadowsApproach:Southbound Northfork Road at River View Meadows LaneScenario:2025 Background plus Site Trips

mph

	AM Volume	PM Volume
Number of Right Turns per Hour:	1	4
Approaching DVH in Outside Lane:	30	41
Calculated Turn Volume Threshold:	109	108
Right Turn Volume Exceeds Threshold?	NO	NO

45

Criterion 1: Vehicular Volume

Major-Street Design Speed:

The vehicular volume criterion is intended for application where the volume of intersecting traffic is the principal reason for considering installation of a right turn lane. The vehicular volume criteria are determined using the curve in Exhibit 7-2.

Exhibit 7-2 Right Turn Lane Criterion



Note: If there is no right turn lane, a shoulder needs to be provided. If this intersection is in a rural area and is a connection to a public street, a right turn lane is needed.







Basic Approach Permit Approval Standards

Points of Interest

What is sight distance? Types of sight distance.

Stopping sight distance.

Intersection sight distance.

Deviations from sight distance standards.

✓ A fast moving vehicle needs more distance to stop safely than a slow moving vehicle.

- ✓ Stopping sight distance increases as speed increases and on down grades.
- ✓ It decreases as speed decreases and on upgrades.

Sight Distance

Sight Distance is one of three approach permit approval standards.

What is Sight Distance?

Sight distance is the length of highway a driver needs to be able to see clearly. It is important for drivers on a highway to see far enough down the highway to recognize an object in the path and react appropriately to avoid a crash. It is equally important for drivers entering the highway to have a clear line of sight in both directions to see oncoming traffic and to be visible to other drivers on the highway.

Two Types of Sight Distance

- 1. Stopping Sight Distance measures the distance between a vehicle on the highway and an object in the travel path.
- 2. Intersection Sight Distance measures the length of the line of sight between a vehicle entering the highway from a driveway or crossroad and vehicles on the highway approaching from the right and left.

Stopping Sight Distance (SSD)

Stopping sight distance is the <u>minimum</u> length of unobstructed roadway a driver needs to see in order to identify an object in the roadway, brake and quickly stop or take other appropriate action to avoid crashing. It is also described as minimum braking distance.



from the height of a driver's eye (3.5 feet) to an object 2 feet high or more in the roadway.

Intersection Sight Distance (ISD)

Intersection sight distance is the <u>minimum</u> length of unobstructed line of sight between a driver entering a highway and vehicles approaching from the right and left on the highway. It is as important for drivers entering the highway to see traffic coming from both directions and to be visible to the on-coming traffic.

A driver entering a highway needs to see far enough down the highway in both directions to judge travel speed and find an acceptable gap in the traffic before turning right or turning left across travel lanes and merging into the traffic. Intersection sight distance is intended to allow a driver to enter the highway safely while allowing traffic on the highway to maintain normal travel speed.



Intersection sight distance (ISD) measures a line of sight from the height of driver's eye (3.5 feet), seated 15 feet back from the fog line or edge of the traveled way, to the right and to the left, to an object in the highway that is 3.5 feet high.

Deviations from Intersection Sight Distance

The sight distance standards ODOT uses to evaluate approach applications are based on intersection sight distance. If it is not possible to meet intersection sight distance standards, then ODOT may be able to adjust:

- The assumed speed of the oncoming traffic; or
- The point in the driveway where intersection sight distance is measured.

In most situations, intersection sight distance is greater than stopping sight distance. ODOT may be able to consider approving a sight distance deviation by using stopping sight distance in place of intersection sight distance. ODOT may require the applicant to provide mitigation in order to approve a deviation from intersection sight distance standards.

Contact: ODOT Access Management Unit

ODOT is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer committed to a diverse workforce. We will provide accommodations for persons with disabilities. We will provide alternative formats upon request.



Fwd: Placement of Water Tower for Riverview Meadows

1 message

PriniLee K. McCord <prinilee@trevallygroup.us> To: Coast Printing <coastprintingoffice@gmail.com>

Wed, Oct 19, 2022 at 3:06 PM

Please make 10 copies of this email.

Thank you!

