

- 6. CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR SETUP OF BARRICADES, WARNING SIGNAGE, OR OTHER PROTECTIVE DEVICES IF ANY EXCAVATIONS ARE LEFT EXPOSED AFTER ON-SITE WORK HOURS. 7. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOT PURPOSEFULLY PROCEED WITH ANY CONSTRUCTION PER PLANS PROVIDED WHEN OBSTRUCTIONS AND/OR GRADE DIFFERENCES EXIST THAT WERE NOT CONSIDERED OR
- 8. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PREVENT SEDIMENT, DEBRIS AND OTHER POLLUTANTS FROM ENTERING ANY STORM WATER SEWER SYSTEM OR, ADJACENT WATER WAYS, ETC., DURING THE DEMOLITION OR CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS THAT ARE PART OF THIS PROJECT. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE AND EXPENSE FOR THE CORRECTION OF ANY ADVERSE IMPACTS TO THE STORM WATER SEWER SYSTEM OR, ADJACENT WATER WAYS, WETLANDS ETC., RESULTING FROM THE WORK DONE AS PART OF THIS PROJECT/CONTRACT.
- 9. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE PRIOR TO BIDDING AND CONSTRUCTION, OF BECOMING AWARE OF ALL EXISTING AND PROPOSED UTILITIES, PIPES, STRUCTURES, ETC. CALL UNCC THREE DAYS BEFORE SCHEDULED WORK AT 811 OR 1-800-922-1987.
- 10. PICK UP TIMES FOR TRASH AND RECYCLABLE MATERIALS SHALL BE LIMITED TO BUSINESS HOURS ONLY, MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY, AND BETWEEN NOON AND 5:00 P.M. ON SATURDAYS AND SUNDAYS.
- 11. EASEMENTS WILL BE DEDICATED BY SEPARATE DOCUMENT

CHANGED AFTER PLANS WERE SUBMITTED. CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY OWNER OR OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE AND THE CITY OF FORT COLLINS IF SITUATION ARISES AND REVISIONS ARE NECESSARY.

NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE STATE OF COLORADO) COUNTY OF \_\_\_\_\_)

THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT WAS ACKNOWLEDGED BEFORE ME BY (PRINTED NAME) THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_ \_, 2013.

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES:

NOTARY PUBLIC

THENCE NORTH 30°20'35" EAST ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF THE REPLAT OF THE COLLINDALE THIRD FILING P.U.D. A DISTANCE OF 354.90 FEET TO THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF COLLINDALE FOURTH FILING, P.U.D.; THENCE SOUTH 41°09'25" EAST ALONG THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF COLLINDALE FOURTH FILING, P.U.D. A DISTANCE OF 332.59 FEET TO THE BEGINNING POINT OF A CURVE, NON-TANGENT TO THIS COURSE ON THE WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF LOCHWOOD DRIVE; THE FOLLOWING THREE COURSES ARE ALONG THE WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINES OF LOCHWOOD DRIVE:

THENCE ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE CONCAVE TO THE SOUTHEAST A DISTANCE OF 425.92 FEET, SAID CURVE HAS A RADIUS OF 500.22 FEET, A DELTA OF 48°47'09" AND IS SUBTENDED BY A CHORD BEARING SOUTH 24°16'10" WEST A DISTANCE OF 413.17 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY: THENCE SOUTH 00°07'25" EAST A DISTANCE OF 64.58 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST A DISTANCE OF 23.56 FEET, SAID CURVE HAS A RADIUS OF 15.00 FEET, A DELTA OF 90°00'00" AND IS SUBTENDED BY A CHORD BEARING SOUTH 44°52'35" WEST A DISTANCE OF 21.21 FEET TO A LINE PARALLEL WITH AND 50.00 FEET NORTHERLY OF, AS MEASURED AT A RIGHT ANGLE TO THE SOUTH LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 30;

THENCE NORTH 89°52'35" EAST ALONG SAID PARALLEL LINE AND ALONG A LINE NON-TANGENT TO THE AFORESAID COURSE A DISTANCE OF 98.00 FEET. THENCE SOUTH 00°07'25" EAST A DISTANCE OF 50.00 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 30; THENCE SOUTH 89°52'35" WEST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 30 A DISTANCE OF 429.14 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 4.905 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

(SEAL)

╞╾╾╾╡ BIKE RACK SCALE 1" = 30'-0"

PROPERTY LINE

\_\_\_\_



Sheet Number:

SHEET INFORMATION

Site Plan

Of:



## North Elevation







# Material Legend

Label	Material	Color
S1	Siding	light tone
S2	Siding	medium tone
S3	Siding at base	medium tone
SS	Shingle Siding	medium tone
R1	Comp Shingle Roof 6:12 pitch	medium tone
R2	Comp Shingle Roof 8:12 pitch	medium tone
MR	Metal Roof 4:12 pitch	medium tone
ST	Stone	light/medium blend
BR	Wood Brackets	medium tone
WB	Wood Beams	medium tone

Note: Windows are single hung and light color

## West Elevation

# South Elevation

# East Elevation

PRINTS ISSUED 08/14/2013

### **REVISIONS**:



architecture interior design engineering planning

1526 Grand Boulevard Kansas City, MO 64108-1404 *p*: 816.472.1448 *f*: 816.472.4702 *e*: design@rosemann.com *w*: www.rosemann.com © 2013 Rosemann & Associates, P.C. Kansas City, MO 🛦 St. Louis, MO





R2 39'-6" \_\_\_\_\_31'-0"\_\_\_ BR SS - S1 - ST - S3

32

048 16

EL-1

DRAWN BY: Author CHECKED BY: Checke

SHEET TITLE Unnamed

SHEET NUMBER:

PROJECT NUMBER: 13014



## West Elevation Detail



# North Elevation Detail



## East Elevation Detail

2013 11:24:59 AM servicenter/DestroalEt\_Colline\_LocalEt\_Colline\_LOC











South Elevation Detail











PRINTS ISSUED 08/14/2013

**REVISIONS**:



architecture interior design engineering planning

1526 Grand Boulevard Kansas City, MO 64108-1404 p: 816.472.1448 f: 816.472.4702 e: design@rosemann.com w: www.rosemann.com © 2013 Rosemann & Associates, P.C. Kansas City, MO ▲ St. Louis, MO



SHEET TITLE Unnamed

PROJECT NUMBER: 13014

SHEET NUMBER:



DRAWN BY: Author CHECKED BY: Checke



August 14, 2013

### MVG-Morningstar Assisted Living & Memory Care PDP Statement of Planning Objectives

The MVG-Morningstar PDP is located at the northwest corner of East Horsetooth Road and Lochwood Drive. The property is currently vacant. Uses surrounding the property consist of the following:

South: Horsetooth Road and Collindale Golf Course West: Collindale PUD 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Filing Condominiums North: Collindale II Condominiums East: Schrader C-Store and KinderCare Learning Center

The proposed project consists of a 71,165 sq. ft., two story building for an assisted living and memory care facility. The building is designed to have a central core area with two wings for the living spaces. The core area will contain the main entrance foyer, reception, administrative offices, a lounge, a bistro and a common dining area for the assisted living residents. The dining room opens into a courtyard/patio. The kitchen and "back of house" facilities are also located here, utilizing the service drive on the west side of the building. The south wing will contain the assisted living units for the residents and the north wing will house the memory care residents. It is designed to revolve around a central courtyard. IN addition to a small dining and gathering area, there will also be an outdoor fenced-in pathway for the use of the residents.

The architectural style of the building is unique to both Fort Collins and the owner utilizing a combination of materials, elevations and building massing breaks to create both interest and maximize views and orientation. The creation of an interior courtyard with a portion of the building along the northwest containing only one story will reduce the impact of the building for the residents within the memory care wing and allow both visibility and light to enhance their daily lives. The reduction in the building scale permits the adjacent neighbors to welcome the reduced scale visually. The mix of stone, horizontal siding, and architectural elements with bay windows, brackets and mix of composition shingles and metal roofing will create a very aesthetic building for the community.

Main access to the site will utilize two entrances entrance off of Lochwood Drive. All drives will be 24'. There is a circular drive drop-off area at the main entrance to the building. 49 off-street parking spaces will be provided. 58% of the site is open space, detention and landscaping. The landscape material will provide seasonal interest and color as well as meeting the City's code for foundation planting and vehicle use screening. The service area on the west side of the building will be screened with landscape and a 6' high solid privacy fence.

### Unit Mix:

1. Memory Care a. Studios b. Singles	15 8
Total Memory Care	23
2. Assisted Living	
a. Studios	19
b. Singles	21
c. Doubles	15
Total Assisted Living	55
Total All Units	78

The 4.9-acre site is in the L-M-N zoning district. According to the Purpose Statement contained within Article 4 of the Land Use Code, "The Low Density Mixed-Use Neighborhood District is intended to be a setting for a predominance of low density housing combined with complementary and supporting land uses that serve a neighborhood and are developed and operated in harmony with the residential characteristics of a neighborhood. The main purpose of the District is to meet a wide range of needs of everyday living in neighborhoods that include a variety of housing choices that invite walking to gathering places, services and conveniences, and that are fully integrated into the larger community by the pattern of streets, blocks, and other linkages. A neighborhood center provides a focal point, and attractive walking and biking paths invite residents to enjoy the center as well as the small neighborhood parks. Any new development in this District shall be arranged to form part of an individual neighborhood."

The area surrounding the MVG-Morningstar project contains a mix of single-family homes, condominiums, a daycare care facility, convenience store, golf course, restaurant and other office uses. The site is ideal for this type of density as it provides a transition between the single-family attached neighborhoods to the north and west and the more intensely developed areas to the east. The project will provide a concrete pad for a future Transfort bus shelter on Horsetooth Road.

Assisted living facilities are defined as a "Long Term Care Facility" in the LMN Zoning District. Long term care facilities are permitted as a Type II use.

## (i) Statement of appropriate City Plan Principles and Policies achieved by the proposed plan:

The MVG Morningstar PDP meets the following applicable City Plan Principles and Policies:

### Economic Health

Principle EH 4: The City will encourage the redevelopment of strategic areas within the community as defined in the Community and Neighborhood Livability and Neighborhood Principles and Policies.

### Policy EH 4.1 – Prioritize Targeted Redevelopment Areas Policy EH 4.2 – Reduce Barriers to Infill Development and Redevelopment

The MVG-Morningstar PDP will provide a compact urban redevelopment project that is in an ideal location, is within walking distance to many destinations and is within an established neighborhood infill area.

### <u>Environmental Health</u> Principle ENV 8: Continually improve Fort Collins' air quality

Due to the nature of this type of population, the residents of MVG-Morningstar PDP are not expected to drive vehicles at all. The employees will be encouraged to utilize alternative transportation and public transportation for the majority of their daily trips.

### Community and Neighborhood Livability

Principle LIV 6: Infill and redevelopment within residential areas will be compatible with the established character of the neighborhood. In areas where the desired character of the neighborhood is not established, or is not consistent with the vision of *City Plan*, infill and redevelopment projects will set an enhanced standard of quality.

Policy LIV 6.1 – Types of Infill and Redevelopment in Residential Areas Policy LIV 6.2 – Seek Compatibility with Neighborhoods

The MVG-Morningstar PDP provides an opportunity for redevelopment of an existing underutilized site and the design of the building will be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The architectural design will be sensitive in shape, form and patterns of building materials.

### Principle LIV 7: A variety of housing types and densities for all income levels shall be available throughout the Growth Management Area. Policy LIV 7.5 – Address Special Needs Housing

Plan for and meet the housing needs of special populations within the community. Disperse residential care facilities, shelters, group homes, and senior housing throughout the Growth Management Area.

MVG-Morningstar PDP is a residential care facility. The central location is ideal and will be convenient for family members and employees.

Principle LIV 28: Low Density Mixed- Use Neighborhoods will provide opportunities for a mix of low density housing types in a setting that is conducive to walking and in close proximity to a range of neighborhood serving uses. Policy LIV 28.2 – Mix of Uses Policy LIV 28.4 –Neighborhood Center The project is located in a well-established neighborhood containing a mix of uses such as single-family detached housing, a day care center, and offices as well as within walking distance to a neighborhood center.

### **Transportation**

Principle T 9: Enhanced Travel Corridors will contain amenities and designs that specifically promote walking, the use of mass transit, and bicycling.

Policy T 9.1 – Locating Enhanced Travel Corridors

Principle T10: Using transit will be a safe, affordable, easy, and convenient mobility option for all ages and abilities. Policy T 10.1 – Transit Stops

There will be a future Transfort stop adjacent to the site. Horsetooth Road is a 4-lane arterial street.

