CURRY COUNTY TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN
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From: Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.
Project: Curry County Transportation System Plan Update
Subject: Final Tech Memo \#5: Future Baseline (No Build)

## INTRODUCTION

The future baseline (no-build) analysis for the Curry County Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update assesses how the County's transportation system is anticipated to perform through the planning horizon, year 2042. The transportation network changes that are currently planned and/or funded are identified in this memorandum and accounted for in the future (no-build) analysis, as appropriate. The network changes will also be considered later in future analyses of possible transportation alternatives. The future baseline no-build assessment also assumes that the transportation system will serve the County's continued economic growth that is consistent with its Comprehensive Plan land use designations.

This memorandum summarizes the future baseline (no-build) transportation conditions for people walking, rolling, biking, using transit, and driving within Curry County. It includes information on planned and/or funded transportation system improvements, forecast traffic volumes, the results of the future transportation system operations, freight, and multimodal analyses, and the traffic safety needs previously presented in Technical Memorandum \#4 (Current Transportation System Operations). A summary of future deficiencies is provided throughout this memorandum.

The information provided herein addresses the requirements identified in Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012-020 (Elements of a Transportation System Plan) for providing a general assessment of committed transportation facilities and services. This information will also help advise on potential transportation system changes needed to support the TSP's goals and the County's vision and be used as a foundation to:

- Help the County understand the effectiveness of potential projects, policies, and programs; and,
- Help policy makers weigh trade-offs regarding future funding priorities that support continued economic growth in a safe, sustainable, fundable, and diverse manner.


## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Key findings from the future baseline (no build) assessment presented within this memorandum are summarized below.

## Population Projections

- Curry County's population is estimated to grow by approximately 0.24 percent per year over the next 20 years, mostly due to population increases within the cities of Brookings, Gold Beach, and Port Orford.


## Programmed Transportation Projects

- The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has a variety of projects programmed for Curry County in its 2021-2024 and 2024-2027 Statewide Transportation Improvement Programs (STIP), primarily along US 101. The projects include variable message sign upgrades, bike lanes and sidewalks, pavement repair, curb ramp installation, rockfall protection, fire rehabilitation, bridge repairs / replacements (including the County's Myrtle Creek Bridge that has a sufficiency rating below 50), fast charging electric vehicle infrastructure, intersection and roadway safety improvements, and landslide/drainage improvements.
- The County's 2021-2027 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) identifies various roadway projects for its transportation system, including retaining wall systems, drainage improvements, pavement repair, roadway widening and/or reconstruction, driveway repairs, curb ramps, and intersection improvements.
- The County's 2021-2027 CIP also identifies various bridge repair or replacement projects for several of its bridges that are structurally deficient, have sufficiency ratings below 50, are scour critical, are weight restricted, or are a combination of these characteristics.


## Future Transportation System Operations

- Future traffic volumes along US 101 are expected to grow by approximately 5 to 13 percent over the next 20 years depending on the location. The segment with the highest growth includes the area between Brookings and Gold Beach.
- All study intersections are expected to meet their applicable mobility targets during the evening peak hour under future 2042 traffic conditions (the US 101 / Winchuck River Road-Ocean View Drive intersection continues to experience the highest side-street delay).
- All available vehicle storage is adequate to serve the expected traffic volume queues during the evening peak hour under future 2042 traffic conditions.
- Non-motorized pedestrian and bicycle movements are expected to stay generally low at the study intersections under future 2042 traffic conditions.


## Future Safety Conditions

- Traffic safety is expected to worsen over time if vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volumes increase and if no changes are made to the transportation system.
- $59 \%$ of the 928 reported crashes (2017-2021) resulted in some level of injury, including 59 serious injury crashes; $39 \%$ of all crashes were with a fixed or other object; 22 of the crashes included pedestrians and 8 included bicyclists (resulting in 5 fatal crashes)
- US 101 / Floras Creek Road intersection crash rate - 0.23 - is approaching its critical crash rate threshold - 0.28.
- 44 roadway segments have observed crash rates that exceed statewide averages.


## Future Multimodal Conditions

- The County's existing bicycle and pedestrian network, which generally lacks walking and biking facilities, is expected to remain the same through 2042, except for the few bike lane and sidewalk projects outlined in the ODOT STIP and County CIP.
- Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) scores on arterials and collectors are expected to remain the same (primarily BLTS 2 and 3) through year 2042 based on forecast traffic volumes, except for short sections of S Bank Chetco River Road, N Bank Chetco River Road, and Sixes River Road.
- The Pedestrian QMA ratings on arterials and collectors are expected to remain the same (generally "poor") if no changes are made to the transportation system.
- Current safety risks to bicyclists and pedestrians are expected to remain the same if no changes are made to the transportation system: relatively high risk for bicyclists along US 101, and highest in Brookings, and greatest risk for pedestrians on US 101 near Airport Road, within the incorporated cities, and near Cape Sebastian and Pistol River.
- Transit services and facilities in the county have a "Fair" Transit Qualitative Multimodal Assessment (QMA) rating primarily due to frequency of service. The transit opportunities identified in the recently adopted Curry Public Transit (CPT) Transit Development Plan (TDP) could affect future transit operations.


## Future Freight Operations

- Freight conditions, including freight designations, restrictions, and pinch points, will be considered in the upcoming alternatives analysis as possible roadway solutions are developed.


## POPULATION PROJECTIONS

The Portland State University (PSU) Population Research Center (PRC) produces population forecasts for Oregon counties and their incorporated cities on a four-year cycle. The forecasts play an important role in understanding the potential for traffic volume growth in the county and determining the transportation facilities and services needed to support growth over the next 20 years. Table 1 summarizes PSU's current population forecasts for Curry County and the cities of Brookings, Gold Beach, and Port Orford through 2045. As shown, the county's population is estimated to grow by approximately 0.24 percent per year; however, most of the growth is expected to occur within the urban growth boundaries (UGB's) of the incorporated cities. Outside of the UGB's, the county's population is projected to decrease over time.

Table 1. PSU Population Projections (2022-2045)

| Location | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 5}$ | Average Annual <br> Growth Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Countywide | $\mathbf{2 3 , 7 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 , 0 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 , 4 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 , 6 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 , 8 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 , 1 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 4 \%}$ |
| Brookings | 11,861 | 12,051 | 12,322 | 12,589 | 12,884 | 13,281 | $0.52 \%$ |
| Gold Beach | 3,361 | 3,382 | 3,403 | 3,436 | 3,501 | 3,624 | $0.34 \%$ |
| Port Orford | 1,811 | 1,803 | 1,782 | 1,770 | 1,777 | 1,816 | $0.01 \%$ |
| Outside UGB's | 6,757 | 6,829 | 6,923 | 6,903 | 6,719 | 6,384 | $-0.24 \%$ |

## PROGRAMMED TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

The following section summarizes transportation projects that are identified for Curry County's transportation system in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the County's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). These programmed improvements will be considered as part of upcoming evaluations of potential transportation alternatives to address identified needs. Other relevant projects that are included in long-range transportation plans, such as the County's previous (2005) TSP and recently adopted Transit Development Plan (TDP), will be identified in the upcoming alternatives analysis and considered as part of the evaluation.

## Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is ODOT's four-year funding program for transportation improvement projects on state and regional transportation systems, including federal land and Indian reservation road systems, interstate, state, and regional highways, bridges, and public transit. It includes state and federally funded system improvements that have approved funding and are expected to be undertaken during the upcoming four-year period. The projects undergo a selection process every two years that is managed by ODOT Regions or central offices to update the STIP.
An expected outcome of the TSP Update process is proposing that the STIP be amended to include projects in the plan. The STIP projects will most likely involve improvements that are eligible for funding through the ODOT Enhance program, which awards funding through a competitive application process. A list of relevant projects identified in the current STIP (20212024) are shown in Table 2. ODOT's draft 2024-2027 STIP projects, also summarized in Table 2, are also available but awaiting approval following federal review.

Table 2. 2021-2024 and 2024-2027 STIP Projects for Curry County

| Project Name | Description | Type | Total Project Cost | 2023 Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021-2024 Projects |  |  |  |  |
| US 101/OR 38: <br> Variable <br> Message Sign Upgrades | Replace existing hazard warning system with LED-based variable message (VMS) system to increase visibility to the traveling public | Preliminary Engineering, Construction | \$2,022,871 | Construction Complete |
| US 101: Parkview Dr - Lucky Ln (Brookings)' | Construct a bike lane and a sidewalk along the east side of US101 and replace deficient sidewalk, add a short segment of sidewalk on Ransom St, add flashing lights at Ransom Ave and Arnold Ave, and convert a 4-lane section to 3-lane from Heather Ln to Arnold Ln to improve pedestrian safety. | Preliminary <br> Engineering, <br> Right of Way, <br> Utility <br> Relocation, <br> Construction | \$4,962,000 | Construction Scheduled for 2024 |
| US 101: Garrison Slough - <br> Cemetery Loop Rd (Port Orford) | Remove existing pavement and replace with new; upgrade ADA ramps; add curb extensions, pedestrian signals, and sign and illumination upgrades | Preliminary Engineering, Right of Way, Construction, Other | \$6,975,668 | Under Construction |
| US 101: Gold Beach (Rogue River) Bridge ${ }^{1}$ | Replace the existing cathodic protection system, a technique used to control the corrosion of a metal surface, to preserve the bridge structure. | Preliminary <br> Engineering, <br> Right of Way, <br> Utility <br> Relocation, <br> Construction | \$25,141,000 | Construction Scheduled for 2024 |
| US 101: Floras Creek and Willow Creek Bridges ${ }^{1}$ | Replace the bridge rails on Floras Creek and Willow Creek structures to meet current safety standards. Replace the driving surfaces and joints on each bridge. Remove asphalt from the Willow Creek bridge and adjust the substructure of the roadway to match. | Preliminary <br> Engineering, <br> Right of Way, <br> Utility <br> Relocation, <br> Construction | \$5,107,000 | Construction Scheduled for 2024 |
| US 101: Arizona Slide | Geological investigation for historical data collection, drilling, drain inspections, and recommendations to provide guidance for a future project. | Planning | \$512,313 | Planning Complete |
| Klondike Fire Rehab | Restore approximately 45 -miles of trails impacted by the Taylor and Klondike Fires | Other | \$119,746 | Complete |
| Arizona Ranch Rd: Myrile Creek Bridge | Design for a future construction project to replace the bridge with a modern bridge type of sufficient width to increase safety and improve access. | Preliminary Engineering | \$514,800 | Project <br> Funded <br> Through Final Plans |
| Southwest Oregon 20242027 ADA Curb Ramp Design, Phase 1 | Design for future construction of curb ramps to meet compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. | Preliminary Engineering | \$5,500,000 | Project <br> Funded <br> Through Final <br> Plans |
| 2024-2027 Draft Projects |  |  |  |  |
| US 101: <br> Washington to Calfifornia | Install National Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) fast charging stations at 50 -mile intervals along US 101 between Washington and California. | Planning, Preliminary Engineering, Construction | \$6,281,000 | Construction Scheduled for 2025 |
| Southwest Oregon Rural Intersection Safeły Improvements | Install signs to provide a safer roadway to the traveling public in ODOT Region 3. | Preliminary Engineering, Construction | \$3,119,988 | Construction Scheduled for 2025 |
| Southwest Oregon 20242027 ADA Curb | Design for future construction of curb ramps to meet compliance ADA standards. | Preliminary Engineering | \$8,316,400 | Project <br> Funded |