------ Forwarded message ------From: Melissa Thompson-Kiefer <mthompson@nehalem.gov> Date: Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 2:14 PM Subject: RE: Placement of Water Tower for Riverview Meadows To: Sarah Absher <sabsher@co.tillamook.or.us> CC: Prini Lee McCord <prinilee@trevallygroup.us>

Hello Sarah,

I have conferred with our City Planner and can confirm that the city would allow the construction of the water tower and installation of the water line in the areas depicted in part of future Phase 3 of Riverview Meadows at the time of construction of the Phase 2 subdivision.

Thanks,

Melissa Thompson-Kiefer City Manager City of Nehalem 503-368-5627

From: Sarah Absher <sabsher@co.tillamook.or.us> Sent: Friday, October 7, 2022 11:53 AM To: Melissa Thompson-Kiefer <mthompson@nehalem.gov> Cc: Prini Lee McCord <prinilee@trevallygroup.us> Subject: Placement of Water Tower for Riverview Meadows

Good Morning Melissa,

Thank you for taking my call. As discussed, the applicants of Riverview Meadows Phase 2 would like to confirm it would be allowed to continue with construction of the water tower and waterline to serve Phase 2 as it is reflected on the submitted plats. The water tower and line installation would be installed upon approval of Phase 2 for future use of Phase 2 and 3. The line would be installed in the location of the future right of way for road improvements in Phase 3.

The City's zoning code is silent on placement of water towers. Please confirm if the city would allow the construction of the water tower and installation of the water line in the areas depicted part of future Phase 3 of Riverview Meadows at the time of construction of the Phase 2 subdivision.

Thank You,



Sarah Absher, CBO, CFM, Director TILLAMOOK COUNTY | Community Development 1510-B Third Street Tillamook, OR 97141 Phone (503) 842-3408 x3317 sabsher@co.tillamook.or.us

Regards, PriniLee K. McCord I Partner Trevally Group, LLC. Trevally International S. DE R.L. DE C.V. PO Box 872495, Vancouver, WA 98687 971.808.7611 I PriniLee@TrevallyGroup.us

This message may contain confidential or proprietary information intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above or may contain information that is legally privileged. If you are not the intended addressee, you are hereby notified that reading, disseminating, distributing or copying this message is strictly prohibited.

Tillamook County, Oregon 10/19/2022 03:54:50 PM DEED-ESMAT



l hereby certify that the within instrument was received for record and recorded in the County of Tillamook, State of Oregon.

Tassi O'Neil, Tillamook County Clerk

AFTER RECORDING RETURN TO:

Riverview Meadows Development LLC 23765 SE Highway 212 Damascus, OR 97089

SEND TAX STATEMENT TO:

NO CHANGE

SPACE ABOVE RESERVED FOR RECORDING LABEL

EASEMENT

Know by all persons present, that Vern Scovell ("Grantor"), for consideration of the mutual promises exchanged herein and other good and valuable consideration exchanged with Riverview Meadows Development LLC, ("Grantee"), does hereby grant a non-exclusive easement for public access over, under and across the real property described herein, for the benefit of the real property as described herein, all being more particularly described herein.

EASEMENT RECITALS

A. Grantor is the owner of the real property ("Parcel 1") being legally described, and pictorially described, in the attached **Exhibit A**.

B. Grantee is the owner of the real property ("Parcel 2") being legally described as follows:

Tract B, RIVERVIEW MEADOWS PHASE I, situated in the Northwest quarter of Section 23, Township 3 North, Range 10 West, Willamette Meridian, County of Tillamook, State of Oregon, recorded July 26, 2010 as Instrument No. 2010-004288, Tillamook County Records.

C. Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 are in close proximity to each other and are, or will be, connected by way of an additional public easement.

D. It is the intent of the parties herein named to create a non-exclusive, public access, and permanent right to enter, re-enter, and use Parcel 1, subject to conditions as set forth herein, for the benefit of Grantee's Parcel 2, and the general public.

E. The non-exclusive easement will be used for public and private ingress and egress purposes by the general public, by Grantee, and by Grantee's successors in ownership of Grantee's Parcel 2.

1 of 4 - Easement Consideration Ø

F. Additionally, the non-exclusive easement for public access and public and/or private utilities, shall also include the right to lay, construct, and maintain streets, water mains, sewer mains, storm drainage lines, and all related appurtenances, to be constructed and located on, across, under or over Parcel 1.