- (ii) Description of proposed open space, wetlands, natural habitats and features, landscaping, circulation, transition areas, and associated buffering on site and in the general vicinity of the project. There are no wetlands or significant natural habitats within the boundaries of the site.
- (iii) Statement of proposed ownership and maintenance of public and private open space areas; applicant's intentions with regard to future ownership of all or portions of the project development plan. Open space and landscaped areas will all be maintained by Morningstar.
- (iv) Estimate of number of employees for business, commercial, and industrial uses. There are estimated to be approximately 20 employees in the building a

There are estimated to be approximately 20 employees in the building at one time.

(v) Description of rationale behind the assumptions and choices made by the applicant.

Morningstar chose this location because there was a need in the Fort Collins area for assisted living. Morningstar provides senior living communities. Within these communities, residents can still maintain their independence, while requiring help with other daily activities. A licensed nurse is available and a 24-hour care staff. The memory care community offers secured environment to safeguard those with memory impairment (Alzheimer's and other forms of dementia). The building has exceptional architecture and meticulous attention to details and we feel will be a good fit within the established neighborhood. This building is a new design and uniquely Fort Collins.

(vi) The applicant shall submit as evidence of successful completion of the applicable criteria, the completed documents pursuant to these regulations for each proposed use. The planning Director may require,

or the applicant may choose to submit, evidence that is beyond what is required in that section. Any variance from the criteria shall be described.

At this time the project is not proposing any variance from the City of Fort Collins criteria.

(vii) Narrative description of how conflicts between land uses or disturbances to wetlands, natural habitats and features and or wildlife are being avoided to the maximum extent feasible or are mitigated. There are no existing wetlands, natural habitats or features currently located on site.

## (viii) Written narrative addressing each concern/issue raised at the neighborhood meeting(s), if a meeting has been held.

Questions and concerns raised at the neighborhood meeting:

**Issue:** Ditch backing up when it rains.

**Answer:** The drainage ditch will convey water to the downstream pond located at the northwest corner of the site. The pond cannot release water with any more frequency than what currently exists today. Morningstar does not plan on piping the ditch and the drainage report provided with the submittal will show that the construction of the improvements on the site will not exacerbate the problem.

**Issue:** Possibly move the northernmost access away from Building A of the Cherry Hills Condos.

**Answer:** The PDP shows the access moved south as requested, but we're not sure if the City will allow it.

**Issue:** Concerns with detention pond holding water/mosquito risk

**Answer:** The detention ponds will hold water for a very short period of time before releasing downstream.

Issue: Proximity of building to western boundary

**Answer:** The building has been re-designed since the neighborhood meeting. It is now longer in a north-south direction and the "west" wing is now gone. There is a service drive between the building and the retaining wall along the drainage easement. The retaining wall will have a 6' fence on top of it to provide screening to the service area. In addition, landscape is provided within the drainage easement, at the bottom of the wall.

## (ix) Name of the project as well as any previous name the project may have had during Conceptual Review.

The project is called MVG-Morningstar Assisted Living & Memory Care PDP. The project was referred to as Horsetooth & Lochwood – Morning Star Assisted Living at Conceptual Review.

Community Development and Neighborhood Services 281 North College Avenue PO Box 580 Fort Collins, CO 80522

**970.221.6750** 970.224.6134 - fax *fcgov.com* 

January 30, 2013

Carolyn Powell MUG-MS LLC PO Box 18970 Denver, CO 80218

Re: Horsetooth & Lochwood – Morning Star Assisted Living

**Description of project:** This is a request to construct 72 assisted living and memory care residence apartments at the northwest corner of Horsetooth Road and Lochwood Drive (Parcel # 87303–00–003). The site is in the Low Density Mixed–Use Neighborhood (L–M–N) Zone District. Multifamily dwellings containing more than 8 units per building are subject to Planning & Zoning Board (Type 2) review in the L–M–N Zone District.

Please see the following summary of comments regarding the project request referenced above. The comments offered informally by staff during the Conceptual Review will assist you in preparing the detailed components of the project application. Modifications and additions to these comments may be made at the time of formal review of this project. If you have any questions regarding these comments or the next steps in the review process, you may contact the individual commenter or direct your questions through the Project Planner, Jason Holland, at 970–224–6126 or jholland@fcgov.com.

### Comment Summary:

Department: Zoning

Contact: Gary Lopez, 970-416-2338, glopez@fcqov.com

1. What is the percentage breakdown between apartments and asst. living components? Min. parking is dictated by that. (LUC 3.2.2[K][1]&[2] and 5.1.2 (Long–Term care facility definition) RESPONSE: There will be 93 beds and 20 employees, which equates to 45 parking spaces. We have 49 spaces shown on the plans.

**2.** Related above – What is the breakdown of apartment units bedroom numbers. x number of 1 bedroom, x number of 2 bedroom.

RESPONSE: For the memory care, there are 15 studios and 8 singles with a total of 23 units. For the assisted living, There will be 19 studios, 21 singles, 15 doubles for a total of 55 units. There is a total of 78 units in all.

### Department: Water-Wastewater Engineering

Contact: Roger Buffington, rbuffington@fcgov.com

1. Existing water mains and sanitary sewers in this area include a 20–inch water main on the south side of Horsetooth, an 8–inch water main in Lochwood and an 8–inch sewer in an easement to the northwest in Collindale 3rd Filing.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

**2.** Existing water mains and sanitary sewers in this area include a 20–inch water main on the south side of Horsetooth, an 8–inch water main in Lochwood and an 8–inch sewer in an easement to the northwest in Collindale 3rd Filing.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

### Department: Water-Wastewater Engineering

Contact: Roger Buffington, rbuffington@fcgov.com

**3.** The water conservation standards for landscape and irrigation will apply. Information on these requirements can be found at: <u>http://www.fcgov.com/standards</u> RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

**4.** The water conservation standards for landscape and irrigation will apply. Information on these requirements can be found at: <u>http://www.fcgov.com/standards</u> RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

5. Development fees and water rights will be due at building permit.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

**6.** Development fees and water rights will be due at building permit. **RESPONSE:** Acknowledged.

7. A grease interceptor will be required. RESPONSE: A grease interceptor is provided on the utility plans.

**8.** A grease interceptor will be required. RESPONSE: A grease interceptor is provided on the utility plans.

Department: Transfort Contact: Emma McArdle, 970–224–6197, <u>emcardle@fcqov.com</u> 1. Transfort's Strategic Operating Plan identifies a route on Horsetooth adjacent to this site and Section 3.6.5 of the LUC requires developments accommodate existing and future transit infrastructure as needed. For this site, a bus stop pad should be located on the southwest corner of your site near the cross walk at Lemay and Horsetooth. A bus stop pad is typically 12' deep by 18' wide, although a update to this standard is currently underway. This pad should be located adjacent to the sidewalk and curb. Please contact me if you have any questions.

RESPONSE: The PDP submittal reflects a 12' x 18' concrete pad for a future bus shelter.

### Department: Stormwater Engineering

### Contact: Glen Schlueter, 970-224-6065, gschlueter@fcgov.com

1. A drainage and erosion control report and construction plans are required and they must be prepared by a Professional Engineer registered in Colorado. The drainage report must address the four-step process for selecting structural BMPs. Standard operating procedures (SOPs) for all onsite drainage facilities need to be prepared by the drainage engineer and there is a final site inspection required when the project is complete and the maintenance is handed over to an HOA or another maintenance organization. The erosion control requirements are in the Stormwater Design Criteria Section 1.3.3. If you need clarification concerning this section, please contact the Erosion Control Inspector, Jesse Schlam at 224–6015 or jschlam@fcgov.com.

RESPONSE: A preliminary drainage report has been submitted. The erosion control portion of the report will be provided during final compliance as requested by Jesse S.

2. When improvements are proposed to an existing developed site and there is an increase in impervious area greater than 1000 square feet, onsite detention is required with a 2 year historic release rate for water quantity. Parking lot detention for water quantity is allowed as long as it is not deeper than one foot.

### RESPONSE: Onsite detention has been provided

**3.** Water quality treatment is also required as described in the Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual, Volume 3 – Best Management Practices (BMPs).

(http://www.udfcd.org/downloads/down\_critmanual\_volIII.htm) Extended detention is the usual method selected for water quality treatment; however the use of any of the BMPs is encouraged. RESPONSE: There are two (2) extended detention basins proposed along with a rain garden to provide the required BMPs

### Department: Stormwater Engineering

Contact: Glen Schlueter, 970-224-6065, gschlueter@fcgov.com

4. The Stormwater Utility anticipates that City Council will be approving new Low Impact Development (LID) requirements that will go into effect March 1, 2013. Please contact Basil Hamdan at 224–6035 or bhamdan@fcgov.com for more information. The present draft requires that 50% of the new impervious area must be treated by an LID method and 25% of new parking lots must be pervious. RESPONSE: The site design incorporates a series of lid's and 25% of the new parking areas are shown to be pervious pavement.

**5.** The drainage outfall for the site is either Lockwood Dr. or possibly the drainage swale along the west side of the property. That swale with a low flow pan was installed in the early 1980s for Collindale 2nd and 3rd Filings. It was built before the Stormwater Department existed so there is no drainage report to refer to for information on the sizing of the swale. The design engineer would have to verify capacity of the swale. The bigger issue is that the swale appears to be on the Collindale developments and they have been responsible for the maintenance of it. If this project were to use it the maintenance would need to be shared with their HOA.

RESPONSE: The drainage outfalls for the site will be to the existing drainage swale along the western boundary. Capacity calculations are provided in the preliminary drainage report and maintenance of the swale is noted to be shared

**6.** The city wide Stormwater development fee (PIF) is \$6,390.00/acre (\$0.1467/sq.ft.) for new impervious area over 350 sq.-ft., and there is a \$1,045.00/acre (\$0.024/sq.ft.) review fee. No fee is charged for existing impervious area. These fees are to be paid at the time each building permit is issued. Information on fees can be found on the City's web site at

http://www.fcgov.com/utilities/business/builders-and-developers/plant-investment-development-fees or contact Jean Pakech at 221- 6375 for questions on fees. There is also an erosion control escrow required before the Development Construction permit is issued. The amount of the escrow is determined by the design engineer, and is based on the site disturbance area, cost of the measures, or a minimum amount in accordance with the Fort Collins Stormwater Design Criteria. RESPONSE:Acknowledged.

7. The design of this site must conform to the drainage basin design of the Foothills Basin Master Drainage Plan as well the City's Design Criteria and Construction standards. RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

### Department: Fire Authority

Contact: Jim Lynxwiler, 970-416-2869, jlynxwiler@poudre-fire.org

### 1. PUBLIC-SAFETY RADIO AMPLIFICATION SYSTEM

New buildings greater than 50,000 square feet will require a fire department, emergency communication system evaluation after the core/shell but prior to final build out. Where adequate radio coverage cannot be established within a building, public-safety radio amplification systems shall be designed and installed in accordance with criteria established by the Poudre Fire Authority. Poudre Fire Authority Bureau Admin Policy #07–01 RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

### 2. FIRE LANES

Fire Lanes shall be provided for every facility, building or portion of a building when any portion of the facility or any portion of an exterior wall of the first story of the building is located more than 150 feet from fire apparatus access, as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. The fire code official is authorized to increase the dimension of 150 feet if the building is equipped

throughout with an approved, automatic fire–sprinkler system. 2006 International Fire Code 503.1.1 RESPONSE: Fire lanes are provided per conversations with PFA. The final location of the emergency access easements will be verified and shown on future submittal documents

Fire lanes shall be designated on the plat as an Emergency Access Easement. RESPONSE:Understood, See above.

Maintain the required 20 foot minimum unobstructed width & 14 foot minimum overhead clearance. RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

### Department: Fire Authority

Contact: Jim Lynxwiler, 970-416-2869, jlynxwiler@poudre-fire.org

**1.** Be designed as a flat, hard, all-weather driving surface capable of supporting 40 tons. **RESPONSE:** Acknowledged.

**2.** Be visible by painting and signage, and maintained unobstructed at all times. RESPONSE: Acknowledged. Signage and striping will be provided at Final.

### 3. DEAD-END FIRE LANES

Dead–end fire access roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with an approved area for turning around fire apparatus. FCLUC 3.6.2(B)2006; International Fire Code 503.2.5 and Appendix D RESPONSE: A modified hammerhead is provided at the end of the service drive along the west side of the building. Final geometry shall be reviewed and approved by PFA.

### 4. FIRE LANE TURNING RADII

The required turning radii of a fire apparatus access road shall be a minimum of 25 feet inside and 50 feet outside. International Fire Code 503.2.4 and Local Amendments RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

### 5. FIRE ALARM AND DETECTION SYSTEMS (Group I)

A manual fire alarm system shall be installed in Group I occupancies. An electrically supervised, automatic smoke detection system shall be provided in accordance with Section 907.2.6.2, with exceptions. 2006 International Fire Code 907.2.6; International Building Code 407.2 RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

### 6. AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEMS

An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout buildings with a Group I fire area. An automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.2 or 903.3.1.3 shall be allowed in Group I–1 facilities.