| Project Name | Description | Type | Total Projecł Cost | 2023 Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ramp Design, Phase 2 |  |  |  | Through Final Plans |
| Highway Barrier Upgrades (Coos/ Curry) | Replace the barrier on highways in Coos and Curry counties to improve safety on the roadway for the traveling public. | Preliminary Engineering, Construction | \$3,578,485 | Construction Scheduled for 2026 |
| sw Oregon Safety Program Funding Reserve (FFY25- 27) | Funding reserved for federal fiscal year 20242027 for the Region 3 ARTS program. | Construction | \$1,195,529 | Bucket of Funds |
| SW Oregon <br> Preservation <br> Program Funding <br> Reserve (FFY25- 27) | Funding reserved for future preservation projects in the 2024-2027 STIP cycle. | Construction | \$1,163,235 | Bucket of Funds |
| sW Oregon HB2017 Safety Program Funding Reserve (FFY2527) | Funding reserved for federal fiscal year 20242027 for the Region 3 HB2017 safety program. | Construction | \$143,554 | Bucket of Funds |
| US101: Anderson Rockfall | Install rock protection screening to help prevent rock falling on roadway. | Preliminary Engineering, Construction | \$2,008,219 | Construction Scheduled for 2024 |
| Arizona Ranch Rd: Myrtle Creek Bridge | Replace the bridge with a wider and modern bridge to increase safety and improve access. | Preliminary Engineering, Right of Way, Utility Relocation, Construction | \$2,616,500 | Construction Scheduled for 2026 |
| US 101: Woodroof Creek Slide | Drainage improvements and pavement resurfacing to provide a safer roadway to the traveling public. | Preliminary Engineering, Right of Way, Construction | \$2,824,884 | Construction Scheduled for 2027 |
| US 101: Robin Lane to California State line | Design project to remove existing pavement and replace with new asphalt to extend pavement service life. Safety upgrades to install barrier. Repair culverts and replace bridge driving surfaces to improve safety for traveling public. | Preliminary Engineering | \$655,815 | Project <br> Funded <br> Through Final Plans |
| Edson Creek "A" Bridge Rehab | Strengthen the existing bridge girders as needed to maintain the integrity of the bridge. | Preliminary Engineering, Construction | \$989,300 | Construction Scheduled for 2026 |

'Project also identified in 2024-2027 Draft STIP

## Curry County Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

The Curry County 2021-2027 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) addresses the transportation system and funding challenges facing the County. The CIP is a comprehensive guide for implementing essential transportation system improvements over a six-year period, including roadway and bridge maintenance needs for facilities within the County's jurisdiction. Recommended improvement projects in the current CIP were established through field evaluations, consideration of existing and planned development, input from the public, and Curry County Road Department Staff input. These projects are tabulated in detail in Attachment A and summarized in the following sections.
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## CIP Roadway Projects

The County's CIP identifies these general types of projects for several of its roadways:

- Retaining wall systems
- Drainage improvements, including curbs and gutters and ditches
- Pavement repair, including chip sealing, asphalt overlay, and pothole repairs
- Roadway widening and/or reconstruction, driveway repairs, and curb ramps
- Intersection improvements, including sight distance enhancements and roundabouts
- Traffic control improvements, including various signage and fog line striping

Table 3 summarizes projects along County arterials and collectors that could address transportation needs that have been identified in Technical Memoranda \#3 (Update System Inventory) and \#4 (Current Transportation System Operations). Although not classified as arterials or collectors, the following local County roads, that have poor pavement conditions and/or do not meet roadway standards, are identified in the CIP for road repair/reconstruction, roadway widening, asphalt overlay or grind and inlay, and/or spot or pothole repairs:

- Hensley Hill Road (MP 0.24 to 1.12)
- "Poor" pavement condition rating (as of 11/17/22)
- Current pavement width is 23 feet (urban standard is $24-30$ feet)
- Azalea Lane in Port Orford (MP 0 to 0.08)
- "Very Poor" pavement condition rating (as of 8/18/09)
- Current pavement width is 15 feet (urban standard is 24-30 feet)
- Fairgrounds Road (MP 0.09-0.28)
- "Poor" to Very Poor" pavement condition rating (as of 11/9/22)
- Current pavement width is 12-22 feet (urban standard is 24-30 feet)
- Noble Drive (MP 0.67-0.83)
- "Very Poor" pavement condition rating (as of 10/4/18)
- Current pavement width is 17 feet (urban standard is $24-30$ feet)
- Azalea Lane in Gold Beach (Full Extents)
- Current pavement width is 28 feet (urban standard is 24-30 feet)

Table 3. 2021-2027 CIP Roadway Projects for Curry County Arterials and Collectors with Identified Needs

| Project Name | Location (MP) | Description | Needs Idenifified in Tech Memo \#3 and/or Tech Memo \#4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gardner Ridge Road | 8.1 | Retaining wall system to repair slide (outside travel lane) | Current Pavement Width: 21 Feet / Rural Standard: 24 Feet |
| Langlois Mountain Road | 0-9.53 | Road maintenance (isolated reconstruction areas / roadway chip sealing) | Current Pavement Width: 18-22 Feet / Rural Standard: 24 Feet |
| Old County Road | 0.88-2.92 | Chip seal / repair isolated areas / examine subbase for possible replacement | Current Pavement Width: 16-19 Feet / Rural Standard: 24 Feet |
| Old Coast Road | $0.74-2.55$ | MP 0.737 to 1.734: pothole repair (ditch maintenance where necessary) <br> MP 1.734 to 2.554: chip seal (isolated repair areas prior) | Current Pavement Width: 16 Feet / Rural Standard: 24 Feet |
|  | $4.35-4.59$ | Chip seal, road reconstruction at both project limits, and ditch installation on east side | Current Pavement Width: 12 Feet / Rural Standard: 24 Feet |
| Floras Creek Road | 2.9 | 20-foot roadway widening (to the south), gabion style retaining wall, drainage improvements, and geotechnical investigation / environmental permitting | Current Pavement Width: 22 Feet / Rural Standard: 26 Feet |
|  | 3.31 | Curve straightening and roadway widening to County standards and drainage improvements | Current Pavement Width: 22 Feet / Rural Standard: 26 Feet |
|  | 3.96 | Gabion style retaining wall, roadway widening to County standards, roadway realignment, fog line striping, drainage improvements, and geotechnical investigation / environmental permitting | Current Pavement Width: 22 Feet / Rural Standard: 26 Feet |
|  | $2.61-5.18$ | Chip sealing, isolated areas of reconstruction, and fog line striping | Current Pavement Width: 22 Feet / Rural Standard: 26 Feet |
| Grizzly <br> Mountain Road | 0.39-1.34 | Asphalt spot repairs, 2-inch overlay, drainage improvements, and fog line striping | Current Pavement Width: 14-20 Feet / Rural Standard: 24 Feet <br> "Poor" PCI (MP 0.64 to 1.34 , as of 11/15/22) |
| Lower Harbor Road | $0.17-0.96$ | 5-foot-wide sidewalks, curb installation/relocation, retaining walls, ADA ramps, driveway approaches, drainage improvements, and utility relocation | No continuous sidewalks available today <br> Urban Standard for Major Collectors: 6Foot Sidewalks |
| Agness-Illahe Road | $6.61-7.55$ | Chip seal and repair turnoff at Illahe Lodge / other isolated areas prior to chip seal | Current Pavement Width: 18 Feet / Rural Standard: 24 Feet <br> "Very Good" PCI (as of 11/15/22) |
| Lower Harbor / Shopping Center | 0.68 | 80-foot roundabout, sidewalks, and possible right-of-way acquisition | Not Applicable |
| Lower Harbor / Commercial | 0.12 | 80-foot roundabout, sidewalks, and possible right-of-way/structure acquisition | Not Applicable |
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## CIP Bridge Projects

Table 4 summarizes County bridge projects in the CIP that could address needs that have been identified in Technical Memoranda \#3 (Update System Inventory) and \#4 (Current Transportation System Operations).
Table 4. 2021-2027 CIP Projects for Curry County Bridges with Identified Needs

| Project Name | ODOT <br> Bridge ID | Carries | Crosses | Description | Needs Identified in Tech Memo \#3 and/or Tech Memo \#4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Morrill Bridge | 15C26 | Floras Creek Rd | Floras Creek (N Fork) | Replacement | Structurally Deficient / Sufficiency Rating < 50 |
| Edson Creek <br> "A" Bridge | 15C004 | Sixes River Rd | Edson Creek | Girder strengthening | Scour Critical; CIP project does NOT address need |
| Myritle Creek Bridge | 15 Cl 5 | Arizona Ranch Rd (Co. Road 500) | Myrtle Creek | Replacement | Scour Critical / Weight Restricted-Load Posted / Sufficiency Rating < 50 |
| Willow Creek Bridge | 15 Cl 2 | Co. Road 136 | Willow Creek (EB) | Replacement | Scour Critical / <br> Sufficiency Rating < 50 |
| Don <br> Cameron Bridge | 15 C 14 | N Bank <br> Chetco River Rd | N Fork Chetco River | Maintenance / Repair | Scour Critical / <br> Sufficiency Rating < 50 |
| Hunter Creek Bridge | 15C010 | Hunter Creek Rd | Hunter Creek | Improvements or abandonment | Scour Critical / Weight Restricted-Load Posted / Sufficiency Rating < 50 |
| Lower Hunter Creek Bridge | 15C24 | Hunter Creek Rd | Hunters Creek | Maintenance / Repair | Scour Critical / Sufficiency Rating < 50 |
| Upper Crook Creek Bridge | 15C32 | North Bank Pistol River Rd | Upper Crook Creek | Elevating / Lengthening | Scour Critical; CIP project may NOT address need |
| Pistol River Overpass | 15C28 | Pistol River Road | Private Road | Rotted members replacement or abandon | Not Applicable |
| Pistol River Bridge | 15C33 | Pistol River Loop Rd (Co. Rd 693) | Pistol River | Improvements or abandonment | Structurally Deficient / <br> Sufficiency Rating < 50 / <br> Scour Critical |
| Gregg's Creek Bridge | 15C27 | Ophir Rd | Greggs Creek | Railing replacement, additional approach guardrail, and safety upgrades; footing beams and erosion monitoring | Scour Critical (could apply) |
| Euchre Creek Bridge | 15C31 | Ophir Rd (Co. <br> Road 510) | Euchre Creek | Replacement | Scour Critical / Weight Restricted-Load Posted / Sufficiency Rating < 50 |

## FUTURE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM OPERATIONS

The future transportation system operations analysis identifies how the study intersections shown in Figure lare expected to operate under year 2042 traffic conditions during the weekday evening peak period. The analysis also identifies non-motorized transportation movements at the study intersections. This evaluation helps to understand future needs of people driving, walking, and biking in the study area. The following sections summarize how forecast traffic volumes were developed at the study intersections and the resultant traffic operations and queuing analyses.
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## Forecast Traffic Volumes

Forecast traffic volumes were developed for the study intersections based on existing traffic volumes and information provided in the Statewide Integrated Model (SWIM). The strength of the SWIM is that it provides an understanding of future demand along US 101 through Curry County, which applies to all the study intersections. Estimated growth along US 101 varies in the SWIM for different regions of the county, therefore localized growth rates were used for the study intersections based on their location in the county, as opposed to using one average growth rate. This approach will avoid overestimating traffic growth in some areas and underestimating it in others.