G. The parties agree that any unknown defect in the above Easement Area due to inaccuracy will not hinder the intent of the parties.

IT IS FURTHER UNDERSTOOD and AGREED:

- 1. The foregoing Easement Recitals paragraphs are contractual and not merely recitals, and are incorporated by this reference.
- 2. The rights and obligations of all the easements herein shall run with and be appurtenant to those parcels of land as described, and shall not be personal to any person, except that the obligation to pay for the costs and expenses (for costs and expenses incurred while a person was an owner) shall be personal to the owners of the described parcels, as well as run with the described parcels.
- 3. Grantee, and the general public shall have a non-exclusive, public access, and permanent right to enter, re-enter, and use Parcel 1 being legally described, and pictorially described, in the attached **Exhibit A**, subject to conditions as set forth herein, for the benefit of Grantee's Parcel 2. The easement shall include the right of the Grantor or Grantee to reasonably improve the surface of the easement area herein described; costs of any improvements to the easement area shall be borne by Grantee, their successors and assigns. Any improvement to the easement area shall be in compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal law.
- 4. Grantee shall have a non-exclusive easement for public access and public and/or private utilities, to include the right to lay, construct, and maintain streets, water mains, sewer mains, storm drainage lines, and all related appurtenances, to be constructed and located on, across, under or over Parcel 1.
- Grantor agrees that the consideration recited herein is just compensation for the property rights herein granted.
- 6. Grantor represents and warrants that Grantor has the authority to grant the easement and that the easement area is free from all liens and encumbrances that would materially affect the easement grant, and that they will defend this easement grant against all lawful claims and demands of all persons whomsoever with respect to any liens or encumbrances that would materially affect the easement grant.

[SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS]

2 of 3 - Easement

The parties above named have hereunto set their hands this $\frac{1^{\circ}}{2}$ day of October, 2022.

GRANTOR:

Vern Scovel

GRANTEE: **Riverview Meadows Development LLC**

Vern Scovelk Member

Carey Sheldon, President of Sheldon Development Inc., Member

STATE OF OREGON County of Till Amoor

hewington www

Man

This instrument was acknowledged before me on October 19th 2022. by Vern Scovell, the above-named Grantor, and Member of Grantee.

OFFICIAL SEAL KERI RUANE SCOTT NOTARY PUBLIC - OREGON Notary Public for Oregon COMMISSION NO. 1009445 MY COMMISSION EXPIRES MARCH 7, 2025 My Commission expires:

This instrument was acknowledged before me on October K 2022. by Carey Sheldon, President of Sheldon Development Inc., Member of the above-named Grantee.

Notary Public State of Washington SHAUNA NELSON COMM. # 147372 MY COMM. EXP. 10/02/2024

STATE OF OREGON

County of

Notary Public for Oregon Washington My Commission expires: 10 2 3024

3 of 3 - Easement

EXHIBIT A

EASEMENT SITUATED IN THE NORTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF SECTION 23, TOWNSHIP 3 NORTH, RANGE 10 WEST, OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN, CITY OF NEHALEM, TILLAMOOK COUNTY, OREGON;