### RESPONSE: Acknowledged. A full system will be installed.

### 7. WATER SUPPLY

Hydrant spacing and flow must meet minimum requirements based on type of occupancy. Commercial requirements: Hydrants to provide 1,500 gpm at 20 psi residual pressure, spaced not further than 300 feet to the building, on 600–foot centers thereafter. 2006 International Fire Code 508.1 and Appendix B RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

### 8. KEY BOXES REQUIRED

Poudre Fire Authority requires at least one key box ("Knox Box") to be mounted in approved location(s) on every new building equipped with a required fire sprinkler or fire alarm system. The top shall not be higher than 6 feet above finished floor. 2006 International Fire Code 506.1 and Poudre Fire Authority Bureau Policy 88–20 RESPONSE: Acknowledged. Lock boxes for fire department access will be provided at all primary entrances as dictated By PFA.

### 9. COMMERCIAL KITCHEN HOODS

A Type I hood shall be installed at or above all commercial cooking appliances and domestic cooking appliances used for commercial purposes that produce grease vapors. 2006 International Fire Code 609.2 RESPONSE: Kitchen hoods will be installed as required.

### **10.** PREMISE IDENTIFICATION

New and existing buildings shall be plainly identified. Address numbers shall be visible from the street fronting the property, plainly visible, and posted with a minimum of six–inch numerals on a contrasting background. 2006 International Fire Code 505.1 RESPONSE: Building signage will be installed.

Department: Environmental Planning Contact: Lindsay Ex, 970–224–6143, <u>lex@fcgov.com</u>

Department: Environmental Planning Contact: Lindsay Ex, 970–224–6143, <u>lex@fcqov.com</u>

1. With respect to landscaping and design, the City of Fort Collins Land Use Code, in Article 3.2.1 (E)(2)(3), requires that you use native plants and grasses in your landscaping or re landscaping and reduce bluegrass lawns as much as possible. Reveille Bluegrass is one option for having bluegrass lawns and using less water.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

### Department: Engineering Development Review

Contact: Marc Virata, 970-221-6567, mvirata@fcgov.com

 Larimer County Road Impact Fees and Street Oversizing Fees are due at the time of building permit. Please contact Matt Baker at 224–6108 if you have any questions.
 RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

2. The City's Transportation Development Review Fee (TDRF) is due at the time of submittal. For additional information on these fees, please see: http://www.fcgov.com/engineering/dev-review.php RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

**3.** Any damaged curb, gutter and sidewalk existing prior to construction, as well as streets, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, destroyed, damaged or removed due to construction of this project, shall be replaced or restored to City of Fort Collins standards at the Developer's expense prior to the acceptance of completed improvements and/or prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy. RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

**4.** Please contact the City's Traffic Engineer, Joe Olson (224–6062) to schedule a scoping meeting and determine if a traffic study is needed for this project. In addition, please contact Transportation Planning for their requirements as well.

RESPONSE: A TIS is provided with the submittal.

5. Any public improvements must be designed and built in accordance with the Larimer County Urban Area Street Standards (LCUASS). They are available online at: <u>http://www.larimer.org/engineering/GMARdStds/UrbanSt.htm</u> RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

**6.** The existing sidewalk along Lochwood Drive abutting the property may not be considered compliant in meeting minimum ADA widths. If the case, the sidewalk (and curb and gutter) would need to be removed and replaced with vertical curb and a 5' wide sidewalk detached 8' from the curb, in accordance with our collector standards.

RESPONSE: A new 5 foot wide detached sidewalk is shown along Lochwood

7. This project is responsible for dedicating any right-of-way and easements that are necessary for this project. If per the previous comment, sidewalk needs to be moved and replaced as detached, additional right-of-way would need to be dedicated to coincide with the back of walk. A 15' utility easement along Horsetooth Road is required behind the right-of-way and a 9' utility easement is requires along Lochwood Drive is required behind the right-of-way, unless agreed to otherwise by the utility providers.

RESPONSE: Proposed utility easements and right of way along lochwood is noted on the drawings

8. Driveway access onto Lochwood Drive will be reviewed against access spacing requirements along a

collector roadway in accordance with Table 7–3 of LCUASS. RESPONSE: Two proposed driveway locations are shown off of Lochwood

9. Construction plans will be required.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

**10.** A Development Agreement will be required and recorded once the project is finalized with recordation costs paid for by the applicant. **RESPONSE:** Acknowledged.

**11.** A Development Construction Permit (DCP) will need to be obtained prior to starting any work on the site. **RESPONSE:** Acknowledged.

### **Current Planning**

Contact: Jason Holland, 970-224-6126, jholland@fcgov.com

 The proposed use is designated as a Long Term Care Facility, which is subject to a neighborhood meeting and review / approval by the Planning and Zoning Board in the L–M–N zone district.
 RESPONSE: Acknowledged. A neighborhood meeting was held February 25, 2013 and a follow-up meeting will be held at the end of the month.

The building footprint is limited to a maximum size of 20,000 square feet. This is described in Section 4.5(E)(2). A proposed larger footprint will need to function better on the site than a smaller building footprint that meets the standard, with the impacts of the larger footprint mitigated.
 RESPONSE: A Modification of Standards request is included with the PDP.

**3.** Minimum front yard setback of all buildings shall be fifteen (15) feet in order to provide a landscaped front yard consistent with the residential character of the L–M–N zone district. **RESPONSE:** Acknowledged.

**4.** The proposed project is subject to Building and Project Compatibility standards, Section 3.5.1, and Institutional Building standards in Section 3.5.3. **RESPONSE: Acknowledged**.

5. Per Section 3.5.3(B), parking is not permitted between the street and the building. If this is requested, please provide an "equal to or better than" design justification. RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

**6.** Per Section 3.5.3(D), standardized prototype design shall be modified and is required to be unique. It appears that this building design has been used in a number of other locations and needs to be modified so that it is unique to Fort Collins. It is also recommended that the eave and roof mass be lowered and integrated into the second floor living space so that the overall height of the building is lower; please refer

to section 4.5(E)(2)(d). RESPONSE: See Planning Objectives.

7. Parking requirements for Long–Term Care Facilities are .33 spaces per bed plus one space per two employees on major shift.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. There will be 93 beds and 20 employees, which equates to 45 parking spaces. We have 49 spaces shown on the plans.

**8**. Please provide a summary description of the program operations and building program including amount and type of staffing, common rooms / amenities, types of private rooms and features of the rooms provided.

RESPONSE: See Planning Objectives.

**9**. The proposed development project is subject to a Type 2 (Planning and Zoning Board) review and public hearing. The applicant for this development request is required to hold a neighborhood information meeting prior to formal submittal of the proposal. Neighborhood meetings offer an informal way to get feedback from your surrounding neighbors and discover any potential hiccups prior to the formal hearing. Please contact me, at 221–6750, to assist you in setting a date, time, and location. I and possibly other City staff, would be present to facilitate the meeting.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. A neighborhood meeting was held February 25, 2013 and a follow-up meeting will be held at the end of the month.

10. Please see the Development Review Guide at www.fcgov.com/drg. This online guide features a color coded flowchart with comprehensive, easy to read information on each step in the process. This guide includes links to just about every resource you need during development review. RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

11. This development proposal will be subject to all applicable standards of the Fort Collins Land Use Code (LUC), including Article 3 General Development Standards. The entire LUC is available for your review on the web at <a href="http://www.colocode.com/ftcollins/landuse/begin.htm">http://www.colocode.com/ftcollins/landuse/begin.htm</a>. RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

**12.** If this proposal is unable to satisfy any of the requirements set forth in the LUC, a Modification of Standard Request will need to be submitted with your formal development proposal. Please see Section 2.8.2 of the LUC for more information on criteria to apply for a Modification of Standard. RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

**13.** Please see the Submittal Requirements and Checklist at: <u>http://www.fcgov.com/developmentreview/applications.php</u>. **RESPONSE:** Acknowledged. 14. The request will be subject to the Development Review Fee Schedule that is available in the Community Development and Neighborhood Services office. The fees are due at the time of submittal of the required documents for the appropriate development review process by City staff and affected outside reviewing agencies. Also, the required Transportation Development Review Fee must be paid at time of submittal. RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

**15.** When you are ready to submit your formal plans, please make an appointment with Community Development and Neighborhood Services at (970)221–6750. **RESPONSE: Acknowledged**.

### Pre-Submittal Meetings for Building Permits

Pre–Submittal meetings are offered to assist the designer/builder by assuring, early on in the design, that the <u>new commercial or multi–family projects</u> are on track to complying with all of the adopted City codes and Standards listed below. The proposed project should be in the early to mid–design stage for this meeting to be effective and is typically scheduled after the Current Planning conceptual review meeting.

Applicants of <u>new commercial or multi-family projects</u> are advised to call 416–2341 to schedule a pre-submittal meeting. Applicants should be prepared to present site plans, floor plans, and elevations and be able to discuss code issues of occupancy, square footage and type of construction being proposed.

### Construction shall comply with the following adopted codes as amended:

2009 International Building Code (IBC) 2009 International Residential Code (IRC) 2009 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) 2009 International Mechanical Code (IMC) 2009 International Fuel Gas Code (IFGC) 2009 International Plumbing Code (IPC) as amended by the State of Colorado 2011 National Electrical Code (NEC) as amended by the State of Colorado

Accessibility: State Law CRS 9–5 & ICC/ANSI A117.1–2003. Snow Load Live Load: 30 PSF / Ground Snow Load 30 PSF. Frost Depth: 30 inches. Wind Load: 100– MPH 3 Second Gust Exposure B. Seismic Design: Category B. Climate Zone: Zone 5 Energy Code Use

- 1. Single Family; Duplex; Townhomes: 2009 IRC Chapter 11 or 2009 IECC Chapter 4
- 2. Multi-family and Condominiums 3 stories max: 2009 IECC Chapter 4.
- 3. Commercial and Multi–family 4 stories and taller: *2009 IECC* Chapter 5.

Fort Collins Green Code Amendments effective starting 1–1–2012. A copy of these requirements can be obtained at the Building Office or contact the above phone number.

City of Fort Collins Building Services Plan Review 416–2341



30,676 S.F.	IRRIGATED TURF DURA-TURF FESCUE BLEND - SOD/SEED	60,691 S.F.	NON-IRRIG <u>GRASS M</u> ARKANSA OR APPRO
391 S.F.	TAN CRUSHER FINES 5" DEPTH STABILIZED		STEEL ED
797 S.F.	SMOOTH RIVER COBBLE SHRUB BED AREAS TO RECEIVE MINIMUM 4"- 6" COBBLE OVER WEED BARRIER FABRIC		
9,118 S.F.	SHREDDED CEDAR MULCH ALL SHRUB BEDS TO RECEIVE A MINIMUM 4"-6" DEPTH SHREDDED CEDAR WOOD MULCH		

### Plant List



r	QTY	RATIO	COMMON NAME	BOTANICAL NAME
ANOPY TR	EES -	53		
c	8	7.0%	CATALPA	Catalpa speciosa
NC	10	8.8%	COTTONWOOD, NARROWLEAF	Populus x acuminata
WHB	9	7.9%	HACKBERRY, WESTERN	Celtis occidentalis
HSH	12	10.5%	HONEYLOCUST, SHADEMASTER	Gleditsia triacanthos inermis 'Shademaster'
AL	8	7.0%	LINDEN, REDMOND	Tilia americana 'Redmond'
OB	6	5.3%	OAK, BUR	Quercus macrocarpa
	-	19		
	6	5.3%	PINE,AUSTRIAN	Pinus nigra
Ø	10	8.8%	PINE, TANNENBAUM MUGO	Piinus mugo 'Tannenbaum'
,	3	2.6%	SPRUCE, BAKERI	Picea pungens 'Bakeri'
FAL TREE	S -	42		
+ PFC	8	7.0%	CRABAPPLE, PRAIRIFIRE	Malus 'Prairiefire'
JLT	6	5.3%	LILAC, JAPANESE LILAC TREE	Syringa reticulata
CLP	8	7.0%	PEAR, AUTUMN BLAZE	Pyrus calleryana 'Autumn Blaze'
$\bigcirc$	20	17.5%	SERVICEBERRY, AUTUMN BRILLANCE	Amelanchier grandiflora 'Autumn Brilliance'
N SHRUB	S -	23		
() I	23	-	PINE, MUGO SLOWMOUND	Pinus mugo 'slowmound'
S SHRUB	8 -	311		
(BC)	10	-	BUTTERFLY BUSH, COMPACT PURPLE	Buddleja davidii nanhoensis Petite Plum
A	15	-	CHOKEBERRY, BRILLIANT RED	aronia arbutifolia 'Brilliantissima'
۵	27	-	CURRENT, GOLDEN	Ribes aureum
(+)	48	-	DOGWOOD, REDTWIG	Cornus baileyi
0	10	-	EUONYMUS, COMPACT BURNING BUSH	Euonymus alatus compacta
٢	23	-	HYDRANGEA, PEE GEE	Hydrangea paniculata 'Grandiflora'
0	45	-	LILAC, DWARF KOREAN	Syringa meyeri 'Palibin'
0	15	-	NINEBARK, MOUNTAIN	Physocarpus monogynus
8	5	_	PLUM, PURPLE LEAF	Prunus x cistena
$\bigcirc$	48	-	SNOWBERRY, MOUNTAIN	Symphoricarpos rotundifolius
<u> </u>	42	-	SPIREA BILLE MIST	Caryopteris x clandonensis 'Blue
e ش	<b>⊤∠</b> 17	-		Mist'
т С	۱ <i>۱</i>	-		Rhus trilobata
$\cup$	U	-		Jaily purpured fiafia
<u>სS / GRAS</u> ი	SES -	1168		11
Жа	206 238	-	DAYLILY, RED	Hemerocallis 'Autumn Red'
<b>107</b>	200	-		Bouteloua gracilis 'Blonde
*	202	-	GRASS, BLUNDE AMBITION GRAMA	Ambition' Calamagrostis acutiflora 'Karl
Ø	202	-	SIGOU, FEATHER REED	Foerster'