While the SWIM provides an understanding of growth along US 101 , it does not provide the same understanding of future demand on all the side streets at the study intersections. Therefore, the localized US 101 growth rates were applied to all movements at the study intersections for a conservative estimate, except for the west leg of the US 101 / Oceanview Drive-Winchuck River Road intersection where estimated growth for the side street is available. Table 5 summarizes the 20-year growth factors that were applied to the existing traffic volumes at the study intersections. As shown, the greatest future demand on the US 101 corridor is expected in the area between Brookings and Gold Beach.

Table 5. 20-Year Study Intersection Growth Factors

| Map ID | Intersection | Growth Factor |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | US 101 / Floras Creek Rd | 1.05 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | US 101 / Sixes River Rd | 1.05 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | US 101 / Cape Blanco Hwy | 1.05 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | US 101 / Ophir Rd | 1.07 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | US 101 / Edson Creek Rd-Nesika Rd | 1.07 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | US 101 / Pistol River Rd | 1.13 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | US 101 / Cape Ferrelo Rd | 1.13 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | US 101 / Winchuck River Rd-Oceanview Dr | 1.03 / 1.25 (West Leg) |

## Traffic Operations Analysis

A future traffic operations analysis was performed to identify if the study intersections exceed their volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio targets in the year 2042. The analysis evaluated the forecast weekday PM peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersections assuming their current lane configurations and traffic control devices, illustrated in Figure 2, as none of the planned projects in Curry County previously referenced are expected to impact future intersection operations. The weekday PM peak hour was selected for the analysis given that it generally represents the most critical time period throughout the day. However, other peak hours may be more critical in some locations, such as near schools. The analysis used PTV Vistro 2022 software and its Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) $7^{\text {th }}$ Edition reports to summarize the V/C ratios, Levels of Service (LOS), delay, and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queves at the study intersections.
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Table 6 reports the resultant traffic operations and V/C ratio targets (per the Methodology and Assumptions Memorandum) at the study intersections and it indicates whether the intersections meet their V/C ratio targets. The V/C ratios shown are reported for the critical movement (CM) at the intersections given that all intersections are stop-controlled. The future 2042 traffic volumes and resultant traffic operations are also illustrated in Figure 3.

According to the analysis, all study intersections are expected to meet their $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ratio targets under year future 2042 (no-build) traffic conditions and the US 101 / Winchuck River Road-Ocean View Drive intersection continues to experience the highest side-street delay. The traffic operations worksheets are included in Attachment B.

Table 6. Traffic Operations Analysis Results - Future 2042 Weekday PM Peak Hour

| Map ID | Intersection | CM ${ }^{1}$ | V/C | LOS | Delay (sec) | V/C Ratio Target | Target Met? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | US 101 / Floras Creek Rd | WB | 0.01 | B | 10.1 | 0.75 N-S / 0.80 E | Yes |
| 2 | US 101 / Sixes River Rd | WB | 0.03 | B | 11.2 | 0.70 N-S / 0.75 E | Yes |
| 3 | US 101 / Cape Blanco Hwy | EB | 0.05 | B | 10.7 | 0.70 N-S / 0.75 W | Yes |
| 4 | US 101 / Ophir Rd | WB | 0.01 | A | 9.3 | 0.70 N-S / 0.75 E | Yes |
| 5 | US 101 / Edson Creek Rd-Nesika Rd | EB | 0.04 | B | 11.0 | 0.70 N-S / 0.75 E-W | Yes |
| 6 | US 101 / Pistol River Rd | WB | 0.03 | B | 11.7 | 0.70 N-S / 0.75 E | Yes |
| 7 | US 101 / Cape Ferrelo Rd | WB | 0.04 | B | 11.0 | 0.70 N-S / 0.75 E | Yes |
| 8 | US 101 / Winchuck River Rd-Oceanview Dr | EB | 0.18 | C | 24.0 | 0.75 N-S / 0.80 E-W | Yes |

$1 \mathrm{NB}=$ northbound; $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound; $\mathrm{EB}=$ eastbound; $\mathrm{WB}=$ westbound

## Queueing Analysis

Table 7 summarizes the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues at the study intersections during the weekday PM peak hour under year 2042 future (no-build) traffic conditions, as compared to the vehicle storage that is available. The vehicle queue lengths were rounded to the nearest 25 feet and the storage lengths reflect striped storage for each turn-lane pocket at the intersections or available storage to the upstream driveway or intersection. According to the analysis, all available vehicle storage at the study intersections is adequate to serve the expected future traffic volume queues. The queuing results are included in the traffic operations worksheets provided in Attachment B.
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Table 7. Queuing Analysis Results - Future 2042 Weekday PM Peak Hour

| Map ID | Intersection | Movement ${ }^{1}$ | Storage Length (feet) ${ }^{2}$ | 95ih Percentile Queue (feet) ${ }^{3}$ | Adequate? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | US 101 / Floras Creek Rd | SBLT | 490 | <25 | Yes |
|  |  | WBLR | 125 | 25 | Yes |
| 2 | US 101 / Sixes River Rd | NBL | 95 | <25 | Yes |
|  |  | SBL | 100 | <25 | Yes |
|  |  | EBLTR | 60 | <25 | Yes |
|  |  | WBLTR | 600 | 25 | Yes |
| 3 | US 101 / Cape Blanco Hwy | NBL | 180 | 25 | Yes |
|  |  | EBLR | 60 | 25 | Yes |
| 4 | US 101 / Ophir Rd | SBL | 750 | <25 | Yes |
|  |  | WBLR | 420 | <25 | Yes |
| 5 | US 101 / Edson Creek Rd-Nesika Rd | NBLTR | 980 | <25 | Yes |
|  |  | SBLTR | 3,400 | <25 | Yes |
|  |  | EBLTR | 980 | 25 | Yes |
|  |  | WBLTR | 260 | 25 | Yes |
| 6 | US 101 / Pistol River Rd | SBL | 155 | <25 | Yes |
|  |  | WBLR | 940 | 25 | Yes |
| 7 | US 101 / Cape Ferrelo Rd | SBLT | 760 | <25 | Yes |
|  |  | WBLR | 570 | 25 | Yes |
| 8 | US 101 / Winchuck River Rd-Oceanview Dr | NBL | 185 | 25 | Yes |
|  |  | SBL | 205 | 25 | Yes |
|  |  | EBLTR | 70 | 25 | Yes |
|  |  | WBLTR | 300 | 25 | Yes |

'NB = northbound; SB = southbound; EB = eastbound; WB = westbound; L = left; T = through; R = right
${ }^{2}$ Storage lengths reflect striped storage for each turn-lane pocket at the intersections or available storage to the upstream driveway or intersection.
${ }^{3}$ Vehicle queues were rounded to the nearest 25 feet.

## Non-Motorized Transportation Analysis

Curry County can expect to see similar pedestrian and bicycle volumes at the study intersections between existing and future 2042 traffic conditions, as summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. Non-Motorized Intersection Movements

| Map ID | Intersection | Non-Motorized Volume | Intersection Leg / Movement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | US 101 / Sixes River Rd | 1 Pedestrian | West Leg |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | US 101 / Cape Blanco Hwy | 1 Pedestrian | West Leg |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | US 101 / Pistol River Rd | 1 Bicyclist | Northbound Through |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | US 101 / Cape Ferrelo Rd | 4 Bicyclists | Southbound Through |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | US 101 / Winchuck River Rd-Oceanview Dr | 1 Pedestrian | Northbound |

As indicated in Technical Memorandum \#3 (Update System Inventory) and Technical Memorandum \#4 (Current Transportation System Operations), there are several gaps and deficiencies in the existing pedestrian and bicycle networks that limit pedestrian and bicycle movements and create stressful environments along roadways and at intersections, including several of the intersections shown above.

## FUTURE SAFETY CONDITIONS

The existing transportation conditions presented in Technical Memorandum \#4 (Current Transportation System Operations) revealed the following safety conditions within the project study area based on the most recent five years of available crash data (January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2021):

- 928 crashes were reported in Curry County between 2017 and 2021.
- $59 \%$ of all reported crashes resulted in some level of injury, including 14 fatal crashes and 45 serious injury crashes ( 4 of the fatal crashes included pedestrians and 1 included a bicyclist).
- $39 \%$ of all reported crashes were with a fixed or other object, $19 \%$ were turning movement, and $15 \%$ were rear-end.
- 22 of the reported crashes included pedestrians and 8 included bicyclists.
- No crashes were reported at the US 101 / Cape Blanco Highway, US 101 / Pistol River Road, or US 101 / Cape Ferrelo Road intersections during the study period.
- No study intersection has an observed crash rate that exceeds the applicable 90th percentile crash rate or critical crash rate (the US 101 / Floras Creek Road intersection crash rate -0.23 - is approaching its critical crash rate threshold -0.28 ).
- No study intersection exhibits an excess proportion of any one crash type.
- 44 of the 125 study segments have observed crash rates that exceed the rural highway crash rates (many exhibited less than one crash per year).
- 6 segments, all along US 101 , had more than ten total crashes, 4 of which are in Brookings (most the crashes were rear-end or turning movement and included 3 of the fatal crashes).
- There are no SPIS sites in the top $10 \%$ within Curry County from the most recent SPIS list.