BEGINNING AT THE MOST EASTERLY SOUTHEAST CORNER OF PARCEL 2, PARTITION PLAT NO. 1994-58, TILLAMOOK COUNTY PLAT RECORDS; THENCE NORTH 61°24'25" WEST ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID PARTITION PLAT NO. 1994-58, A DISTANCE OF 165.96 FEET; THENCE NORTH 45°07'05" WEST CONTINUING ALONG SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 228.41 FEET; THENCE NORTH 15°49'59" WEST CONTINUING ALONG SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 275.39 FEET; THENCE NORTH 16°45'30" WEST CONTINUING ALONG SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 338.59 FEET; THENCE NORTH 11°37'10" WEST CONTINUING ALONG A PORTION OF SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 89.07 FEET TO THE WEST LINE OF THAT PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN DOCUMENT NO. 2005-011393, TILLAMOOK COUNTY DEED RECORDS; THENCE SOUTH 36°55'01" EAST ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID DOCUMENT NO. 2005-011393, A DISTANCE OF 121.94 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 16°45'30" EAST ALONG SAID WEST LINE OF DOCUMENT NO. 2005-011393, A DISTANCE OF 313.23 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 15°49'59" EAST ALONG SAID WEST LINE OF DOCUMENT NO. 2005-011393, A DISTANCE OF 262.73 FEET TO THE MOST WESTERLY CORNER OF THAT PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN BOOK 614, PAGE 807, TILLAMOOK COUNTY DEED RECORDS; THENCE SOUTH 45°07'05" EAST ALONG THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN BOOK 614, PAGE 807, A DISTANCE OF 208.19 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 61°24'25" EAST CONTINUING ALONG SAID SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN BOOK 614, PAGE 807, A DISTANCE OF 183.79 FEET TO THE MOST SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF THAT PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN BOOK 211, PAGE 52, TILLAMOOK COUNTY DEED RECORDS; THENCE SOUTH 60°03'55" EAST ALONG THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN BOOK 211, PAGE 52, A DISTANCE OF 120.81 FEET TO THE MOST WESTERLY CORNER OF PARTITION PLAT NO. 1993-46, TILLAMOOK COUNTY PLAT RECORDS; THENCE SOUTH 59°58'05" EAST ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID PARTITION PLAT NO. 1993-46, A DISTANCE OF 130.92 FEET TO THE WEST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE FOR NORTH FORK COUNTY ROAD; THENCE ALONG 250.37 FOOT RADIUS NON-TANGENT CURVE TO THE LEFT, THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 14°32'27", A LENGTH OF 63.54 FEET, THE LONG CHORD OF WHICH BEARS SOUTH 67°12'31" WEST 63.37 FEET; THENCE NORTH 60°03'55" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 237.03 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING



EXHIBIT A Page 2 of 2



Tillamook County Public Works

503 Marolf Loop Road, Tillamook, OR 97141 County Road Phone: 503-842-3419 Solid Waste Phone: 503-815-3975 Fax: 503-842-6473 Email: pubwks@co.tillamook.or.us TTY Oregon Relay Service

Trees, Cheese, and Ocean Breeze

October 13, 2022

To: Sarah Absher, Planning Department Director Tillamook County Planning Department From: Ronald E. Newton, Engineering Technician III Tillamook County Public Works

Subject: Partition Request #851-21-000415-PLNG Sheldon Development, Inc.

Sarah,

Recently received correspondence from counsel advising Riverview Meadows Inc. indicates some question of authority to require a fully functional secondary access road to support future development of the planned unit development known as River View Meadows.

As you now, the proposed development is located outside the city limits of The City of Nehalem, but within the associated Urban Growth Boundary, (UGB). This presents the situation where city ordinance language is based on development within the grid system of the city street plan and will not provide adequate safe transportation planning to the limits of the UGB. In these situations, authority is supported by Oregon Revised Statute, (ORS) Chapter 368. ORS chapter 368.016 provides for the County Engineer to take action in regards to local city streets at times when the city consents to the action. In this case, city ordinance does not provide adequate transportation design guidance, and both city and county agree that county standards should be applied. The result is that the County Engineer's evaluation of transportation requirements becomes the controlling authority.

ORS Ch. 368.039 provides that county has the authority to require design standards that "shall supersede and prevail over any specifications and standards for roads and streets that are set forth in a uniform fire code adopted by the State Fire Marshal, a municipal fire department or a county firefighting agency." This clearly provides the County Engineer authority to require safe, effective public transportation in situations where otherwise inadequate or nonexistent options otherwise exist.

Tillamook County Ordinance #55 references the Oregon Department of Transportation *Standard Specifications for Highway Construction*, The American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials Manual *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets* and the Federal Highway Administrations *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* as adopted by the Oregon Department of Transportation. These documents become the controlling standards and specifications adopted by Tillamook County.

The section of Riverview Meadows Drive adjacent to North Fork Nehalem River Road represents little more than a single lane paved alignment and fails to meet any applicable AASHTO standard for lane width, shoulder width, adjacency of immovable obstructions, etc. In

this first section of roadway there are four private residences located at the very edge of the existing Right of Way line. Please note the aerial image below to assist in viewing the limited width of the existing roadway showing a single vehicle traveling through this section. This image provides evidence of the inadequate capacity of the existing roadway.