GRASS, FOUNTAIN - GRASS, RED SWITCH SHENANDOAH Panicum virgatum 'Shenandoah'

163

**⊛** 170

Pennisetum alopecuroides

In GROUP

444 Mountain Ave. | TEL 970.532.5891 Berthoud,CO 80513 | WEB TBGroup.us

SEAL \_\_\_\_\_

MVG-Morningstar Assisted Living & Memory Care

\_\_\_PROJECT\_TITLE ---

Project Development Plan

Ft Collins, Colorado PREPARED FOR

MVG-MS, a Colorado limited liability company

1509 York Street Denver, CO 80206 303.339.5184

CALL UTILITY NOTIFICATION CENTER OF 81 Know what's below. Call before you dig. CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

REVISIONS \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_DATE\_\_\_\_\_ August 14, 2013 SHEET TITLE -----Landscape Plan SHEET INFORMATION Sheet Number

Of: 2

IGATED NATIVE PRAIRIE MEADOW SAS VALLEY SEED MIX - SEE NOTES ROVED EQUAL

DGER, ROUNDED TOP

## **UTILITY PLANS FOR: MVG MORNINGSTAR APARTMENT COMPLEX PROJECT** LOCATED IN THE SOUTWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 6 NORTH, RANGE 68 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN CITY OF FORT COLLINS, COUNTY OF LARIMER, STATE OF COLORADO **AUGUST 2013**



### **ABBREVIATION LIST**

### **INDEMNIFICATION STATEMENT:**

THESE PLANS HAVE BEEN REVIEWED BY THE LOCAL ENTITY FOR CONCEPT ONLY. THE REVIEW DOES NOT IMPLY RESPONSIBILITY BY THE **REVIEWING DEPARTMENT, THE LOCAL ENTITY ENGINEER, OR THE** LOCAL ENTITY FOR ACCURACY AND CORRECTNESS OF THE CALCULATIONS. FURTHERMORE, THE REVIEW DOES NOT IMPLY THAT QUANTITIES OF ITEMS ON THE PLANS ARE THE FINAL QUANTITIES REQUIRED. THE REVIEW SHALL NOT BE CONSTRUED IN ANY REASON AS ACCEPTANCE OF FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY BY THE LOCAL ENTITY FOR ADDITIONAL QUANTITIES OF ITEMS SHOWN THAT MAY BE **REQUIRED DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE.** 









			DR	AINAG	ESUM	ARY T	ABL
Design	Tributary	Area	C (2)	C (10)	C (100)	tc (2)	tc (10
Point	Sub-basin	(ac)				(min)	(min
1 (SW)	1 (SW)	1.24	0.39	0.39	0.49	12.0	12.0
2 (NE)	2 (NE)	3.18	0.46	0.46	0.58	14.1	14.1

### PRELIMINARY DRAINAGE REPORT

### MVG-MORNINGSTAR ASSISTED & MEMORY CARE PROJECT

Prepared for:

### Max Consulting, LLC

4061 S. Clermont St. Englewood, CO 80113 (303) 482-7420

Prepared by:

Interwest Consulting Group 1218 West Ash, Suite C Windsor, Colorado 80550 (970) 674-8488

August 14, 2013

Job Number 1173-105-00

August 14, 2013

Mr. Wes Lamarque City of Fort Collins Stormwater 700 Wood Street Fort Collins, CO 80522-0580

### RE: Preliminary Drainage Report for MVG-Morningstar Assisted & Memory Care Project

Dear Wes,

I am pleased to submit for your review and approval, this Preliminary Drainage Report for the MVG-Morningstar Assisted & Memory Care Project development. I certify that this report for the drainage design was prepared in accordance with the criteria in the City of Fort Collins Storm Drainage Manual.

I appreciate your time and consideration in reviewing this submittal. Please call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Reviewed By:

Mark Morrison, E.I.T.

Robert Almirall, P.E. Colorado Professional Engineer No. 33441

TABLE	OF	CONTENTS
-------	----	----------

1. GENERAL LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION       1         1.1 Location       1         1.2 Description of Property       1         2. DRAINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS       1         2.1 Major Basin Description       1         2.2 Sub-basin Description       2         3. DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         3.1 Regulations       2         3.2 Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         3.3 Hydrological Criteria       3         3.4 Hydraulic Criteria       3         3.5 Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4. DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1 General Concept       4         4.2 Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3 Drainage Summary       6         5. CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1 Compliance with Standards       6         5.2 Drainage Concept       6	<ol> <li>GEN         <ol> <li>GEN             </li> <li>I</li> <li>I</li> <li>I</li> <li>DRA             </li> <li>Z.1 M</li></ol></li></ol>	NERAL LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION       1         Location       1         Description of Property       1         AINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS       1         Major Basin Description       1         Sub-basin Description       2         AINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2
1.1       Location       1         1.2       Description of Property       1         2.       DRAINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS       1         2.1       Major Basin Description       1         2.2       Sub-basin Description       2         3.       DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         3.1       Regulations       2         3.2       Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         3.3       Hydrological Criteria       3         3.4       Hydraulic Criteria       3         3.5       Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4.       DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1       General Concept       4         4.2       Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3       Drainage Summary       6         5.       CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1       Compliance with Standards       6	1.1 I 1.2 I 2. DRA 2.1 N 2.2 S 3. DRA 3.1 H	Location       1         Description of Property       1         AINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS       1         Major Basin Description       1         Sub-basin Description       2         AINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         Regulations       2         Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2
1.2       Description of Property       1         2.       DRAINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS       1         2.1       Major Basin Description       1         2.2       Sub-basin Description       2         3.       DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         3.1       Regulations       2         3.2       Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         3.3       Hydrological Criteria       3         3.4       Hydraulic Criteria       3         3.5       Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4.       DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1       General Concept       4         4.2       Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3       Drainage Summary       6         5.       CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1       Compliance with Standards       6         5.2       Drainage Concept       6	1.2 I 2. DRA 2.1 N 2.2 S 3. DRA 3.1 H	Description of Property       1         AINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS       1         Major Basin Description       1         Sub-basin Description       2         AINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         Regulations       2         Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2
2. DRAINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS       1         2.1 Major Basin Description       1         2.2 Sub-basin Description       2         3. DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         3.1 Regulations       2         3.2 Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         3.3 Hydrological Criteria       3         3.4 Hydraulic Criteria       3         3.5 Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4. DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1 General Concept       4         4.2 Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3 Drainage Summary       6         5. CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1 Compliance with Standards       6         5.2 Drainage Concept       6	<ol> <li>DRA</li> <li>2.1 M</li> <li>2.2 S</li> <li>3. DRA</li> <li>3.1 H</li> </ol>	AINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS
2. DRAINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS       1         2.1 Major Basin Description       1         2.2 Sub-basin Description       2         3. DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         3.1 Regulations       2         3.2 Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         3.3 Hydrological Criteria       3         3.4 Hydraulic Criteria       3         3.5 Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4. DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1 General Concept       4         4.2 Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3 Drainage Summary       6         5.1 Compliance with Standards       6         5.2 Drainage Concept       6	<ol> <li>2. DRA</li> <li>2.1 M</li> <li>2.2 S</li> <li>3. DRA</li> <li>3.1 H</li> </ol>	AINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS       1         Major Basin Description       1         Sub-basin Description       2         AINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         Regulations       2         Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         Hydrological Criteria       2
2.1       Major Basin Description       1         2.2       Sub-basin Description       2         3.       DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         3.1       Regulations       2         3.2       Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         3.3       Hydrological Criteria       3         3.4       Hydraulic Criteria       3         3.5       Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4.       DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1       General Concept       4         4.2       Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3       Drainage Summary       6         5.1       Compliance with Standards       6         5.2       Drainage Concept       6	2.1 M 2.2 S 3. DRA 3.1 H	Major Basin Description       1         Sub-basin Description       2         AINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         Regulations       2         Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         Hydrological Criteria       2
2.2       Sub-basin Description       2         3.       DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         3.1       Regulations       2         3.2       Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         3.3       Hydrological Criteria       3         3.4       Hydraulic Criteria       3         3.5       Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4.       DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1       General Concept       4         4.2       Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3       Drainage Summary       6         5.1       Compliance with Standards       6         5.2       Drainage Concept       6	2.2 S 3. DRA 3.1 H	Sub-basin Description       2         AINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         Regulations       2         Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         Hydrological Criteria       2
3. DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         3.1 Regulations       2         3.2 Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         3.3 Hydrological Criteria       3         3.4 Hydraulic Criteria       3         3.5 Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4. DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1 General Concept       4         4.2 Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3 Drainage Summary       6         5. CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1 Compliance with Standards       6         5.2 Drainage Concept       6	3. DRA 3.1 I	AINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA
3. DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         3.1 Regulations       2         3.2 Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         3.3 Hydrological Criteria       3         3.4 Hydraulic Criteria       3         3.5 Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4. DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1 General Concept       4         4.2 Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3 Drainage Summary       6         5. CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1 Compliance with Standards       6         5.2 Drainage Concept       6	3. DRA 3.1 I	AINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA       2         Regulations       2         Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         Hydrological Criteria       2
3.1       Regulations.       2         3.2       Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         3.3       Hydrological Criteria       3         3.4       Hydraulic Criteria       3         3.5       Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4.       DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1       General Concept       4         4.2       Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3       Drainage Summary       6         5.       CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1       Compliance with Standards       6         5.2       Drainage Concept       6	3.1 H	Regulations       2         Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         Hydrological Criteria       2
3.2       Development Criteria Reference and Constraints       2         3.3       Hydrological Criteria       3         3.4       Hydraulic Criteria       3         3.5       Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4.       DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1       General Concept       4         4.2       Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3       Drainage Summary       6         5.       CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1       Compliance with Standards       6         5.2       Drainage Concept       6		Development Criteria Reference and Constraints
3.3       Hydrological Criteria       3         3.4       Hydraulic Criteria       3         3.5       Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4.       DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1       General Concept       4         4.2       Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3       Drainage Summary       6         5.       CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1       Compliance with Standards       6         5.2       Drainage Concept       6	3.2 1	Hydrological Criteria
3.4       Hydraulic Criteria       3         3.5       Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4.       DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1       General Concept       4         4.2       Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3       Drainage Summary       6         5.       CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1       Compliance with Standards       6         5.2       Drainage Concept       6	3.3 H	nydrological Criteria
3.5       Floodplain Regulations Compliance       3         4.       DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN       4         4.1       General Concept       4         4.2       Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3       Drainage Summary       6         5.       CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1       Compliance with Standards       6         5.2       Drainage Concept       6	3.4 I	Hydraulic Criteria
4. DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN	3.5 H	Floodplain Regulations Compliance
4. DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN		
4.1       General Concept	4. DRA	JNAGE FACILITY DESIGN 4
4.2       Specific Flow Routing       5         4.3       Drainage Summary       6         5.       CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1       Compliance with Standards       6         5.2       Drainage Concept       6	4.1 (	General Concept4
4.3 Drainage Summary       6         5. CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1 Compliance with Standards       6         5.2 Drainage Concept       6	4.2 S	Specific Flow Routing
5. CONCLUSIONS	4.3 I	Drainage Summary
5. CONCLUSIONS       6         5.1 Compliance with Standards       6         5.2 Drainage Concept       6		
5.1       Compliance with Standards       6         5.2       Drainage Concept       6	5. CON	CLUSIONS
5.2 Drainage Concept	5.1 C	Compliance with Standards
	5.2 I	Drainage Concept
6. REFERENCES	6. REFI	<b>ERENCES</b>
APPENDIX	APPEND	DIX
VICINITY MAP AND DRAINAGE PLAN	VICINIT	Y MAP AND DRAINAGE PLAN
	HYDROL	LOGIC COMPUTATIONS

.