The safety conditions summarized above are expected to worsen over time if vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volumes increase and if no changes are made to the transportation system. Although the County's CIP includes several important roadway improvements, none of them are expected to improve these safety conditions. They will be evaluated in the upcoming alternatives analysis for potential safety solutions.

## FUTURE MULTIMODAL CONDITIONS

A review of future multimodal conditions across the county is presented in the following sections, including the current and expected inventory of multimodal facilities and services, future bicycle level of traffic stress, and the pedestrian and transit qualitative multimodal assessments. The current multimodal conditions identified in Technical Memorandum \#4 (Current Transportation System Operations) are generally expected to deteriorate with time if vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volumes increase and if no changes are made to the transportation system.

## Multimodal Inventory

A comprehensive inventory of the existing transit, bicycle, and pedestrian network was undertaken in Technical Memorandum \#3 (Update System Inventory). The transit inventory detailed that:

- Public transit is operated by Curry Public Transit (CPT) and the SouthWest POINT. CPT runs fixed-route service between Coos Bay/North Bend and Smith River and dial-a-ride service in Brookings and Gold Beach. SouthWest POINT operates intercity bus service between Klamath Falls and Brookings.
- CPT has 5 official bus stops in Port Orford, Gold Beach, Brookings, and Harbor and 2 flag stops in Langlois. Bus stop amenities range from no amenities to covered shelters, etc.
CPT does not have park and ride facilities or transit centers in its service area.
- $24 \%$ of Curry County's overall population lives with a disability and many are concentrated around the incorporated cities and unincorporated rural communities.

The recently adopted CPT Transit Development Plan (TDP) has identified several transit opportunities that may affect future transit operations. These opportunities will be considered in the upcoming alternatives analysis.
The bicycle and pedestrian inventory found that:

- County collectors and arterials lack walking and biking facilities in both the rural areas and within the UGBs, except for some sidewalks and bike lanes on select streets in Brookings and Gold Beach.
- The only walking and biking facilities available on the State highway system are four foot (or wider) paved shoulders along US 101 (this highway is a coastal bike route). Sidewalks and bike lanes are generally provided on US 101 within the UGBs.
- The Oregon Coast Bike Route (OCBR) is a popular bike route running the length of the Oregon coast (US 101) for approximately 370 miles. The Wild Rivers Coast Scenic Bikeway is an Oregon Scenic Bikeway in the Port Orford area.
- Many of the county's primary activity centers that could generate biking and walking trips are located within the urban and unincorporated areas and appear to be accessible by bicycle or walking.

The existing bicycle and pedestrian network is expected to remain the same through 2042, with the exception of a few bike lane and sidewalk projects outlined in ODOT's STIP and the County's CIP. These projects will be considered in the upcoming alternatives analysis.

## Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress

The existing Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) analysis presented in Technical Memorandum \#4 (Current Transportation System Operations) revealed that most arterials and collectors in Curry County score with a BLTS 2 or 3 and few of these roadways or sections of roadway score with a BLTS 1 or BLTS 4. The BLTS scores of roadways generally lowers further from the urbanized areas of the county where daily traffic volumes decrease and the roadway environment becomes increasingly rural. Even without dedicated biking facilities, rural roadways can receive a score of BLTS 2 if bicyclists are sharing the roadway with fewer vehicles, depending on the posted or prevailing speed. The lack of dedicated bicycle facilities may still be uncomfortable for some riders, despite a BLTS score of 2 .

Conversely, most roadways with higher BLTS scores are generally centered around the urbanized areas of the county and are attributed to higher traffic volumes and higher posted speeds, especially without dedicated biking facilities.

The BLTS for arterials and collectors in the county is expected to remain the same over time with the estimated growth in vehicular volumes, described in previous sections, except for these facilities:

- S Bank Chetco River Road from Harbor View Creek to the eastern UGB: the BLTS score for this segment is expected to increase from 3 under current traffic conditions to 4 under future traffic conditions, if no changes are made to the facility.
- N Bank Chetco River Road from Yellowbrick Road to the eastern UGB: the BLTS score for this segment is expected to increase from 3 under current traffic conditions to 4 under future traffic conditions, if no changes are made to the facility.
- Sixes River Road from US 101 to MP 2.0: the BLTS score for this segment is expected to increase from 2 under current traffic conditions to 3 under future traffic conditions, if no changes are made to the facility.

The changes in BLTS scores are illustrated in Figure 4 and the analysis worksheet is provided in Attachment C . These bicycle conditions will be evaluated in the upcoming alternatives analysis for possible bicycle facility solutions.

## Pedestrian Qualitative Multimodal Assessment

The existing pedestrian qualitative multimodal assessment presented in Technical Memorandum \#4 (Current Transportation System Operations revealed that:

- Most arterials and collectors result in "Poor" Pedestrian QMA ratings - except within and near the incorporated cities and unincorporated communities. This "Poor" rating is generally due to a lack of walking facilities and lighting and the presence of higher posted speeds.
- US 101 is primarily rated as "Fair" near the incorporated cities and unincorporated communities and demonstrates some "Good" ratings in Port Orford and Brookings.
- Some sections of US 101 and the remaining State highways are rated as "Poor."

The pedestrian conditions summarized above are expected to remain the same if no changes are made to the transportation system. These conditions will be evaluated in the upcoming alternatives analysis for possible pedestrian facility solutions.

## Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Risk

The existing safety risk assessment presented in Technical Memorandum \#4 (Current Transportation System Operations) revealed that:

- Safety risks to bicyclists are relatively high along the US 101 corridor throughout the county but is highest within the Brookings UGB. This is due to factors such as access density, proximity to transit and schools, demographics, and zoning of adjacent lands.
- The greatest safety risks to pedestrians are the highest on US 101 near Airport Road, within the city limits of Port Orford and Gold Beach (northern) and the Brookings UGB, and near the Cape Sebastian area north of Pistol River.

These bicycle and pedestrian safety risk conditions will be evaluated in the upcoming alternatives analysis for possible solutions.
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## Transit Qualitative Multimodal Assessment

The existing transit qualitative multimodal assessment presented in Technical Memorandum \#4 (Current Transportation System Operations) revealed that transit services and facilities in the county results in a Transit QMA rating of "Fair" primarily due to its frequency. Although service is rated as "Fair," it is important to note that available services and facilities are currently rural and provide countywide coverage, and more. The transit conditions are expected to remain the same if no changes are made to the transit or transportation systems. These transit quality conditions will be evaluated in the upcoming alternatives analysis, including the recommendations identified in the recently adopted CPT TDP, for possible solutions.

## FUTURE FREIGHT OPERATIONS

The existing transportation conditions presented in Technical Memorandum \#4 (Current Transportation System Operations) revealed the following freight conditions:

- US 101, OR 250, and OR 255 are restricted to moving freight up to specific lengths and widths (more details are available on MCTD route maps) and are not authorized to move triples combinations.
- US 101 includes weight restricted bridges across Reinhart Creek (MP 311.40) south of Port Orford and Connector Road (MP 326.47) in Gold Beach.
- OR 250 and OR 255 are not authorized for continuous movement of 14 feet wide mobile homes / modular building units.
- Alternative freight routes to the primary arterials accessing Curry County - US 101, US 199, OR 42 - are limited and may not be appropriate for moving freight in their current state.
- One low-priority freight pinch point is located on US 101 that is approximately 1.8 miles long near Humbug Mountain State Park. Removing the pinch point would involve significant environmental constraints and major earthwork and construction.
- No high-priority bottlenecks, seismic landslide sites, specific freight impacts, or freight highway delay areas are identified on the State highway system in the county.
- 29 bridges are identified as either being structurally deficient (6), weight restricted (7), or having sufficiency ratings below 50 (25); one bridge can be all three of these.
- 10 of these bridges are under County jurisdiction and the remaining are owned by ODOT, the State Parks, or privately held. The County's CIP is addressing some of these bridges.
- No seismic bridges are identified on the State highway system in Curry County.
- Lower Harbor Road in Brookings and Dock Road to Harbor Drive in Port Orford are intermodal connectors with identified needs for moving freight.

These freight conditions will be considered in the upcoming alternatives analysis as possible roadway solutions are developed.

## ATTACHMENT A - CURRY COUNTY 2021-2027 CIP PROJECTS

Table 9. 2021-2027 CIP Roadway Projects for Curry County

| Project Name | Description | Type | Project Cost | Schedule |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gardner Ridge Road (MP 8.1) | A retaining wall system will be installed to repair the slide. | Slide Repair | \$800,670 | 2020-21 |
| Langlois Mountain Road (MP 5.7) | Drainage improvements, including placement of deep sub drainage systems, a paved roadway ditch on the north side of the road along with ditch inlets, and a catch basin to convey surface water away from the road. | Slide Repair/ Drainage | \$324,550 | 2020-21 |
| Langlois Mountain Road (MP 0 to 9.53) | Road maintenance including isolated reconstruction areas to repair sections of pavement, followed by chip sealing the roadway. | Spot <br> Repair/Chip Seal | $\begin{gathered} \$ 120,870 / \\ \$ 202,000 \end{gathered}$ | 2023-24 |
| Nicholson Drive (MP 0 to 0.18 ) | Construct 2-inch asphalt overlay and reconstruct areas as necessary to fix potholes. Install ditching and culvert improvements. | Drainage/ Spot Repair/ Overlay | \$110,250 | 2020-21 |
| Chapman Lane (MP 0 †o 0.17) | Construct 2-inch asphalt overlay and reconstruct areas as necessary. Install posted speed signs. | Spot Repair/ Overlay | \$154,590 | 2021-22 |
| Cedar Valley and McKinnon Drive | Remove existing 60-inch diameter Corrugated Metal Pipe culvert and replace it with a 19 foot 6 inch wide by 9 -foot-high bottomless arch culvert to meet fish passage design standards. Construct a pre-treatment bioswale. Reconstruct existing removed roadway with new 22-foot wide roadway with type " $c$ " curbs, 4 -inches of asphalt concrete pavement on 12 -inches of aggregate base. | Drainage/ Overlay | \$471,080 | 2020-21 |
| Old County Road (MP 0.88 to 2.92) | Chip seal road and repair isolated areas. Examine subbase to determine if it needs replacing. | Spot Repair/ Chip Seal | $\begin{gathered} \$ 84,890 / \\ \$ 55,000 \end{gathered}$ | 2021-22 |
| Wollam Road (MP 0 to 0.11) | Chip seal to preserve the existing asphalt and extend the life of the road. The alligator cracking area at MP 0.05 needs to be investigated prior to chip sealing for subbase failure. | Subbase Inv./ Chip Seal | $\begin{gathered} \$ 17,220 / \\ \$ 4,000 \end{gathered}$ | 2021-22 |
| Hensley Hill Road (MP 0.24 to 1.12) | Curbing with a curb inlet and culvert across the road is recommended for preservation at the beginning of the County section of roadway. Some reconstruction areas will be needed to fix sinking pavement in this section of the road. Low lying areas on the uphill side of the single lane road could use sub-drainage systems to convey water across the road. Some cracking areas will require reconstruction. A 2-inch overlay is recommended after repairs have been made to the entire roadway. | Spot Repair/ Curb/Overlay | \$527,540 | 2023-24 |