The Traffic Impact Study, (TIS), provided by the applicants suggest that the intersection at the end of this section of roadway contains adequate carrying capacity to support the full buildout of the Riverview Meadows development. The TIS suggests that there will be times when vehicles leaving the development will queue in this same section of roadway. It is the determination of the County Engineer that this creates an unsafe point of congestion even in normal daily traffic. With commuters queued to enter the North Fork County Road, there is no safe way for vehicular movement by adjacent land owners to enter or leave the existing roadway.

Public Works finds additional issues with the TIS. Section 160(1)(a). identifies that the standard to be used is "A Policy on Geometric Design on Highway and Streets" (referred hereinafter as the Green Book). The "Riverview Meadows Traffic Impact Study" dated August 12, 2022 (hereinafter referred to as the Study) used these standards. The Intersection Sight Distance section of the report identifies that the standards are not met.

The Study reported "... a minimum of 500 ft of intersection sight distance is generally desired in each direction for each point of access. However, horizontal curves in the site vicinity limit both the available sight lines and the approach speeds of vehicles at the limits of sight distance." The 500 ft distance listed is published sight distance using a Design Speed of 45 mph and passenger cars.

Per the Study: "For the existing site access on River View Meadows Lane, the available intersection sight distance was measured to be 428 feet to the north and 378 feet to the south."

The study uses a speed study to lower the acceptable sight distance. Please note the following excerpts from the Green Book:

"Posted speed limits, as a matter of policy, are not the highest speeds that might be used by drivers. Instead, such limits are usually set to approximate the 85th percentile speed of traffic as determined by measuring the speeds of a sizeable sample of vehicles."

"Operating speed is the speed at which drivers are observed operating their vehicles during free-flow conditions. The 85th percentile of the distribution of observed speeds is the most frequently used measure of the operating speed associated with a particular speed associated with a particular location or geometric feature."

"Design speed is the selected speed used to determine the various geometric design features of the roadway. The selected design speed should be a logical one with respect to the anticipated operating speed, topography, the adjacent land use, and the functional classification of the highway."

The Study states "*Typically, the 85th percentile speed is used for design.*" is not correct. However, the Study did identify that reducing the design speeds to match the 85th percentile speed did not produce an acceptable sight distance. "*Again, the available intersection sight distance was less than the desired intersection distance.*" The Study then deviates from utilizing the intersection sight distance standard and uses stopping sight distance and the 85th percentile speed.

The proposed project does not meet the standard for Intersection Sight Distance. Please note 500-ft is based on a Design Speed of 45 mph and passenger cars. The distance increases to 630-ft for single unit trucks.

In the River View Meadows Lane – Roadway Geometry section, the Study identifies that "...single-unit trucks, garbage trucks, and fire apparatus... require the full width of River View Meadows Lane for maneuvering in the vicinity of North Fork Road." It is not acceptable to place additional traffic on this road as the risk of collision increases.

The combination of the lack of sight distance and the above-described vehicle maneuvering issues in the vicinity of North Fork Road is not acceptable.

Based on the above, and in concurrence with the City of Nehalem, Tillamook County Public Works will require that a full developed, two-lane roadway built to county road standards shall be a requirement for approval of any future buildout of the Riverview Meadows residential development.

Please feel free to contact we directly with any questions.

Thank you,

Randol E. Newt-

Ronald E. Newton, *LSI* Eng. Tech. III, Tillamook County Public Works

AFTER RECORDING RETURN TO:

Riverview Meadows Development LLC 23765 SE Highway 212 Damascus, OR 97089



interedy certify that the within instrument was received for record and recorded in the County of Tillamook, State of Oregon.

Tassi O'Neil, Tillamook County Clerk

SEND TAX STATEMENT TO:

NO CHANGE

SPACE ABOVE RESERVED FOR RECORDING LABEL

EASEMENT

Know by all persons present, that Donald E. Dillard ("Grantor"), for consideration of the mutual promises exchanged herein and other good and valuable consideration exchanged with Riverview Meadows Development LLC, ("Grantee"), which Grantor hereby acknowledges, does hereby grant a non-exclusive easement for public access over, under and across the real property described herein, and for public and/or private utilities, for the benefit of the real property as described herein, all being more particularly described herein.