### 1. GENERAL LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

### 1.1 Location

The MVG-Morningstar Assisted & Memory Care Project development is located in southeast Fort Collins. It is located in the Southwest Quarter of Section 30, Township 6 North, Range 68 West of the Sixth Principal Meridian, in the City of Fort Collins, Larimer County, Colorado. See the location map in Appendix A.

The project is located west of Lochwood Drive, north of E. Horsetooth Road, and bounded on the west and north sides by existing residential lots. An existing drainage ditch with an existing 25 ft Drainage Easement runs along the west edge of the property, dividing it from the residential properties.

### **1.2 Description of Property**

The property consists of approximately 4.41 acres of land. The existing land currently drains from southeast to northwest at approximately a 2% grade. The land is currently vacant with mild sloping terrain and covered with natural dry-land vegetation across the entire site. The only offsite flow entering the site is through an existing concrete drainage ditch originating at the SW corner of the property and conveys runoff to the northeast. There is an existing 25' drainage easement accompanying the existing concrete ditch, extending from the existing flowline 25' to the west. An additional 25' drainage easement is proposed, extending from the flowline 25' to the east, to make the entire Drainage Easement 50' wide up to the Tract A-Utility & Drainage Easement. The channel is not mapped by FEMA. The project is located in FEMA FIRM Panel 08069C1000F, Zone X.

### 2. DRAINAGE BASINS AND SUB-BASINS

### 2.1 Major Basin Description

The proposed development lies within the McClelland's Creek Master Drainage Basin. The entire site currently drains to an existing concrete drainage ditch along the west and northwest property boundary. James H. Stewart and Associates performed a drainage study on this drainage in March of 1978 and determined the 100-year storm to produce 217.0 cfs. However, the updated 2010 SWMM model for the basin shows a 2-year storm

run-off of 20.6 cfs and a 100-year storm run-off of 150.2 cfs. See Appendix B for existing site hydrologic computations.

### 2.2 Sub-basin Description

The existing site has a historic runoff of 1.5 cfs and 6.7 cfs for the 2-year & 100-year runoff event, respectively, with a historic 2-year release rate of 0.35 cfs/acre. The site will be divided into 2 sub-basins for proposed construction activities. Sub-basin A will consist of approximately 1.24 ac and will be collected in a small extended detention basin located southwest of the proposed building before releasing into the existing drainage ditch to the west. Sub-basin B consists of approximately 3.18 ac and drains to the northwest corner of the property where it will be collected in a second extended detention basin before releasing into the existing concrete drainage ditch bounding the property. Once the runoff enters the existing ditch, it will flow northeast eventually reaching McClelland's Channel.

### 3. DRAINAGE DESIGN CRITERIA

### 3.1 Regulations

This report was prepared to meet or exceed the "City of Fort Collins Storm Drainage Design Criteria Manual" specifications. Where applicable, the criteria established in the "Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual" (UDFCD), developed by the Denver Regional Council of Governments, has been used.

### 3.2 Development Criteria Reference and Constraints

Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (UDFCD) recommends a Four Step Process for receiving water protection that focuses on reducing runoff volumes, treating the water quality capture volume (WQCV), stabilizing drainageways and implementing long-term source controls. The Four Step Process applies to the management of smaller, frequently occurring events.

### Step 1: Employ Runoff Reduction Practices

To reduce runoff peaks, volumes, and pollutant loads from urbanizing areas, implement Low Impact Development (LID) strategies, including Minimizing Directly Connected

### Impervious Areas (MDCIA).

Runoff for the site will be split around the proposed building's SE corner to the west and north, respectively.

### Sub-Basin A

Runoff directed to the west will be routed through vegetated bio-swales or a concrete pan to an extended detention basin, herein referred to as "Water Quality Pond A" equipped with a Water Quality Outlet Structure which will release flow into the existing concrete drainage ditch along the west edge of the property.

### Sub-Basin B

Runoff directed to the north will be routed through vegetated areas, a rain garden, and a storm drain system thereby reducing runoff from impervious surfaces over permeable areas to slow runoff and increase the time of concentration and promote infiltration. Runoff from the parking lot shall drain across Pervious Pavers before entering a second extended detention basin, herein referred to as "Water Quality Pond B".

### Step 2: Implement BMPs that Provide a Water Quality Capture Volume with Slow Release

### Sub-Basin A

Water Quality Pond A shall be equipped with a Water Quality Outlet Structure designed to allow sediments to settle while releasing treated flows at or less than historic rates.

### Sub-Basin B

A Proposed Rain Garden located SE of the main entrance shall collect a majority of the down-spout runoff before conveying the water to the second water quality treatment pond. Water Quality Pond B shall be equipped with a Water Quality Outlet Structure designed to allow sediments to settle while releasing treated flows at or less than historic rates.

### Step 3: Stabilize Drainageways

Natural Drainageways are subject to bed and bank erosion due to increases in frequency, duration, rate and volume of runoff during and following development. Rip-Rap shall be used at the outlet of both Water Quality Pond's as well as the two points where a majority of water will enter Water Quality Pond B. The Rip Rap shall be stabilized in place.

### Step 4: Implement Site Specific and Other Source Control BMPs

Proactively controlling pollutants at their source by preventing pollution rather than removing contaminants once they have entered the stormwater system or receiving waters is important when protecting storm systems and receiving waters. This can be accomplished through site specific needs such as construction site runoff control, postconstruction runoff control and pollution prevention / good housekeeping. It will be the responsibility of the contractor to develop a procedural best management practice for the site.

### 3.3 Hydrologic Criteria

Runoff computations were prepared for the 2-year and 10-year minor and 100-year major storm frequency utilizing the rational method. The Modified FAA method was used to determine preliminary detention volumes for the proposed water quality ponds.

All hydrologic calculations associated with the basins are included in Appendix B of this report.

Final water quality volumes will be presented in the final drainage report and calculated using the method recommended in the "Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual".

### 3.4 Hydraulic Criteria

All hydraulic calculations will be presented in the final drainage report and prepared in accordance with the City of Fort Collins Drainage Criteria.

### 3.5 Floodplain Regulations Compliance

No work is proposed within the existing floodplain.

### 4. DRAINAGE FACILITY DESIGN

### 4.1 General Concept

The proposed MVG-Morningstar site was designed to treat run-off as close to the pointsource as possible, while also minimizing the length of drainage routing to the most feasible extents of the site. The proposed site shall be divided into two sub-basins based on design points A and B. The proposed drainage design follows the existing drainage pattern of southeast to northwest. The project will consist of an Assisted & Memory Care Complex building with a footprint of approximately 42,500 SF, a parking area for patients and employees, an access lane, a retaining wall, sidewalks and landscaped areas. All proposed site run-off is directed to a water quality pond at one of the two design points before being released off-site. Each water quality pond shall be equipped with a Water Quality Outlet Structure, designed specifically for that sub-basin, to treat and release the run-off into the existing concrete ditch at or below historic run-off rates.

Both of the extended detention ponds serving as water quality ponds shall also act as onsite detention ponds for the proposed construction. The on-site detention shall hold the proposed 100-year run-off and release it at the historic 2-year storm release rate.

### 4.2 Specific Flow Routing

A summary of the drainage patterns within each basin is provided in the following paragraphs.

**Sub-Basin 1** includes the southwest corner of the property, excluding the existing drainage ditch, and the south half of the downspouts from the proposed building, approximately 1.24 ac. From the downspouts, flow will be routed through vegetated areas carrying flow away from the building or sheet flow over-top the sidewalk. A sidewalk chase is proposed in one location to keep positive drainage through the sidewalk. Remaining Sub-basin 1 flow will be collected and routed through a concrete pan along the south edge of the property to Water Quality Pond A, which is located just southwest of the proposed building. Once the run-off is treated, the outlet structure discharges into the existing concrete channel to the west of the site, eventually reaching McClelland's Channel. Sub-Basin 1 is calculated to have a 10-year and 100-year discharge of 1.7 & 4.5 cfs, respectively.

**Sub-Basin 2** includes the remaining approximately 3.18 acres located northeast of Subbasin 1 within the site, including the north half of the proposed building downspouts. The east side building down-spout run-off as well as that immediately adjacent to the southeast side of the proposed building will be collected in a proposed rain garden before entering the site's storm drain system. The north side building down-spout run-off as well as that immediately adjacent to the north, northeast, and northwest sides of the building shall sheet flow to the northwest to the proposed Water Quality Pond B. Parking and access road run-off will also sheet flow to the northwest or enter the site's storm drain system, which also drains into Water Quality Pond B. Run-off is then treated and released into the existing drainage ditch flowing northeast into McClelland's Channel. Sub-basin 2 is calculated to have a 10-year and 100-year discharge of 4.8 & 12.3 cfs, respectively.

### 4.3 Drainage Summary

The percent impervious weighted average of the entire site is 44%. All proposed site runoff follows existing drainage flow patterns while adding a level of water quality to the discharge.

Drainage facilities located outside of the right of way (including the rain garden, water quality pond, proposed storm sewer system and the pond outlets) will be maintained by the owners of the property. The property owner shall also share maintenance of the 50' Drainage Easement and existing drainage ditch to the west of the property with the Collindale PUD Homeowners Association.

### 5. CONCLUSIONS

### 5.1 Compliance with Standards

All computations that have been completed within this report are in compliance with the City of Fort Collins(COFC) Erosion Control Reference Manual for Construction Sites, the COFC Storm water Criteria Manual, the COFC Master Drainage Plans, and the COFC floodplain regulations. All floodway information is in compliance with Chapter 10 of the City of Fort Collins Municipal Code and all State and Federal regulations.

### 5.2 Drainage Concept

The proposed drainage concepts presented in this report and on the construction plans adequately provide for stormwater quantity and quality treatment of proposed impervious areas. Conveyance elements have been designed to pass required flows and to minimize future maintenance.

If, at the time of construction, groundwater is encountered, a Colorado Department of Health Construction Dewatering Permit will be required.

### 6. **REFERENCES**

- 1. City of Fort Collins, "Storm Drainage Criteria Manual", (SDCM), dated March, 1986.
- Urban Drainage and Flood Control District, "Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual", Volumes 1 and 2, dated June 2001, and Volume 3 dated September 1999.
- ICON Engineering, Inc., "McClelland's Creek Master Drainage Plan Update", dated November 20, 2000 (Revised March 2003).

### APPENDIX A

### VICINITY MAP AND DRAINAGE PLAN








1. THE CITY STORMWATER DEPARTMENT EROSION CONTROL INSPECTOR MUST BE NOTIFIED AT LEAST 24 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ON THE SITE.

2. PRIOR TO ANY EARTHWORK ACTIVITIES PERIMETER EROSION CONTROL SHALL BE ESTABLISHED. THIS SHALL INCLUDE INSTALLATION OF THE SILT FENCE, INLET PROTECTION AT THE EXISTING INLETS ON LOCKWOOD DRIVE, AND THE VEHICLE TRACKING PAD AT THE SITE ACCESS OFF OF LOCKWOOD DRIVE. ALL OTHER EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN SHALL BE INSTALLED AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME IN THE CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCE (I.E. INLET PROTECTION INSTALLED AT THE TIME OF INLET CONSTRUCTION, WATTLES INSTALLED AT THE ROUGH GRADING OF ALL SWALES, CONCRETE WASHOUT INSTALLED PROTECTION MASON WORK).

3. PRE-DISTURBANCE VEGETATION SHALL BE PROTECTED AND RETAINED WHERE VER POSSIBLE, REMOVAL OR DISTURBANCE OF EXISTING VEGETATION SHALL BE LIMITED TO THE AREA REQUIRED FOR IMMEDIATE CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS, AND FOR THE SHORTEST PRACTICAL PERIOD OF TIME.

4. ALL SOILS EXPOSED DURING LAND DISTURBING ACTIVITY (STRIPPING, GRADING, UTILITY INSTALLATIONS, STOCKPILING, FILLING, ETC.) SHALL BE KEPT IN A ROUGHENED CONDITION BY RIPPING OR DISKING ALONG LAND CONTOURS UNTIL MULCH, VEGETATION, OR OTHER PERMANENT EROSION CONTROL IS INSTALLED. NO SOILS IN AREAS OUTSIDE PROJECT STREET RIGHTS OF WAY SHALL REMAIN EXPOSED BY LAND DISTURBING ACTIVITY FOR MORE THAN THIRTY (30) DAYS BEFORE REQUIRED TEMPORARY OR PERMANENT EROSION CONTROL (E.G. SEED/MULCH, LANDSCAPING, ETC.) IS INSTALLED, UNLESS OTHERWISE APPROVED BY THE STORMWATER DEPARTMENT.