| Project Name | Description | Type | Project Cost | Schedule |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Bayview Drive (MP } \\ 0 \text { to } 0.11 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | Recommended improvements include removing curbs and adding curbs and gutters with a 2inch taper grind and 2-inch asphalt inlay. Provide reconstruction of the asphalt, 18-inches outside of the new gutter to install the curb and gutter. Driveways will need to be paved or reconstructed with new curb and gutter construction. A curb inlet should be installed at the northeast and northwest intersections of Bayview Drive and Hillside Terrace with a culvert installed to convey flows to the north and into the Hillside Terrace drainage system. | Spot Repair/Curb/ Overlay | \$287,610 | Not <br> Scheduled |
| Hillside Terrace (MP 0.1 to 0.27) | Full road reconstruction with curb and gutters on each side of the road, storm drainage infrastructure and road widening at the north end of the street. Existing ditching on the east side of the road would be replaced with piping. The north end of the road will be widened and designed to provide proper site distance from oncoming traffic on the top of the hill. | Full Reconstruction | \$574,260 | 2022-23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Crestline Loop (MP } \\ & 0 \text { to } 0.25 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | Construct 2-inch asphalt overlay with leveling and some reconstruction areas prior to paving. Reconstruction areas will be required. Asphalt driveway aprons are recommended to keep gravel off the roadway. | Spot Repair/ Overlay | \$157,580 | 2021-22 |
| Titus Lane (MP 0 to 0.13) | Construct 2-inch overlay; perform manhole frame adjustments. | Overlay | \$86,660 | 2021-22 |
| Knapp Rd (MP 0 to $0.35)$ | Construct 2-inch overlay. The center of the road will have an increased depth of asphalt to reestablish the crown of the road where the road appears to be flat. Work includes drainage ditching and adding culverts in areas that do not currently have drainage infrastructure. | Drainage/ Overlay | \$251,280 | 2023-24 |
| Pacific Crest Drive <br> (MP 0 to 0.27) | Widen approach of Pacific Crest Drive. Near the driveway at 19056 Pacific Crest Drive the pavement is cracking and settling on the edge of the road that will require road reconstruction. It is recommended to provide a new chip seal after areas of the road have been repaired and the approach widened. | Widening/ Overlay/Chip Seal | $\begin{gathered} \$ 155,120 / \\ \$ 9,000 \end{gathered}$ | 2024-25 |
| McKenzie Road (MP 0 †o 0.48) | The intersection of McKenzie Road should be reconstructed to meet Curry County standards. A soil nail wall system is needed to resolve this slide area. A temporary drainage and groundwater system is needed for improving the drainage in this area including a paved ditch, subsurface drain system and upgrading the ditch inlet. Multiple areas along the roadway will require reconstruction. After reconstruction areas are repaired it is recommended the McKenzie Road be chip sealed. | Slide/Spot Repair/Chip Seal | $\begin{gathered} \$ 236,130 / \\ \$ 15,000 \end{gathered}$ | 2023-24 |
| Stonecypher Road (MP 0 †o 0.3) | Construct 2-inch overlay. | Overlay | \$110,470 | 2023-024 |
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| Project Name | Description | Type | Project Cost | Schedule |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Old Coast Road (MP 0.74 MP 2.55) | Milepost 0.737 to Milepost 1.734 on Old Coast Road has some pothole areas to be repaired. Ditch maintenance is suggested where necessary. It is recommended that MP 1.734 to MP 2.554 on Old Coast Road be chip sealed to preserve the existing asphalt. Isolated repair areas are recommended prior to chip sealing. | Spot Repair/ Chip Seal | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 208,900 / \\ & \$ 100,000 \end{aligned}$ | 2024-25 |
| Old Coast Road (MP 4.35 to 4.59 ) | The roadway section needs to be chip sealed to preserve the existing pavement. The beginning and end of this section of Old Coast Road needs to be reconstructed prior to the chip seal. Tree roots will be cut out of the road and the asphalt and base repaired after removing the roots. A ditch installed on the east side of the road will ensure the water is redirected from the road. | Spot Repair/ Chip Seal | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 54,650 / \\ & \$ 15,000 \end{aligned}$ | 2024-25 |
| Floras Creek Road (MP 2.9) | Widen road to the south to a standard 20 -foot wide road. Install a 100 -foot section of gabion style retaining wall along the road and across the 72 -inch diameter culvert for slope stability. The existing ditch will need to be filled in and replaced with 12 -inch diameter culverts. The 72 -inch diameter culvert and structure are recommended to be replaced. A culvert outlet structure will need to be installed to replace the existing wooden structural pipe support. A geotechnical investigation and environmental permitting are included in the construction cost estimate. | Drainage/ Widening/ Slide Repair | \$650,130 | Not <br> Scheduled |
| Floras Creek Road (MP 2.7) | Install an 80 -foot gabion style retaining wall along the north side. The existing 18 -inch diameter culvert needs replacement. The inlet side of the road needs to be ditched parallel to the road on each side of the new culvert. A geotechnical investigation and environmental permitting are included in the construction cost estimate. | Bank <br> Stabilization | \$231,680 | Not <br> Scheduled |
| Floras Creek Road (MP 3.96) | Install a 120-foot of gabion style retaining wall on the north inside side of the curve. The road should be widened to County standards. The existing roadway will be realigned 100 feet east of the curve. Fog line installation on each side of the road is suggested for safety. The existing culvert outlet on the north side of the road will need to be replaced and extended, ten feet. Rip rap installation on the outlet side will ensure slope stabilization. A geotechnical investigation and environmental permitting are included in the construction cost estimate. | Slide Repair/ Widening | \$421,450 | Not <br> Scheduled |
| Floras Creek Road (MP 3.31) | The road needs to be realigned to fix sharp curves and widen the road to County standards. Work will include the replacement of 200 feet of roadway to straighten the road, embankment, and extending the existing culvert 20 feet to the south. | Realignment/ Widening/ Drainage | \$179,420 | Not <br> Scheduled |
| Floras Creek Road (MP 2.61 to 5.18 ) | Recommended improvements include chip sealing the existing roadway to preserve the pavement. Some isolated areas of reconstruction are recommended to fix sinking and cracking areas, primarily along the edge of the road. These repairs will take place prior to chip sealing. Fog lines need to be added on each side of the roadway. | Spot Repair/ Chip Seal | $\begin{gathered} \$ 219,990 / \\ \$ 119,000 \end{gathered}$ | 2023-24 |


| Project Name | Description | Type | Project Cost | Schedule |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pacific View Drive <br> (MP 0 to 0.36) | Overlaying Pacific View Drive after the repair areas are addressed is recommended. Reconstruction includes grinding out the existing asphalt to subbase and paving back to grade before chip sealing. Attention should be given to the subbase to determine if any replacement will be necessary. Foundation stabilization should be used as required. Maintenance of ditches, culverts, and sweeping the roadway is to be provided by the County as necessary. | Grind/Chip Seal | \$153,060 | 2025-26 |
| County Shop Road (MP 0 to 0.23) | Some reconstruction areas will be necessary to repair the roadway, specifically near the County Shop Road and Highway 101 intersection and near the culvert on the north side of the road. After repair areas have been completed the road will have a 2 -inch overlay with leveling to preserve the existing asphalt. A majority of culverts on this road are in fair/poor condition and need to be brought to good condition prior to overlaying the roadway. Permitting may be required for culvert replacements and is included in the cost for this project. | Drainage/ Spot Repair/ Overlay | \$209,230 | Not <br> Scheduled |
| Azalea Lane (MP 0 to 0.08) | It is recommended to widen the road to 16 feet and pave Azalea Lane with 2-inches of asphalt on 12 -inches of aggregate base to bring it up to County standards. Prior to paving an investigation to determine if existing rock can be used as a road base for cost savings should be performed. | Widening/ Paving | \$87,880 | 2020-21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Demoss Road (MP } \\ & 0 \text { to } 0.16 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | Install 2-inch asphalt overlay. Work includes reconstruction areas to repair potholes and cracking as necessary before the overlay. | Spot Repair/ Overlay | \$116,280 | 2021-22 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Gowman Lane (MP } \\ 0 \text { to } 0.19 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | A full roadway reconstruction for Gowman Lane with 2-inches of asphalt on 12-inches of aggregate base is suggested. The subbase will be investigated and replaced with foundation stabilization as necessary. | Full Reconstruction | \$320,680 | 2021-22 |
| Grizzly Mountain Road (MP 0.39 to 1.34) | Recommendations include spot repairs for asphalt removal and paving back 4-inches where necessary. The spot repairs will be followed by a 2 -inch overlay. Install additional culverts and maintain ditching. Fog lines on each side of the road are suggested for safety during low visibility conditions. | Spot Repair/ Overlay/ Drainage | \$315,760 | 2024-25 |
| Emerald Drive (MP 0 to 0.09) | It is recommended to realign and change the elevation of 300 linear feet of road starting at Hunter Creek Heights. Right-of-way may need to be procured to the east of Emerald Drive to realign the road. The remaining portion of the road will be reconstructed where necessary and a 2 -inch overlay for pavement preservation to increase the life of the road. | Realign/Spot Repair/ Overlay | $\begin{gathered} \$ 199,800 / \\ \$ 3,000 \end{gathered}$ | 2024-25 |
| Fairgrounds Road (MP 0.09 to 0.28) | FAIRGR601A\&B need a 2-inch grind and inlay. Potholes and sinking areas will need to be repaired as necessary before the inlay. A proper drainage system is recommended with valley gutters, ditches, and culverts. FAIRGR601C will need full reconstruction per Curry County standards. | Spot Repair/ Inlay | \$286,320 | 2024-25 |
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| Project Name | Description | Type | Project Cost | Schedule |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lower Harbor Road (MP 0.17 to 0.96 ) | This project includes adding 3,500 lineal feet of 5 -foot-wide concrete sidewalks on Lower Harbor Road. Work for the sidewalk improvements will include some new curb installation/relocation, retaining walls, ADA ramps, driveway approaches, storm drainage improvements where necessary, and relocation of utilities as required. | Sidewalk Improvements | \$1,089,720 | Not <br> Scheduled |
| Agness-Illahe Road (MP 6.61 to 7.55) | It is recommended to finish chip sealing from MP 6.8 to MP 7.548 to preserve and extend the life of the existing pavement. The turnoff at Illahe Lodge and some isolated areas will need repaired prior to the chip seal. | Spot Repair/ Chip Seal | \$53,840 | 2022-23 |
| Noble Drive (MP 0.67 to 0.83 ) | It is recommended for Curry County to transfer this road to the adjacent property owners for sole use of the roadway. If the County does not vacate the road, costs for full reconstruction of the roadway are provided. | Full Reconstruction | \$177,860 | Not <br> Scheduled |
| Driftwood Drive, Azalea Lane, and lris Street (MP 0 to 0.31) | Recommended improvements include removing curbs and replacing them with curb and gutters. A 2-inch grind, and 2-inch asphalt inlay. A reconstruction area, 18-inches from the existing curb line prior to the inlay is recommended to repair the large gap between existing curbs and asphalt. The storm drain system needs upgraded with new culverts, storm drain pipes and catch basins. | Drainage/ Reconstruction | \$1,415,170 | Not Scheduled |
| Lower Harbor and Shopping Center Intersection (MP 0.68 ) | Installing a roundabout addresses flow issues from the boat launch parking and Shopping Center intersection and will increase safety. The proposed roundabout with sidewalks would encompass an 80 foot radius, which may require some additional right-of-way. This item is not included in the cost of the project. | Intersection Improvement | \$977,640 | Not <br> Scheduled |
| Lower Harbor and Commercial Intersection (MP 0.12) | Installing a roundabout at this intersection would address any flow issues and increase safety. The proposed roundabout and sidewalks footprint would include an 80 foot radius. Steep ground and an existing retaining wall prohibit construction of the roundabout to the east of Lower Harbor Road. Land acquisition needs procured to the west of Lower Harbor Road for right-of-way. It appears the Seal Cove Reality Building is located within the construction area and would need to be purchased and removed. These items are not included in the cost of this project. | Intersection Improvement | \$1,027,480 | Not <br> Scheduled |
| Lakeshore Drive Turnaround (MP 0.37) | Installing a " $T$ " turnaround at the end of this road would address preexisting issues. Gabian retaining wall will be installed at the end of Lakeshore Drive. Signs can be posted to deter the public from parking and using the dead end road for lake access. | Turnaround Improvement | \$98,270 | Not <br> Scheduled |