EASEMENT RECITALS

A. Grantor is the owner of the real property ("Parcel 1") being legally described as:

Tract A, RIVERVIEW MEADOWS PHASE I, in the County of Tillamook, State of Oregon, recorded July 26, 2010 in Plat Cabinet B1142-0, Tillamook County Records.

B. Grantee is the owner of the real property ("Parcel 2") being legally described as follows:

Tract B, RIVERVIEW MEADOWS PHASE I, situated in the Northwest quarter of Section 23, Township 3 North, Range 10 West, Willamette Meridian, County of Tillamook, State of Oregon, recorded July 26, 2010 as Instrument No. 2010-004288, Tillamook County Records.

C. Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 are adjacent to each other.

D. It is the intent of the parties herein named to create a non-exclusive, public access, and permanent right to enter, re-enter, and use Parcel 1, subject to conditions as set forth herein, for the benefit of Grantee's Parcel 2, and the general public.

1 of 4 - Easement

onsideration up to 50,000.00

E. The non-exclusive easement will be used for public and private ingress and egress purposes by the general public, by Grantee, and by Grantee's successors in ownership of Grantee's Parcel 2.

F. Additionally, the non-exclusive easement for public access and public and/or private utilities, shall also include the right to lay, construct, widen and maintain streets, water mains, sewer mains, storm drainage lines, and all related appurtenances, to be constructed and located on, across, under or over Parcel 1.

G. The parties agree that any unknown defect in the above Easement Area due to inaccuracy will not hinder the intent of the parties.

IT IS FURTHER UNDERSTOOD and AGREED:

- 1. The foregoing Easement Recitals paragraphs are contractual and not merely recitals, and are incorporated by this reference.
- 2. The rights and obligations of all the easements herein shall run with and be appurtenant to those parcels of land as described, and shall not be personal to any person, except that the obligation to pay for the costs and expenses (for costs and expenses incurred while a person was an owner) shall be personal to the owners of the described parcels, as well as run with the described parcels.
- 3. Grantee and the general public shall have a non-exclusive, public access, and permanent right to enter, re-enter, and use a portion of Parcel 1 being legally described in the attached EXHIBIT "A", and pictorially described in the attached EXHIBIT "B", subject to conditions as set forth herein, for the benefit of Grantee's Parcel 2 and the general public. The easement shall include the right of the Grantor or Grantee to reasonably improve the surface of the easement area herein described; costs of any improvements to the easement area shall be borne by Grantee, their successors and assigns. Any improvement to the easement area shall be in compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal law. In the event such applicable local, state, and federal law shall require broader access to Parcel 1 for the purposes set forth herein, then the portion of Parcel 1 being legally described in the attached EXHIBIT "A", and pictorially described in the attached EXHIBIT "B", shall increase in scope, and shall be geographically or otherwise broadened to meet such applicable local, state, and federal law without affecting the validity of the easement granted herein.
- 4. Grantee shall have a non-exclusive easement for public access and public and/or private utilities, to include the right to lay, construct, and maintain streets, water mains, sewer mains, storm drainage lines, and all related appurtenances, to be constructed and located on, across, under or over Parcel 1. Any improvement to the easement area shall be in compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal law.

- 5. Grantor agrees that the consideration recited herein is just compensation for the property rights herein granted. Specifically, Grantor has granted this easement in consideration of an Easement Agreement dated September 20, 2022 wherein Grantee agrees to pay Grantor the sum of \$25,000.00 upon execution of this Agreement, and Grantee agrees, if practicable, to install two access gates for security purposes. If it is not practicable to install the access gates, Grantee shall pay Grantor an additional sum of \$25,000.00.
- 6. Grantor represents and warrants that Grantor has the authority to grant the easement and that the easement area is free from all liens and encumbrances that would materially affect the easement grant, and that they will defend this easement grant against all lawful claims and demands of all persons whomsoever with respect to any liens or encumbrances that would materially affect the easement grant.

[SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS]

The parties above named have hereunto set their hands this 19 day of October, 2022.

GRANTOR:

GRANTEE: **Riverview Meadows Development LLC**

Carey Sheldon, President of Sheldon Dévelopment Inc., Member

STATE OF OREGON County of TILLAMENA

This instrument was acknowledged before me on UCTOBER 19 , 2022. by Donald E. Dillard, the above-named Grantor.



Notary Public for Oregon

69

My Commission expires:

64

NASLINGTONCIN STATE OF OREGON County of MA

This instrument was acknowledged before me on UHDREV K . 2022. by Carey Sheldon, President of Sheldon Development Inc., Member of the above-named Grantee.



Notary Public for Oregon Washington My Commission expires:



PO Box 955

Sandy, Oregon 97055

Phone: 503-668-3151

Fax: 503-668-4730

EXHIBIT "A"

Legal Description over a portion of Tract 'A', "Riverview Meadows Phase 1"

A TRACT OF LAND SITUATED IN THE NW 1/4 OF SECTION 23, TOWNSHIP 3 NORTH, RANGE 10 WEST, W.M., SHOWN AS AN "EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS EASEMENT" IN "RIVERVIEW MEADOWS PHASE 1", RECORDED AS DOCUMENT NUMBER 2010-4288, TILLAMOOK COUNTY PLAT RECORDS, BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of Tract 'A' of "Riverview Meadows Phase 1"; thence South 88°34'29" East, along the North line of said Tract 'A' of said "Riverview Meadows Phase 1", a distance of 531.12 feet, to the most Northeasterly corner of said Tract 'A' of said "Riverview Meadows Phase 1", said point also being the most Northwesterly corner of the right of way of Sunnyview Drive, as dedicated in said "Riverview Meadows Phase 1", said point also being the True Point of Beginning; thence South 01°25'31" West, along the West line of the said right of way of said Sunnyview Drive, a distance of 50.00 feet, to the Southwesterly corner of the said right of way of said Sunnyview Drive, said point also being on the North line of Lot 11 of said "Riverview Meadows Phase 1"; thence North 88°34'29" West, along the North line of said Lot 11 and the North line of Lot 10 of said "Riverview Meadows Phase 1" and the westerly extension thereof, a distance of 245.17 feet, to a point of curvature, said point is the beginning of a curve that will be referred to as Curve 1 from hereon; thence along said Curve 1, an 86.29 foot radius tangent curve to the left, an arc distance of 155.19 feet through a central angle of 103°02'41" (chord bears South 39°54'11" West 135.10 feet) to a point of tangency, said point is the beginning of a line that will be referred to as Line 1 from hereon; thence along said Line 1, South 11°37'10" East, a distance of 272.73 feet, to an angle point; thence leaving said Line 1, South 16°45'30" East, a distance of 23.52 feet more or less, to a point on the West line of said Tract 'A' of said "Riverview Meadows Phase 1", said point being marked with a 5/8" iron rod with a yellow plastic cap marked "PLS 2351"; thence North 36°55'01" West, along the said West line of said Tract 'A' of said "Riverview Meadows Phase 1", a distance of 121.86 feet more or less, to a point that is 50 feet from, when measured at right angles to, the previously described Line 1; thence leaving the said West line of said Tract 'A' of said "Riverview Meadows Phase 1", 50 feet from and parallel with said Line 1, North 11°37'10" West, a distance of 185.81 feet to a point of curvature; thence along a 136.29 foot radius tangent curve to the right, 50 feet from and parallel with said Curve 1, an arc distance of 245.11 feet through a central angle of 103°02'36" (long chord bears North 39°54'08" East 213.39 feet), to a point on the said North line of said Tract 'A' of said "Riverview Meadows Phase 1"; thence South 88°34'29" East, along the said North line of said Tract 'A' of said "Riverview Meadows Phase 1", a distance of 245.17 feet, to the True Point of Beginning. Containing 32,711 square feet, more or less.

Basis of bearings for this description is from Document Number 2010-4288, Tillamook County Plat Records.



Affiliated: Professional Land Surveys of Oregon • American Congress of Surveying and Mapping