5. THE PROPERTY MUST BE WATERED AND MAINTAINED AT ALL TIMES DURING CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES SO AS TO PREVENT WIND-CAUSED EROSION. ALL LAND DISTURBING ACTIVITIES SHALL BE IMMEDIATELY DISCONTINUED WHEN FUGITIVE DUST IMPACTS ADJACENT PROPERTIES, AS DETERMINED BY THE CITY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT.

6. ALL TEMPORARY (STRUCTURAL) EROSION CONTROL MEASURES MUST BE INSPECTED AND REPAIRED OR RECONSTRUCTED AS NECESSARY AFTER EACH RUNOFF EVENT AND EVERY 14 DAYS IN ORDER TO ASSURE CONTINUED PERFORMANCE OF THEIR INTENDED FUNCTION. ALL RETAINED SEDIMENTS. PARTICULARLY THOSE ON PAVED ROADWAY SURFACES, SHALL BE REMOVED AND DISPOSED OF IN A MANNER AND LOCATION SO AS NOT TO CAUSE THEIR RELEASE INTO ANY DRAINAGEWAY.

7. NO SOIL STOCKPILE SHALL EXCEED TEN (10) FEET IN HEIGHT. ALL SOIL STOCKPILES SHALL BE PROTECTED FROM SEDIMENT TRANSPORT BY SURFACE ROUGHENING, WATERING, AND PERIMETER SILT FENCING. ANY SOIL STOCKPILE REMAINING AFTER 30 DAYS SHALL BE SEEDED AND MULCHED. SEED MIX SPECIFIED ON THE LANDSCAPE PLAN.

8. CITY ORDINANCE PROHIBITS THE TRACKING, DROPPING, OR DEPOSITING OF SOILS OR ANY OTHER MATERIAL ONTO CITY STREETS BY OR FROM ANY VEHICLE. ANY INADVERTENT DEPOSITED MATERIAL SHALL BE CLEANED IMMEDIATELY BY THE CONTRACTOR. DURING BUILDING DEMOLITION AND UTILITY INSTALLATION, VEHICLES MAY NOT LEAVE THE SITE IF THERE IS SEDIMENT ON THE VEHICLE. A TRACKING PAD SHALL BE INSTALLED IN THE EXCAVATED AREA OR A MODULAR PAD SHALL BE USED. IF NEITHER IS POSSIBLE, TRUCKS SHALL BE HAND CLEANED PRIOR TO EXTING THE CONSTRUCTION AREA. 9. OWNER/CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING A STATE OF COLORADO CDPHE, GENERAL PERMIT APPLICATION-STORMWATER DISCHARGES ASSOCIATED WITH CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION (NPES PERMIT). THE OWNER/CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE THE CITY WITH A COPY OF THIS PERMIT APPLICATION TO THE STATE PRIOR TO RECEIVING A GRADING/CONSTRUCTION PERMIT. THE OWNER/CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL FEES ASSOCIATED WITH THIS STATE PERMIT. SEE EROSION CONTROL NOTES ON THE GERAL NOTES PAGE FOR MORE DETAILS.

10. TRASH STORAGE, PORTABLE TOILETS AND OTHER ON SITE POLLUTANT SOURCES TO BE LOCATED BASED ON THE COLORADO DISCHARGE PERMIT SYSTEM - STORMWATER CONSTRUCTION PERMIT STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN. TOILETS ARE TO BE STAKED DO\VN. TOILETS AND OTHER ON SITE POLLUTANT SOURCES ARE TO BE LOCATED NO CLOSER THAN 50 FEET FROM THE NEAREST INLET OR STATE WATERS.

11. THE PERIMETER OF THE CONSTRUCTION AREA SHALL BE FENCED OFF USING ORANGE CONSTRUCTION FENCING OR OTHER CONTRACTOR FENCING.

12. NO DISTURBANCE SHALL OCCUR WITHIN ANY BUFFER ZONE AND NO PERSON SHALL ENGAGE IN ANY ACTIVITY THAT WILL DISTURB, REMOVE, FILL, DREDGE, CLEAR, DESTROY, OR ALTER ANY AREA, INCLUDING VEGETATION WITHIN NATURAL HABITATS OR FEATURES INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION, LAKES, PONDS, STREAM CORRIDORS AND WETLANDS EXCEPT AS SPECIFICALLY APPROVED AND NOTED IN SECTION 3.4.1(D)2.C.

### DRAINAGE SUMMARY TABLE

Design	Tributary	Area	C(2)	C (10)	C (100)	tc (2)	tc (10)	tc (100)
Point	300-045 m	(ac)				(min)_	(min)	(m in)
1 (SW)	1 (SW)	1.24	0.39	0.39	0.49	12.0	12.0	11.4
2 (NE)	2 (NE)	3.18	0.46	0.46	0.58	14.1	14.1	14.1



# **APPENDIX B**

# HYDROLOGIC COMPUTATIONS

.

James H. Stewart and Associates, Inc.

**Consulting Engineers** 

March 15, 1978

## STORM DRAINAGE SWALE

# COLLINDALE SECOND FILING

The swale that exists at the Easterly side of Collindale, Second Filing will receive drainage from the following areas:

Foothills Meadow Apartments	-	16 Acres
Warren Shores		23 Acres
North Shore P.U.D.	. ·	10 Acres
Warren Lake Park	· _	26 Acres
Collindale, First Filing	_	11 Acres
TOTAL		86 Acres

Of the above areas, North Shore P.U.D. does have onsight detention and the Warren Lake Park will not increase the runoff, due to development, to a great extent. The runoff for a 100 year frequency storm would be as follows:

Foothills Meadows	.(*)1	Q	u	0.8	x	4.2	x	16	=.	54	c.f.s.	8.
Warren Shores	•	Q	1	0.6	x	4.2	x	23	æ.	58	c.f.s	
North Shore P.U.D.		Q	=	0.4	x	5	x	10	=	20	c.f.s	·
Warren Lake Park		Q		0.4	x	5	x	26	W	52	c.f.s	
 Collindale		Q	#	0.6	x	5	x	11		33	c.f.s.	1- p.
									-			1.1

= 217 c.f.s TOTAL

The swale would be as shown below to carry the 100 year storm.

	· ·					
		50'				••••
	2 <b>1</b> 11					
The MA	TT WP	T			TINT	
June Es	MITTER .	· N		mill		
D-AV- Ali	484 243 1/2	Min	A= ARGA = "	50KA = 50	- 6 - <sup>6</sup> - 6 - 6	
CX=III-AA	1486 (50)4	31 1/2	R: Hrp EAD = :	A = 50	( one	5 Fel
. = 50×	·075 * (52)	× (.006) *	S= SLOPE		ESFORT	HELS.
= 23	OCHS		1= MANNING	COETFICIE	NTINFA	FIR
Therefore, i	it is determined	that Buildin	gs C, D, E,	and F as she	own on the	mon
site plan wo	ould not be dama;	ged during a	100 year fre	quency stor	m	

Richard 9 Rutherford

Richard A. Rutherford, P.E. & L.S.

OFFICE-214 NORTH HOWES • P.O. BOX 429 • FORT COLLINS, COLORADO 80522 • TELEPHONE AREA 303/182-9331

# Worksheet for Q100 PROP Typical Section (NO PAN & NO PINCH)

Project Description		
Flow Element:	Irregular Section	
Friction Method:	Manning Formula	
Solve For:	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Channel Slope:	0.00600	ft/ft
Discharge:	150.20	ft³/s
Options		
Current Roughness Weighted Metho	ImprovedLotters	a and with conducting \$1.5 for a second of
Open Channel Weighted Roughnes:	ImprovedLotters	
Closed Channel Weighted Roughne	Hortons	
Results		
Roughness Coefficient:	0.025	
Water Surface Elevation:	1.70	ft
Elevation Range:	0.00 to 2.15 ft	
Flow Area:	36.48	ft²
Wetted Perimeter:	43.13	ft
Top Width:	42.99	ft
Normal Depth:	1.70	ft
Critical Depth:	1.54	ft
Critical Slope:	0.00997	ft/ft
Velocity:	4.12	ft/s
√elocity Head:	0.26	ft
Specific Energy:	1.96	ft
Froude Number:	0.79	
Flow Type:	Subcritical	
Segment Roughness		
Start Station End Station Roughness		

Section Geometry Station Elevation

(0+25, 1.83) (-0+25, 2.15) 0.025

	12-1-1-1-1
0+25	1.83
0+00	0.00

# Worksheet for Q100 PROP Typical Section (NO PAN & NO PINCH)

Station	Elevation
-0+25	2 15

# Cross Section for Q100 PROP Typical Section (NO PAN & NO PINCH)

Project Description		a state of the state of the state of
Flow Element:	Irregular Section	
Friction Method:	Manning Formula	
Solve For:	Normal Depth	
Section Data		
Roughness Coefficient:	0.025	
Channel Slope:	0.00600	ft/ft
Normal Depth:	1.70	ft
Elevation Range:	0.00 to 2.15 ft	
Discharge:	150.20	ft³/s



## Table RO-11

# Rational Method Runoff Coefficients for Composite Analysis

Character of Surface	Runoff Coefficient
Streets, Parking Lots,	
Drives:	
Asphalt	0.95
Concrete	0.95
Gravel	0.5
Roofs	0.95
Recycled Asphalt	0.8
Lawns, Sandy Soil:	
Flat <2%	0.1
Average 2 to 7%	0.15
Steep >7%	0.2
Lawns, Heavy Soil:	
Flat <2%	0.2
Average 2 to 7%	0.25
Steep >7%	0.35

(4) A new Section 2.9 is added, to read as follows:

# 2.9 Composite Runoff Coefficient

Drainage sub-basins are frequently composed of land that has multiple surfaces or zoning classifications. In such cases a composite runoff coefficient must be calculated for any given drainage sub-basin.

The composite runoff coefficient is obtained using the following formula:

$$C = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (C_i * A_i)}{A_i}$$
(RO-8)

Where: C = Composite Runoff Coefficient

 $C_i$  = Runoff Coefficient for Specific Area (A<sub>i</sub>)

 $A_i$  = Area of Surface with Runoff Coefficient of  $C_i$ , acres or feet<sup>2</sup>

n = Number of different surfaces to be considered

 $A_t$  = Total Area over which C is applicable, acres or feet<sup>2</sup>

(5) A new Section 2.10 is added, to read as follows:



# RAINFALL INTENSITY-DURATION-FREQUENCY CURVE

Figure RA-16 City of Fort Collins Rainfall Intensity-Duration-Frequency Curves

- (13) Section 5.0 is deleted in its entirety.
- (14) Section 6.0 is deleted in its entirety.
- (15) Section 7.0 is deleted in its entirety.
- (16) Section 7.1 is deleted in its entirety.
- (17) Section 7.2 is deleted in its entirety.
- (18) Section 7.3 is deleted in its entirety.
- (19) Section 8.0 is deleted in its entirety.
- (20) Table RA-1 is deleted in its entirety.

# SUMMARY

# DRAINAGE SUMMARY TABLE

DRAINAGE	STRUCTURE /REMARKS				
Q(100)tot	(cfs)		45	2	12.3
Q(10)tot	(cfs)		1.7		4.8
Q(2)tot	(cfs)		1.0		2.8
tc (100)	(min)		11.4		14.1
tc (10)	(min)		12.0		14.1
tc (2)	(min)		12.0		14.1
C (100)			0.49		0.58
C (10)			0.39		0.46
C (2)			0.39		0.46
Area	(ac)	1000	1.24		3.18
Tributary Sub-basin			1 (SW)		2 (NE)
Design	Point		1 (SW)		2 (NE)

•

DELICH ASSOCIATES Traffic & Transportation Engineering 2272 Glen Haven Drive Phone: (970) 669-2061 Loveland, Colorado 80538 Fax: (970) 669-5034

# MEMORANDUM

- BOLDESSIONAL ENGINEER
- TO: Max C. Martin, Max Consulting Cathy Mathis, The Birdsall Group Ward Stanford, City of Fort Collins Traffic Engineering
- FROM: Joe/Matt Delich

**DATE**: August 13, 2013

SUBJECT: MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care Transportation Impact Study (File: 1310ME02)

This memorandum addresses the transportation impacts of the proposed MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care development. MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care is located in the northwest quadrant of the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access intersection in Fort Collins. The site location is shown in Figure 1. The site is currently vacant. MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care will consist of 77 beds. The scope of this study was discussed with the Fort Collins Traffic Operations Engineer. A brief memorandum was requested. The Base Assumptions form is provided in Appendix A. There are sidewalks along Horsetooth Road and Lochwood Drive. There are bicycle lanes along Horsetooth Road and Lockwood Drive. Transfort Route 5 has a stop at the Horsetooth/Lemay intersection approximately 1650 feet away from this site.

Horsetooth Road is south of (adjacent to) the proposed MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care site. It is an east-west street classified as a four-lane arterial street according to the Fort Collins Master Street Plan. Currently, Horsetooth Road has a four-lane cross section. At the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access intersection, Horsetooth Road has an eastbound and westbound left-turn lane and two through lanes in each direction. There is stop sign control at the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access. Horsetooth Road has a posted speed of 40 mph.