Table 10. 2021-2027 CIP Bridge Projects for Curry County

| Project Name | Description | Project Cost | Schedule |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Morril Bridge | Morrill Bridge is currently in the design phase of full removal and replacement. | \$2,500,000 | 2020-21 |
| Edson Creek "A" Bridge | The proposed recommendation is to strengthen the existing bridge girders in accordance with the ODOT Bridge Design Manual as needed for flexure and shear. | \$366,000 | 2021-22 |
| Myrtle Creek Bridge | The proposed recommendation is a full bridge replacement with a modern bridge type of sufficient width and clearance, including standard bridge rails and approach rail features. The replacement bridge is assumed to be a single span structure with a width of less than 20 feet so that is not considered a deficient two-lane bridge. | \$3,410,000 | 2025-26 |
| Willow Creek Bridge | The County stated that the bridge has deteriorated since last bridge inspection and anticipates a much lower bridge rating. This bridge is considered priority for replacement. | TBD | TBD |
| Don Cameron Bridge | The Don Cameron Bridge is in fair to poor condition and meets minimum tolerable limits. If funds become available minor repairs would improve the Don Cameron Bridge significantly. | TBD | TBD |
| Lower Hunter Creek Bridge | Lower Hunter Creek Bridge is in fair to poor condition and a high priority for corrective action. | TBD | TBD |
| Upper Crook Creek Bridge | Although the bridge structure is in good condition, there is very low clearance between the bottom of the bridge and creek bed. This location has been experiencing buildup of silt and gravel from upstream salmon habitat projects. The buildup is causing capacity concerns, and excavating is not an option due to regulatory requirements. The bridge needs to be elevated and lengthened to accommodate flow levels. | TBD | TBD |
| Pistol River Overpass | Pistol River Overpass Bridge received a fair condition rating and would benefit from the replacement of damaged/rotten members. The County would like to abandon this bridge and provide current residents with an alternative route to cut costs for bridge maintenance and future repairs. | TBD | TBD |
| Gregg's Creek Bridge | Gregg's Creek Bridge received a high structural inspection rating and would highly benefit from railing replacement, additional approach guardrail, and an upgrade to current safety standards. There is a scheduled install of object markers at all four corners of the structure. Monitoring of the footing, cracks in beams, and erosion is needed. | TBD | TBD |
| Euchre Creek Bridge | Euchre Creek Bridge is in critical to serious condition with a sufficiency rating of 23.8 and is a high priority for replacement. Euchre Creek Bridge has been identified as a historical structure and may be eligible for alternate funding. There are alternate routes available if this bridge were to be closed due to safety concerns and the County could elect to abandon the bridge if repairs are too costly. | TBD | TBD |
| Pistol River Bridge | Pistol River Bridge was rated as structurally deficient. This is one of the longest bridges maintained by Curry County. The bridge is located on a looped roadway; because of the looped road, the bridge is not crucial for traffic conveyance. If funding cannot be acquired, an option would be to abandon the bridge. | TBD | TBD |
| Hunter Creek Bridge | Hunter Creek Bridge is in serious condition, basically intolerable, and a high priority for corrective action. This bridge is also located on a looped roadway and abandoning the structure may be an option if funding cannot be secured. | TBD | TBD |

## ATTACHMENT B - FUTURE TRAFFIC OPERATIONS WORKSHEETS

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 1: US 101 / Floras Creek Road

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 12.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 7th Edition | Level Of Service: | B |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.004 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | US 101 |  | US 101 |  | Floras Creek Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $F$ |  | $4$ |  | $T$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Entry Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exit Pocket Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 55.00 |  | 40.00 |  | 55.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 2.80 |  | -1.90 |  | 1.10 |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |

## Volumes

| Name | US 101 |  | US 101 |  | Floras Creek Rd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 204 | 4 | 7 | 275 | 2 | 9 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 11.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8.00 | 0.00 | 11.00 |
| Growth Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 204 | 4 | 7 | 275 | 2 | 9 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 54 | 1 | 2 | 72 | 1 | 2 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 215 | 4 | 7 | 289 | 2 | 10 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |

Version 2022 (SP 0-2)
Intersection Settings

| Priority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  | Yes |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  |  |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | No |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.65 | 0.00 | 12.28 | 9.61 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | B | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft/ln] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 1.26 | 1.26 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.18 |  | 10.05 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | B |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 2: US 101 / Sixes River Road

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay (sec /veh): | 12.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 7th Edition | Level Of Service: | B |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.017 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | US 101 |  |  | US 101 |  |  | Private Driveway |  |  | Sixes River Rd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $7 F$ |  |  | $7 F$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Entry Pocket Length [ft] | 95.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exit Pocket Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 55.00 |  |  | 55.00 |  |  | 10.00 |  |  | 55.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 2.40 |  |  | 0.70 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | US 101 |  |  | US 101 |  |  | Private Driveway |  |  | Sixes River Rd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 2 | 226 | 10 | 6 | 232 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 10 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 0.00 | 12.00 | 10.00 | 0.00 | 13.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 |
| Growth Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 2 | 226 | 10 | 6 | 232 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 10 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 1 | 59 | 3 | 2 | 61 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 2 | 238 | 11 | 6 | 244 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 11 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  |

Version 2022 (SP 0-2)
Intersection Settings

| Priority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  | Yes |  |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  | 0 |  |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | No |  |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 7.71 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.72 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 13.28 | 13.29 | 9.60 | 12.91 | 13.04 | 10.00 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | B | A | B | B | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft/ln] | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 2.46 | 2.46 | 2.46 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.06 |  |  | 0.18 |  |  | 9.60 |  |  | 11.22 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection Level Of Service Report

Intersection 3: US 101 / Cape Blanco Highway (OR 250)

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 12.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 7th Edition | Level Of Service: | B |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.029 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | US 101 |  | US 101 |  | Cape Blanco Highway |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $71$ |  | $\\|$ |  | $T$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Thru | Right | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Entry Pocket Length [ft] | 180.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exit Pocket Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 55.00 |  | 55.00 |  | 55.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | -1.30 |  | 2.50 |  | 1.50 |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |

## Volumes

| Name | US 101 |  | US 101 |  | Cape Blanco Highway |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 23 | 223 | 237 | 8 | 14 | 16 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 0.00 | 11.00 | 12.00 | 25.00 | 8.00 | 0.00 |
| Growth Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 23 | 223 | 237 | 8 | 14 | 16 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9300 | 0.9300 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 6 | 59 | 62 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 24 | 235 | 249 | 8 | 15 | 17 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |

Version 2022 (SP 0-2)
Intersection Settings

| Priority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  | No |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  |  |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | No |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 7.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12.23 | 9.28 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | B | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln] | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft/ln] | 1.39 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.77 | 3.77 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.72 |  | 0.00 |  | 10.66 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | B |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.96 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 4: US 101 / Ophir Creek Road

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 10.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 7th Edition | Level Of Service: | B |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.002 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | US 101 |  |  | US 101 |  |  | Private Driveway |  |  | Ophir Creek Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Entry Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exit Pocket Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 55.00 |  |  | 55.00 |  |  | 15.00 |  |  | 55.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.72 |  |  | -1.50 |  |  | 1.80 |  |  | 1.50 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | US 101 |  |  | US 101 |  |  | Private Driveway |  |  | Ophir Creek Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 0 | 110 | 1 | 4 | 171 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 0.00 | 17.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Growth Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 110 | 1 | 4 | 171 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 29 | 0 | 1 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 116 | 1 | 4 | 180 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

Version 2022 (SP 0-2)
Intersection Settings

| Priority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  | No |  |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  | 0 |  |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | No |  |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 7.56 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.43 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10.74 | 11.08 | 9.19 | 10.70 | 11.07 | 8.86 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | B | A | B | B | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft/ln] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.36 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.16 |  |  | 10.34 |  |  | 9.32 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection Level Of Service Report

 Intersection 5: US 101 / Edson Creek Road-Nesika RoadControl Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Two-way stop
HCM 7th Edition
15 mindes

| Delay (sec / veh): | 12.5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Level Of Service: | B |
| Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c})$ : | 0.016 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | US 101 |  |  | US 101 |  |  | Nesika Road |  |  | Edson Creek Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Entry Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exit Pocket Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 55.00 |  |  | 55.00 |  |  | 55.00 |  |  | 45.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.40 |  |  | 0.30 |  |  | 2.30 |  |  | -2.00 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | US 101 |  |  | US 101 |  |  | Nesika Road |  |  | Edson Creek Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 21 | 127 | 6 | 9 | 170 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 10.00 | 18.00 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 16.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14.00 | 6.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50.00 |
| Growth Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 21 | 127 | 6 | 9 | 170 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 6 | 33 | 2 | 2 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 22 | 134 | 6 | 9 | 179 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 19 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