Lochwood Drive is east of (adjacent to) the proposed MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care site. It is a north-south street classified as a two-lane collector street according to the Fort Collins Master Street Plan. Currently, Lochwood Drive has a two-lane cross section. Lochwood Drive only has a public street on the north leg at the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access intersection. The south leg is an access to the Collindale Golf Course and C.B. & Potts Restaurant. At the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access intersection, Lochwood Drive has a southbound left-turn/through lane and a southbound right-turn lane. The Collindale Access has all movements combined into a single lane. At the Lochwood/Gas Station Access and Lochwood/Kindercare Access intersections, Lockwood Drive has all movements combined into a single lane. There is stop sign control at the Lochwood/Gas Station Access and Lochwood/Kindercare Access intersections on the Gas Station Access and Kindercare Access, respectively. Lochwood Drive has a posted speed of 25 mph. The Gas Station Access and Kindercare Access serve more uses; however, there are the primary uses and were used for naming purposes.

Figure 2 shows recent afternoon peak hour counts at the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access, Lochwood/Gas Station Access, and Lochwood/Kindercare Access intersections. The count data was obtained in February 2013. Raw traffic data is provided in Appendix B. Since the traffic counts were obtained on different days, they were balanced between intersections and are shown in Figure 3. Table 1 shows the current morning and afternoon peak hour operation of the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access, Lochwood/Gas Station Access, and Lochwood/Kindercare Access intersections. Calculation forms are provided in Appendix C. A description of level of service for unsignalized intersections from the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual and a table showing the Fort Collins Motor Vehicle LOS Standards (Intersections) are also provided in Appendix C. The MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care site is in an area termed "low density mixed use district" on the Fort Collins Structure Plan. In areas termed "low density mixed use district," acceptable operation at unsignalized intersections along arterial streets during the peak hours, is defined as level of service F, which is considered to be normal in an urban environment. The key intersections operate acceptably during the morning and afternoon peak hours. At the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access intersection, the calculated delay for some movements was commensurate with level of service F during the peak hours.

Figure 4 shows the site plan for MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care. <u>Trip</u> <u>Generation, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition</u>, ITE was used as the reference document in calculating the trip generation. Code 254, Assisted Living with occupied beds as the trip generation variable was used. Table 2 shows the trip generation for MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care. This trip generation was discussed and agreed to in the scoping meeting. The trip generation for MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care is calculated at: 254 daily trip ends, 17 morning peak hour trip ends and 28 afternoon peak hour trip ends.

The trip distribution for this site is shown in Figure 5. The trip distribution was determined using the existing traffic counts, knowledge of the existing and planned street system, development trends, and engineering judgment. The trip distribution was discussed and agreed to in the scoping meeting. Figure 6 shows the site generated traffic assignment of MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care.

Figure 7 shows the short range (2018) background afternoon peak hour traffic at the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access, Lochwood/Gas Station Access, and Lochwood/Kindercare Access intersections. Background traffic volume forecasts for the short range (2018) future were obtained by reviewing traffic studies for other developments in this area and reviewing historic counts in the area. The traffic on Horsetooth Road was increased at the rate of 1.5 percent per year. Lochwood Drive,



north of the site, is built out and therefore was not increased. Table 3 shows the short range (2018) background afternoon peak hour operation at the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access, Lochwood/Gas Station Access, and Lochwood/Kindercare Access intersections. Calculation forms are provided in Appendix D. The key intersections operate acceptably during the morning and afternoon peak hours. At the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access intersection calculated delay for some movements with level of service F during the peak hours.

Figure 8 shows the short range (2018) total peak hour traffic at the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access, Lochwood/Gas Station Access, and Lochwood/Kindercare Access intersections. Table 4 shows the short range (2018) total peak hour operation at the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access, Lochwood/Gas Station Access, and Lochwood/Kindercare Access intersections. Calculation forms are provided in Appendix E. The key intersections will operate acceptably during the morning and afternoon peak hours. At the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access intersection calculated delay for some movements was commensurate with level of service F during the peak hours.

The existing westbound right-turn volume in one peak hour (pm) at the Horsetooth/Lockwood-Collindale Access intersection exceeds the threshold shown in Figure 8-4, LCUASS for a right-turn deceleration lane. This proposed development will add a small amount of traffic to this movement. Provision of this right-turn lane will not change the operational level of service at this intersection. Therefore, this right-turn lane is not recommended. Figure 9 shows the short range (2018) geometry at the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access, Lochwood/Gas Station Access, and Lochwood/Kindercare Access intersections. This is the current geometry.

The MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care site is in an area within which the City requires pedestrian and bicycle level of service evaluations. As shown on the site plan (Figure 4), there is a concrete sidewalk along the north side of this property. This sidewalk was built by others and is maintained by others. This walk will remain and it is not the responsibility of this development. Appendix F shows a map of the area that is within 1320 feet of MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care. The MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care site is located within an area termed as "other," which sets the level of service threshold at LOS C for all measured categories. There are five destination areas within 1320 feet of the proposed MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care: 1) the residential area to the north of the site, 2) the residential area to the east of the site, 3) the residential area to the west of the site, 4) Warren Park to the southwest of the site, and 5) Collindale Golf Course to the south of the site. Appendix F contains a Pedestrian LOS Worksheet. Acceptable pedestrian level of service will be achieved for all pedestrian destinations.

Appendix F shows a map of the area that is within 1320 feet of MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care. Based upon Fort Collins bicycle LOS criteria, there are two bicycle destinations: Warren Park and Collindale Golf Course to the south. The Bicycle LOS Worksheet is provided in Appendix F. This site connects directly to bike lanes on Horsetooth Road and Lochwood Drive, which achieves level of service A, as shown in Appendix F.



Transfort Route 5 (Horsetooth/Lemay intersection is approximately 1650 feet from this site. It is doubtful that residents of this facility would use the Transfort system, however employees could use it.

It is concluded that, with development of MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care, the future level of service at the Horsetooth/Lochwood-Collindale Access, Lochwood/Gas Station Access, and Lochwood/Kindercare Access intersections will be acceptable. No new auxiliary lanes are required at the key intersections. The level of service for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit modes will be acceptable.









TABLE 1 Current Peak Hour Operation									
Intersection	Movement	Level of	Service						
	Wovement	AM	PM						
	NB LT/T/RT	В	F						
	EB LT	А	В						
Horsetooth/Lochwood-Colindale Access (stop sign)	WB LT	В	В						
	SB LT	F	F						
	SB T/RT	С	E						
	SB APPROACH	D	F						
Lochwood/Gas Station Access	WB LT/RT	А	В						
(stop sign)	SB LT/T	A	A						
Lochwood/Kindercare Access	WB LT/RT	A	A						
(stop sign)	SB LT/T	A	A						

TABLE 2 Trip Generation												
Code	Use	Size	AWE	AWDTE AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hou						ak Hou	ır	
			Rate	Trips	Rate	In	Rate	Out	Rate	In	Rate	Out
254	Assisted Living	93 beds	2.74	254	0.12	11	0.06	6	0.15	14	0.15	14





SITE PLAN

# Figure 4

MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care TIS, August 2013







Short Range (20	TABLE 3 18) Background Peal	K Hour Operation							
Intersection	Movement	Level of	Service						
	Movement	AM	PM						
	NB LT/T/RT	В	F						
	EB LT	В	В						
Horsetooth/Lochwood-Colindale WB LT B B									
(stop sign)	SB LT	F	F						
	SB T/RT	D	F						
	SB APPROACH	E	F						
Lochwood/Gas Station Access	WB LT/RT	A	В						
(stop sign)	SB LT/T	A	A						
Lochwood/Kindercare Access	WB LT/RT	A	А						
(stop sign)	SB LT/T	A	A						

Short Range	TABLE 4 (2018) Total Peak Ho	our Operation	
Interception	Movement	Level of	Service
Intersection	wovement	AM	РМ
	NB LT/T/RT	В	F
	EB LT	В	В
Horsetooth/Lochwood-Colindale	WB LT	В	В
(stop sign)	SB LT	F	F
	SB T/RT	D	F
	SB APPROACH	E	F
	NB LT/T/RT	A	A
Lochwood/Gas Station Access-	EB LT/T/RT	A	A
(ston sign)	WB LT/T/RT	В	В
	SB LT/T/RT	А	A
Lochwood/MorningStar Access	NB LT/T	A	A
(stop sign)	EB LT/RT	А	А
Lochwood/Kindercare Access	WB LT/RT	A	A
(stop sign)	SB LT/T	A	A







# APPENDIX A

# Attachment A Transportation Impact Study Base Assumptions

Project Information		
Project Name MVG M	OPHING STAP	
Project Location NW QUAN	PHIT OF HAPSTON	TH / OCHWARD
TIS Assumptions	THE OF HURDE IN	117 - CLAWOOD
Type of Study	Full: NO	Intermediate: upun-
Study Area Boundaries	North: SITE ACCESS	S South: 1/2 DOGTOTU
	East: LOCHWOOD	West: / What
Study Years	Short Range: 2018(s	Long Range: ALA
Future Traffic Growth Rate	1.52/40-Hopsetontil	109-lackamer B
Study Intersections	1. All access drives (2)	5.
1	2. Hopsetar Wlackum	6.
	3.	7.
	4.	8.
Time Period for Study	AM: 7:00-9:000 PM: 4:00-	6:00) Sat Noon: 110
Trip Generation Rates	PER ITE ATTA	ICHED
Trip Adjustment Factors	Passby:	Captive of / A
Overall Trip Distribution	SEE ATTACH	Market: N/H
Mode Split Assumptions	SEE ATTACI	ILD SKETCH
Contract Part Assumptions	NIA	
Committed Roadway Improvements	NOT AWARE OF	: ANY
Other Traffic Studies	NOT AWARE OF	ANY
Areas Requiring Special Study		
ate: FEBRUARY	, 2013	
raffic Engineer:ELICH	ASSOCIATES	
ocal Entity Engineer: HE Att	2/10/10	
wai tentry Englicer. <u>IVC / HAS</u>	2/19/13	
		1310 BAF

Page 4-34

Larimer County Urban Area Street Standards – Repealed and Reenacted April 1, 2007 Adopted by Larimer County, City of Loveland, City of Fort Collins



SITE LOCATION





1" = 50'

MVG MORNINGSTAR - ASSISTED LIVING MEMORY CARE 93 STT UNITS / BEDS ABSISTED LIVING (CODE. 254, T.G. 9Th) VARIABLE - OCCUPIED BEDS DAILY (2.74) - 210 >254 AM (0.18) , N (682) [0.12] - 9 PII OUT (328) [0.06] - 576 PM (0.29) IN (502) [0.145] - H-714 OUT (502) [0.145] - H-714 HOWINK LOCHWOOD TRIP DISTRIBUTION 652 SITE 350 HORSETOOTH 6

# APPENDIX B

DELICH ASSOCIATES 2272 GLEN HAVEN DRIVE LOVELAND, CO 80538 Phone: (970) 669-2061

# TABULAR SUMMARY OF VEHICLE COUNTS

<b>Observer: Sue</b>	Jurisdiction: Fort Collins	Horsetooth/Lochwood
Date: 2/19/2013	Day: Tuesday	Intersection:

R = right turn S = straight

	Total	AII	528	521	456	405	
	Total	east/west	489	483	430	369	
	Horsoettoth	Total	<i>L</i> 61	213	183	187	
	:pu	R	5	10	8	2	
	stbou	S	192	203	174	184	
	We	Γ	0	0	1	1	
	Horsetooth	Total	292	270	247	182	
	:pu	R	0	1	4	0	
	stbou	S	278	255	231	169	
	Ea	Г	14	14	12	13	
	Total	north/south	39	38	26	36	
	Lochwood	Total	68	38	26	98	
	:pu	R	25	28	17	31	
	thbou	S	0	0	0	0	
	Sou	L	14	10	6	2	
	Lochwood	Total	0	0	0	0	
	:pu	R	0	0	0	0	
	thbou	S	0	0	0	0	
	Nor		0	0	0	0	
= left turn	Time	Begins	7:30	7:45	8:00	8:15	

1910		
1771		
`		Ì
780	0.92	
25		I
753		
2		1
166	0.85	
5		1
933		
53		
139		
139	0.89	
101		I
0		
38		ì
0	n/a	
0		J
0		
0		
7:30-8:30	PHF	

	477	525	529	486
-	450	494	507	447
	216	254	240	215
ľ	9	11	10	14
ľ	207	242	229	201
ľ	0	1	1	0
	234	240	267	232
ľ	4	5	-	9
ľ	215	207	245	209
ľ	15	28	21	17
	27	31	22	39
	25	30	17	33
	21	25	6	22
	0	0	2	1
	4	5	9	10
	2	1	5	9
ľ	2	-	2	2
ĺ	0	0	0	2
ſ	0	0	3	2
	4:30	4:45	5:00	5:15