Version 2022 (SP 0-2)
Intersection Settings

| Priority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  | Yes |  |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  | 0 |  |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | No |  |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 7.69 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 11.98 | 12.48 | 9.48 | 11.57 | 11.50 | 9.61 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | B | A | B | B | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln] | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft/ln] | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 3.01 | 3.01 | 3.01 | 1.75 | 1.75 | 1.75 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 1.04 |  |  | 0.37 |  |  | 10.37 |  |  | 10.99 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 6: US 101 / Pistol River Road

| Control Type: | Two-way stop | Delay $(\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}):$ | 12.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Method: | HCM 7 th Edition | Level Of Service: | B |
| Analysis Period: | 15 minutes | Volume to Capacity $(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}):$ | 0.015 |

Intersection Setup

| Name | US 101 |  | US 101 |  | Carpenterville Road |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $F$ |  | $71$ |  | $T$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Entry Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 155.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exit Pocket Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 55.00 |  | 55.00 |  | 55.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | -1.30 |  | 1.40 |  | 2.70 |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |

## Volumes

| Name | US 101 |  | US 101 |  | Carpenterville Road |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 213 | 6 | 3 | 244 | 6 | 5 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 7.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 19.00 | 20.00 | 50.00 |
| Growth Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 214 | 6 | 3 | 248 | 6 | 5 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 56 | 2 | 1 | 65 | 2 | 1 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 225 | 6 | 3 | 261 | 7 | 6 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |

Version 2022 (SP 0-2)
Intersection Settings

| Priority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  | Yes |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  |  |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | No |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.68 | 0.00 | 12.88 | 10.35 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | B | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft/ln] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 1.82 | 1.82 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.09 |  | 11.71 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | B |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection Level Of Service Report Intersection 7: US 101 / Cape Ferrelo Road



Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:

Two-way stop
HCM 7 th Edition
15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh):
11.0

Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ):
0.045

Intersection Setup

| Name | US 101 |  | US 101 |  | Cape Ferrelo Road |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Westbound |  |
| Lane Configuration | $\\|$ |  | $4$ |  | $T$ |  |
| Turning Movement | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Left | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Entry Pocket Length [ft] | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exit Pocket Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 55.00 |  | 55.00 |  | 35.00 |  |
| Grade [\%] | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | -7.10 |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |

## Volumes

| Name | US 101 |  | US 101 |  | Cape Ferrelo Road |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 260 | 44 | 3 | 299 | 25 | 1 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 9.00 | 5.00 | 0.00 | 19.00 | 5.00 | 0.00 |
| Growth Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 261 | 44 | 3 | 299 | 25 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9000 | 0.9000 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 69 | 12 | 1 | 79 | 7 | 0 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 275 | 46 | 3 | 315 | 28 | 1 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |

Version 2022 (SP 0-2)
Intersection Settings

| Priority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  | No |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  |  |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | No |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.88 | 0.00 | 11.05 | 9.32 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | B | A |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft/ln] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.06 | 3.61 | 3.61 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.00 |  | 0.07 |  | 10.99 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A |  | B |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 0.51 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection Level Of Service Report

Intersection 8: US 101 / Winchuck River Road-Ocean View Drive
Control Type:
Analysis Method:
Analysis Period:
Two-way stop
HCM 7 th Edition
15 minutes

Delay (sec / veh):
35.4

Level Of Service:
Volume to Capacity (v/c):

E
0.128

Intersection Setup

| Name | US 101 |  |  | US 101 |  |  | Ocean View Dr |  |  | Winchuck River Rd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| Lane Configuration | $75$ |  |  | $71$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Turning Movement | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Lane Width [ft] | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Entry Pocket | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Entry Pocket Length [ft] | 185.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 205.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| No. of Lanes in Exit Pocket | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Exit Pocket Length [ft] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Speed [mph] | 55.00 |  |  | 55.00 |  |  | 40.00 |  |  | 40.00 |  |  |
| Grade [\%] | 2.10 |  |  | -2.10 |  |  | 2.40 |  |  | -5.60 |  |  |
| Crosswalk | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |

## Volumes

| Name | US 101 |  |  | US 101 |  |  | Ocean View Dr |  |  | Winchuck River Rd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Volume Input [veh/h] | 24 | 448 | 10 | 38 | 482 | 19 | 16 | 1 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 37 |
| Base Volume Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Heavy Vehicles Percentage [\%] | 4.00 | 3.00 | 10.00 | 6.00 | 7.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 | 0.00 | 8.00 |
| Growth Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| In-Process Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site-Generated Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass-by Trips [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing Site Adjustment Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Volume [veh/h] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Hourly Volume [veh/h] | 24 | 448 | 10 | 38 | 482 | 19 | 16 | 1 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 37 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9500 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 | 0.9200 |
| Other Adjustment Factor | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| Total 15-Minute Volume [veh/h] | 6 | 118 | 3 | 10 | 127 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 10 |
| Total Analysis Volume [veh/h] | 25 | 472 | 11 | 40 | 507 | 20 | 17 | 1 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 40 |
| Pedestrian Volume [ped/h] |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |

Version 2022 (SP 0-2)
Intersection Settings

| Priority Scheme | Free | Free | Stop |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flared Lane |  |  | Yes |  |
| Storage Area [veh] | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes |
| Two-Stage Gap Acceptance |  |  | 0 |  |
| Number of Storage Spaces in Median | 0 | 0 | No |  |

Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results

| V/C, Movement V/C Ratio | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.06 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [s/veh] | 8.58 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8.54 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 35.36 | 30.04 | 14.91 | 23.03 | 19.13 | 11.74 |
| Movement LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | E | D | B | C | C | B |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [veh/ln] | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.35 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ft/ln] | 1.86 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.95 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 15.44 | 15.44 | 15.44 | 8.78 | 8.78 | 8.78 |
| d_A, Approach Delay [s/veh] | 0.42 |  |  | 0.60 |  |  | 23.98 |  |  | 13.66 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |
| d_I, Intersection Delay [s/veh] | 1.88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## ATTACHMENT C - FUTURE BLTS WORKSHEET

| Segment \# | Street | From | To | Context | Bike Lanes | Parking | Outside Lane Width | Speed | Exhibit | Existing ADT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Growth } \\ & \text { Factor } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2042 \\ & \text { ADT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2042 \text { ADT } \\ \text { Bucket } \end{gathered}$ | Paved Shoulder Width | Number of Lanes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Functional } \\ \text { Class } \end{gathered}$ | LTS | $\begin{gathered} 2042 \\ \text { LTS } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Winchuck River Rd | US 101 | Mp 5.0 | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 40 | 14-6 | 1114 | 1.03 | 1147 | 750-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | Winchuck River Rd | Mp 5.0 | Eastern Terminus | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 40 | 14-6 | 675 | 1.03 | 695 | 400-750 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | Oceanview Dr | US 101 | Seagull Ln | Rural | Yes | N | $11^{\prime}$ | 40 | 14-6 | 960 | 1.25 | 1200 | 750-1500 | $4^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime}$ | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | Oceanview Dr | Seagull Ln | Max Ln | Rural | Yes | N | $11^{\prime}$ | 40 | 14-6 | 851 | 1.25 | 1064 | 750-1500 | $4^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime}$ | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 5 | Oceanview Dr | Max Ln | Cedar Ln | Rural | Yes | N | $11^{\prime}$ | 40 | 14-6 | 851 | 1.25 | 1064 | 750-1500 | $4^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime}$ | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 6 | Oceanview Dr | Cedar Ln | Olsen Ln | Urban | No |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 35 | 14-6 | 1414 | 1.25 | 1768 | 1500-7000 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 7 | Oceanview Dr | Olsen Ln | Benham Ln | Urban | No |  | 11 | 35 | 14-6 | 1453 | 1.25 | 1816 | 1500-7000 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 8 | Benham Ln | Oceanview Dr | Mary's Ln | Urban | Yes | N | $12^{\prime}$ | 30 | 14-4 | 2609 | 1.25 | 3259 | 1500-7000 | $4^{\prime}-6^{\prime}$ | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 9 | Benham Ln | Mary's Ln | US 101 | Urban | Yes | N | $12^{\prime}$ | 30 | 14-4 | 4402 | 1.25 | 5498 | 3000-7000 | $4^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime}$ | 1 thru/direction | Collector |  | 2 |
| 10 | S Bank Chetco River Rd | us 101 | Harbor View Creek | Urban | Yes | N | $12^{\prime}$ | 35 | 14-4 | 3429 | 1.06 | 3623 | 1500-7000 | $4^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime}$ | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 11 | S Bank Chetco River Rd | Harbor View Creek | UGB (MP 4.0) | Urban | No |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 40 | 14-6 | 1439 | 1.06 | 1520 | 1500-7000 | >6' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 4 |
| 12 | S Bank Chetco River Rd | UGB (MP 4.0) | Eastern Terminus | Urban | No |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 40 | 14-6 | 109 | 1.06 | 115 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 13 | Lower Harbor Rd | Benham Ln | US 101 | Urban | Yes | N | $12^{\prime}$ | 30 | 14-4 | 5545 | 1.23 | 6815 | 3000-7000 | $4^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime}$ | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 14 | Shopping Center Ave | W Hoffeldt Ln | Lower Harbor Rd | Urban | Yes | N | $12^{\prime}$ | 35 | 14-4 | 2528 | 1.00 | 2528 | 3000-7000 | $4^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime}$ | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 15 | N Bank Chetco River Rd | MP 1 | Yellowbrick Rd | Urban | No |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 40 | 14-6 | 2567 | 1.07 | 2734 | 1500-3000 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 4 | 4 |
| 16 | N Bank Chetco River Rd | Yellowbrick Rd | UGB (MP 5) | Urban | No |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 40 | 14-6 | 1492 | 1.07 | 1589 | 1500-3000 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 4 |
| 17 | $N$ Bank Chetco River Rd | UGB (MP 5) | Gardner Ridge Rd | Rural |  |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 40 | 14-6 | 1034 | 1.07 | 1101 | 400-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 18 | $N$ Bank Chetco River Rd | Gardner Ridge Rd | MP 17.5 | Rural |  |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 35 | 14-6 | 383 | 1.07 | 408 | 400-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 19 | Gardner Ridge Rd | N Bank Chetco River Rd | MP 17.0 | Rural |  |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 45 | 14-16 | 340 | 1.06 | 359 | <400 | <4' | No lanes | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 20 | Cape Ferrelo Rd | US 101 | Brookside Dr | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 35 | 14-6 | 1042 | 1.13 | 1177 | 750-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 21 | Cape Ferrelo Rd | Brookside Dr | HWY 255 | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 35 | 14-6 | 548 | 1.13 | 619 | 400-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 22 | Pistol River Loop | HWY 255 | Hwy 255 (Cape View Loop) | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 55 | 14-16 | 182 | 1.13 | 206 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 23 | N Bank Pistol River Rd | Pistol River Loop | MP 8 (Forest Boundary) | Rural |  |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 55 | 14-16 | 148 | 1.13 | 167 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction and no lanes | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 24 | Hunter Creek Rd | HWY 009 | UGB (MP 2.3) | Urban | No |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 55 | 14-6 | 1660 | 1.06 | 1760 | 1500-7000 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 4 | 4 |
| 25 | Hunter Creek Rd | UGB (MP 2.3) | Eastern Terminus | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 55 | 14-16 | 380 | 1.06 | 403 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 26 | NF-3680 (cont. from Hunter | ( Hunter Creek Rd | Agness Rd | Rural |  |  |  | 55 | 14-16 | <400 | 1.06 | <400 | <400 |  | no lanes | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 27 | Jerrys Flat Rd | US 101 | MP 79 | Urban | No |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 30 | 14.5 | 2462 | 1.06 | 2610 | 1500-7000 | $4^{\prime}-6^{\prime}$ |  | Arterial | 3 | 3 |
| 28 | Jerrys Flat Rd | MP 79 | Saunders Creek Rd | Urban | No |  |  | $>45$ | 14-6 | 1461 | 1.06 | 1549 | 750-1500 |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |
| 29 | Jerrys Flat Rd | Saunders Creek Rd | MP 76.5 | Urban | Yes | N | $12^{\prime}$ | 35 | 14-4 | 745 | 1.06 | 790 | 750-1500 | <4' |  | Arterial | 3 | 3 |
| 30 | Jerrys Flat Rd | MP 76.5 | UGB (MP 75.5) | Urban | No |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 45 | 14-6 | 427 | 1.06 | 453 | 400-750 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Arterial | 3 | 3 |
| 31 | Jerrys Flat Rd | UGB (MP 75.5) | Eastern Terminus | Rural |  |  |  | $>45$ | 14-16 | 378 | 1.06 | 401 | <400 |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| 32 | Agness Rd | Lobster Creek Rd | Galice Creek Rd | Rural |  |  |  | 45 | 14-16 | 228 | 1.06 | 241 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Arterial | 2 | 2 |
| 33 | Agness Rd | Galice Creek Rd | County Boundary (Coos) | Rural |  |  |  | 45 | 14-16 | 83 | 1.06 | 88 | <400 | <4' | 1 trand | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 34 | Oak Flat Rd | Agness Rd | campground road (MP 3) | Rural |  |  |  | 45 | 14-16 | 77 | 1.06 | 81 | <400 |  | nolanes | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 35 | Galice Creek Rd | Agness Rd | County Boundary (Josephine) | Rural |  |  |  | 45 | 14-16 | <400 | 1.06 | <400 | <400 |  | No lanes | Collector | 2 |  |
| 36 | N Bank Rogue River Rd | US 101 | MP 0.5 | Urban | No |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 30 | 14-5 | 1836 | 1.04 | 1902 | 1500-7000 | <4' |  | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 37 | N Bank Rogue River Rd | MP 0.5 | MP 0.8 | Urban | No |  |  | 45 | 14-6 | 1480 | 1.04 | 1533 | 1500-7000 |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |
| 38 | N Bank Rogue River Rd | MP 0.8 | Edson Creek Rd | Rural |  |  |  | 45 | 14-16 | 1318 | 1.04 | 1365 | 400-1500 | <4' |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| 39 | N Bank Rogue River Rd | Edson Creek Rd | Cedar Valley Rd | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 40 | 14-6 | 1281 | 1.04 | 1327 | 400-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 40 | N Bank Rogue River Rd | Cedar Valley Rd | Lobster Creek Rd | Rural |  |  |  | 40 | 14-6 | 467 | 1.04 | 484 | 400-750 | <4' |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| 41 | Cedar Valley Rd | $N$ Bank Rogue River Rd | Ophir Rd | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 55 | 14-16 | 481 | 1.06 | 508 | 400-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 42 | Edson Creek Rd | $N$ Bank Rogue River Rd | US 101 | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 45 | 14-16 | 485 | 1.07 | 519 | 400-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 43 | Lobster Creek Rd | $N$ Bank Rogue River Rd | Agness Rd | Rural |  |  |  | 45 | 14-16 | 170 | 1.06 | 180 | <400 |  | No lanes | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 44 | Nesika Beach Rd | US 101 | Gun Club Rd | Rural |  |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 55 | 14-16 | 598 | 1.07 | 640 | 400-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 45 | Nesika Beach Rd | Gun Club Rd | US 101 | Rural |  |  |  | 40 | 14-6 | 330 | 1.07 | 353 | <400 |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| 46 | Ophir Rd | US 101 | Euchre Creek Rd | Rural |  |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 45 | 14-16 | 336 | 1.07 | 360 | $<400$ | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 47 | Euchre Creek Rd | Ophir Rd | MP 3 (Forest Road) | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 55 | 14-16 | 90 | 1.06 | 95 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 48 | Elk River Rd | US 101 | Wagner Ln | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 45 | 14-16 | 541 | 1.06 | 573 | 400-1500 | <4' |  | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 49 | Elk River Rd | Wagner Ln | Haiku Ln (MP 5.5) | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 45 | 14-16 | 204 | 1.06 | 216 | <400 | <4' |  | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 50 | Elk River Rd/NF 5325 | Haiku Ln (MP 5.5) | County Boundary (Coos) | Rural |  |  |  | 45 | 14-16 | 141 | 1.06 | 149 | <400 | <4' | No lanes | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 51 | Sixes River Rd | US 101 | MP 2.0 | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 55 | 14-16 | 396 | 1.05 | 416 | 400-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 3 |
| 52 | Sixes River Rd | MP 2.0 | NF-4600 | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 55 | 14-16 | 273 | 1.05 | 287 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 53 | Airport Rd | US 101 | The Airport | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 45 | 14-16 | 170 | 1.06 | 180 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 54 | Floras Lake Loop Rd | US 101 S | Us 101 N | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 45 | 14-16 | 265 | 1.06 | 281 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 55 | Floras Lake Rd | Floras Lake Loop Rd | Lakes End Dr | Rural |  |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 45 | 14-16 | 233 | 1.06 | 247 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 56 | Floras Creek Rd | US 101 | Allen Canyon Loop | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 55 | 14-16 | 455 | 1.05 | 478 | 400-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 57 | Floras Creek Rd | Allen Canyon Loop | S Fork Flores Creek Rd | Rural |  |  | $12^{\prime}$ | 55 | 14-16 | 126 | 1.05 | 132 | <400 | <4' | No lanes | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 58 | Langlois Mountain Rd | US 101 | Bethel Creek Rd | Rural |  |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 45 | 14-16 | 145 | 1.06 | 154 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 59 | Pedrioli Dr | Western Terminus | Ocean View Dr | Urban | No |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 25 | 14-5 | 139 | 1.25 | 174 | 750-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 60 | Pedrioli Dr | Ocean View Dr | US 101 | Rural |  |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 35 | 14-6 | 938 | 1.25 | 1173 | 750-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 61 | W Hoffeldt Ln | W Hoffeldt Ln | US 101 | Urban | No |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 25 | 14-5 | 1812 | 1.06 | 1924 | 1500-3000 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 62 | W Hoffeldt Ln | South of Titus Ln | W Hoffeldt Ln | Urban | No |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 25 | 14-5 | 315 | 1.06 | 334 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 63 | Old County Rd | Pacific Terrace Loop | UGB | Urban | No |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 35 | 14-6 | 188 | 1.06 | 200 | <400 | <4' | No lanes | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 64 | Old County Rd | UGB | Eastern Terminus | Rural |  |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 35 | 14-6 | 188 | 1.06 | 200 | <400 | <4' | No lanes | Collector | 3 | 3 |
| 65 | Parkview Dr | Vistra Ridge Dr | Eastern Terminus | Urban | No |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 25 | 14-5 | 68 | 1.06 | 72 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 66 | Rainbow Rock Rd | Carpenterville Hwy | Aqua Vista Ln | Urban | No |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 45 | 14-6 | 801 | 1.06 | 851 | 750-1500 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 4 | 4 |
| 67 | Rainbow Rock Rd | Aqua Vista Ln | Carpenterville Hwy | Rural |  |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 45 | 14-16 | 213 | 1.06 | 226 | <400 | <4' | 1 thru/direction | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 68 | Grizly Mountain Rd | UGB | Eastern Terminus | Rural |  |  | $11^{\prime}$ | 35 | 14-6 | <400 | 1.06 | <400 | <400 | <4' | No lanes | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 69 | Wedderburn Loop | US 101 | Doyle Point Rd | Urban | No |  |  | 30 | 14-5 | 389 | 1.06 | 413 | $<750$ | $4^{\prime}-6{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| 70 | Wedderburn Loop | Doyle Point Rd | Old Coast Hwy | Urban | No |  |  | 30 | 14-5 | 389 | 1.06 | 413 | $<750$ | <4' |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| 71 | Old Coast Hwy | Wedderburn Loop | US 101 | Rural |  |  |  | 30 | $14-5$ | 337 | 1.06 | 358 | <400 | <4' |  | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 72 | China Mountain Rd | UGB | US 101 | Rural |  |  |  | 45 | 14-16 | 228 | 1.06 | 242 | <400 | <4' |  | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 73 | Cemetery Loop Rd | US 101 | US 101 | Urban | No |  |  | 35 | 14.6 | 253 | 1.06 | 269 | <400 |  |  | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 74 | Vista Dr | Gold Run Rd | Old Mill Rd | Urban | No |  |  | 35 | $14-6$ | 110 | 1.06 | 117 | <400 |  |  | Collector | 2 | 2 |
| 75 | Grassy Knob Rd | US 101 | Eastern Terminus | Rural |  |  |  | 45 | 14-16 | 306 | 1.06 | 325 | <400 | <4' |  | Collector | 2 | 2 |


[^0]:    6 | Curry County Transportation System Plan | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.

[^1]:    8 | Curry County Transportation System Plan | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.

[^2]:    9 | Curry County Transportation System Plan | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.

[^3]:    18 | Curry County Transportation System Plan | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.