2017	
1898	
925	16.0
44	
879	
2	
673	16.0
16	
876	
81	
119	
105	0.8
77	
3	
25	
14	0.58
7	
2	
5	
4:30-5:30	PHF

DELICH ASSOCIATES 2272 GLEN HAVEN DRIVE LOVELAND, CO 80538 Phone: (970) 669-2061

# TABULAR SUMMARY OF VEHICLE COUNTS

 Date: 2/20/2013
 Observer: Sue

 Day: Wednesday
 Jurisdiction: Fort Collins

 Intersection:
 Lockwood/Gas Station Access

R = right turn S = straight

= left turn																			
Time	Nor	thbou	:pur	Lochwood	Sout	thboui	:pu	Lochwood	Total	Ea	stboui	:pu		Wes	tbour	nd: G	as Station A	Total	Total
Begins		S	R	Total		S	R	Total	north/south		S	Я	Total	_	S	R	Total	east/west	AII
7:30		18	7	25	2	22		24	49				0	6		0	6	9	55
7:45		12	5	17	3	28		31	48		L		0	14		2	16	16	64
8:00		7	5	12	4	19		23	35		L		0	6		2	11	11	46
8:15		15	10	25	2	24		26	51		L		0	13		2	15	15	66
7:30-8:30	0	52	27	6 <i>L</i>	11	93	0	104	183	0	0	0	0	42	0	9	48	48	231
							Í												

231		
48		
48	0.75	
6		•
0		
42		
0	n/a	
0		
0		
0		
183		
104	0.84	
0		
93		
11		•
62	0.79	
27		,
52		
0		
7:30-8:30	PHF	

77	92	81	77
17	20	18	12
17	20	18	12
4	9	9	2
13	14	12	10
0	0	0	0
60	72	63	65
21	30	26	27
5 21	9 30	2 26	5 27
6 15 <b>21</b>	1 29 30	4 22 <b>26</b>	2 25 27
<b>39</b> 6 15 <b>21</b>	<b>42</b> 1 29 <b>30</b>	<b>37</b> 4 22 <b>26</b>	<b>38</b> 2 25 <b>27</b>
7 39 6 15 21	3 <b>42</b> 1 29 <b>30</b>	5         37         4         22         26	3 <b>38</b> 2 25 <b>27</b>
32         7         39         6         15         21	39         3         42         1         29         30	32         5         37         4         22         26	35         3         38         2         25         27

6         13         91         0         104         260         0         0         0         49         0         18         67         67           3	8 156 0.93	156         13         91         0         16           0.93         0.6         0.6         0.6         0.6	104 0.87	260 0	0	0	0 49 n/a	0	18	67 0.84	67	327
---	---------------	---	----------	-------	---	---	-------------	---	----	------------	----	-----

DELICH ASSOCIATES 2272 GLEN HAVEN DRIVE LOVELAND, CO 80538 Phone: (970) 669-2061

# TABULAR SUMMARY OF VEHICLE COUNTS

 Date:
 2/20/2013
 Observer:
 Sue

 Day:
 Wednesday
 Jurisdiction:
 Fort Collins

 Intersection:
 Lockwood/Kindercare

R = right turn S = straight

	otal	IIF	12	16	15	13	
	Τ		4	4	ŝ	4	
	Total	east/west	2	0	3	2	
	Kindercare	Total	2	0	3	2	
	ind: I	R	0	0	2	0	
	estbou	S					
	We	L	2	0	1	2	
		Total	0	0	0	0	
	:pu	R					
	istbou	S					
	Ea	L					
	Total	north/south	40	9†	32	۲1	
	Lochwood	Total	22	32	23	74	
	:pur	R					
	uthbou	S	22	31	22	24	
	Sol	_	0	-	-	0	
	Lochwood	Total	18	14	6	11	
	:pur	R	-	-	<del>, -</del>	<del>, -</del>	
	rthbou	S	17	13	8	16	
	No						
<u> </u>	Time	Begins	7:30	7:45	8:00	8:15	

159 0 0 0 0 0	101 159 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 101 159 0 0 0 0 0 0	99         0         101         159         0         0         0         0           0.70	5 0 2 7 7 166
159 0 0 0	101 159 0 0 0 0	0 101 159 0 0 0 0.79	99 0 101 159 0 0 0	0
159 0 0	101 159 0 0 0.79	0 101 159 0 0 0.79	99         0         101         159         0         0           0.79         0.79         0.79         0.79         0         0         0         0	0
159 0	101 159 0 0.79	0 101 159 0 0.79	99 0 101 159 0 0.79	0
159	101 159 0.79	0 101 159 0.79	99 0 101 159 0.79	0
	101 0.79	0 101 0.79	99 0 101 0.79	159
2 99 0	2 99	2		2 99 0 101
58 2 99 0 0.81	58 2 99 0.81	58 2 0.81	58 0.81	58 2 99 0 101
4         58         2         99         0           0.81         0.81         0         0         0         0	4 58 2 99 0.81	4 58 2 0.81	4 58 0.81	4 58 2 99 0 101
54         4         58         2         99         0           0.81         0.81         0.81         0.81         0         0	54         4         58         2         99           0.81	54         4         58         2           0.81         0.81         0.81         0.81	54 4 58 0.81	54 4 58 2 99 0 101
0         54         4         58         2         99         0           0.81	0         54         4         58         2         99           0.81	0 54 4 58 2 0.81	0 54 4 58 0.81	0 54 4 58 2 99 0 101

59	78	66	64
3	4	1	6
3	4	1	6
2	2	0	0
-	2	1	9
0	0	0	0
56	74	65	58
20	29	27	21
20	28	25	21
0	1	2	0
36	45	38	37
-	-	2	2
35	44	36	35
30	45	00:	:15

267	
14	
<b>†</b> L	0.58
4	
0	
10	
0	n/a
0	
0	
0	
253	
<i>L</i> 6	0.84
0	
94	
3	
156	0.87
6	
150	
0	
4:30-5:30	PHF

# APPENDIX C

Intersection												
Intersection Delay, s/veh	2.6											
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Vol, veh/h	54	933	5	2	753	25	0	0	7	37	0	100
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Storage Length	175		0	150		0	0		0	120		0
Median Width		12			12			12			12	
Grade, %		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.89	0.89	0.89
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	64	1098	6	2	818	27	0	0	8	42	0	112
Number of Lanes	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
Maior/Minor		Maior 1			Maior 2			Minor 1			Minor 2	
Conflicting Flow All	846	0	0	1104	0	0	1642	2078	552	1512	2067	423
Stane 1	- 040	-	-	-	-	-	1228	1228		836	836	-120
Stage 7 Stage 2	-	-	_	_	-	-	414	850	_	676	1231	-
Follow-up Headway	2 22	-	-	2 22	-	-	3 52	4 02	3 32	3 52	4 02	3 32
Pot Canacity-1 Maneuver	787	-	_	628	-	-	66	53	477	83	54	579
Stage 1	-	-	-	- 020	-	-	189	249	-	328	381	
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	586	375	-	409	248	-
Time blocked-Platoon. %	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0,0	0	0	0	0
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	787	-	-	628	-	-	50	49	477	76	49	579
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	49	-	76	49	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	174	229	-	301	380	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	471	374	-	369	228	-
Approach	FB			WB			NB			SB		
HCM Control Delay s	0.5			0			12.7			32.1		
HCM LOS	-			-			Β			52.1 D		
Minor Lane / Maior Mymt		NBI n1	FBI	FBT	FBR	WBI	WBT	WBR	SBI n1	SBI n2		
Can veh/h		/77	787			628			76	225		
HCM Control Delay s		107	9 976	-	-	10 752	-	-	70 1 77	22.1		
HCM Lane V/C Patio		0 02	0 NR	-	-	0.752	-	-	0.2K	۲۲. ۱ ا		
		0.02 R	0.00 A	-	-	0.00 R	-	-	0.30 E	0.30		
HCM 95th_tile O veh		01	03	-	-	0.0	-	-	1 /	17		
		0.1	0.5	-	-	0.0	-	-	1.4	1.7		
Notes												

~: Volume Exceeds Capacity; \$ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined
Intersection												
Intersection Delay, s/veh	4.2											
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Vol. veh/h	91	876	16	2	879	49	5	2	0	29	4	90
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Storage Length	175		0	150		0	0		0	120		0
Median Width		12			12			12			12	
Grade, %		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	100	963	18	2	966	54	6	2	0	34	5	106
Number of Lanes	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
Major/Minor		Maior 1			Maior 2			Minor 1			Minor 2	
Conflicting Flow All	1020	1010j01 1 0	0	980	1010j01 2 0	0	1661	2105	/19/	1679	2177	510
Stane 1	1020	-	-	- 700	-	-	1171	1171		997	997	510
Stage 7	-	-	-	_	-	-	490	1024	_	682	1180	_
Follow-up Headway	2 22	-	-	2 22	-	-	3 52	4 02	3 32	3 52	4 02	3 32
Pot Canacity-1 Maneuver	676	-	-	700	-	-	64	45	524	62	46	509
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	205	265		262	320	
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	529	311	-	406	262	-
Time blocked-Platoon. %	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	676	-	-	700	-	-	41	38	524	52	39	509
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-	-	41	38	-	52	39	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	175	226	-	223	319	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	412	310	-	342	223	-
Approach	FB			WB			NB			SB		
HCM Control Delay s	1			0			117			51.8		
HCM LOS	-			-			F			F		
Minor Lane / Maior Mymt		NBI n1	FBI	FBT	FBR	WBI	WBT	WBR	SBI n1	SBI n2		
Can veh/h		//0	676		LDR	700	-		52511	222112		
HCM Control Delay s		117	11 248	-	-	10 159	_	-	110 R	223		
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.21	0 15	-	-	0.00	_	-	0 44	0 55		
HCM Lane LOS		5.21 F	0.15 R	-	-	0.00 R	_	-	5.74 F	5.55 F		
HCM 95th-tile Q, veh		0.7	0.5	-	-	0.0	-	-	1.6	2.9		
Notes												

Intersection									
Intersection Delay, s/veh	2.4								 
<i>.</i>									
Movement	WRI		WRR		NRT	NRR	SBI	SBT	
Vol veh/h	//2		6		52	27	11	0/	 
Conflicting Dods #/br	43		0		52	27	0	74 0	
Sign Control	Stop		Ston		Eroo	Eroo	Eroo	Eroo	
DT Chappelized	Nono		Nono		Nono	Nono	Nono	Nono	
Storago Longth					NULLE			NULLE	
Modian Width	10		0		10	0	0	10	
	12				12			12	
Dook Hour Easter									
HODWY Vobicles %	0.00		0.00 C		0.00 C	0.00 n	0.00 C	0.00 n	
neavy venicies, % Mumt Elow	۲ ۲		2		۲ ۲۱	∠ ວງ	∠ 10	ے 111	
Number of Lance	5 I 1		/		01	32	13	1	
NUMBER OF Laffes	I		U		I	U	U	I	
Major/Minor					Major 1			Major 2	 
Conflicting Flow All	213		77		0	0	93	0	
Stage 1	77		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	136		-		-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Headway	3.518		3.318		-	-	2.218	-	
Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver	775		984		-	-	1501	-	
Stage 1	946		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	890		-		-	-	-	-	
Time blocked-Platoon, %	0		0		-	-	0	-	
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	768		984		-	-	1501	-	
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	768		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	946		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	882		-		-	-	-	-	
5									
Approach	W/R				NR		SR		
HCM Control Delay s	0.0				0		0.8		 
HCMIOS	7.7 Δ				-		0.0		
	Л				-		-		
Minor Long / Major Mumt		NDT		\//DI1	CDI	СПТ			
		INRI	NRK	VVBLNI	SRF	281			 
Cap, ven/n		-	-	/89	1501	-			
HUM LONTROI Delay, S		-	-	9.9	1.419	0			
HUM Lane V/C Ratio		-	-	0.07	0.01	-			
HUM Lane LUS		-	-	A	A	А			
HCINI 95th-tile Q, veh		-	-	0.2	0.0	-			
Notes									

Intersection										
Intersection Delay, s/veh	2.6									
<u> </u>										
Movement	WBL		WBR		NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT		
Vol. veh/h	43		18		126	16	13	80	 	
Conflicting Peds. #/hr	0		0		0	0	0	0		
Sign Control	Stop		Stop		Free	Free	Free	Free		
RT Channelized	None		None		None	None	None	None		
Storage Length	0		0			0	0			
Median Width	12				12			12		
Grade, %	0%				0%			0%		
Peak Hour Factor	0.85		0.85		0.93	0.93	0.87	0.87		
Heavy Vehicles, %	2		2		2	2	2	2		
Mymt Flow	51		21		135	17	15	92		
Number of Lanes	1		0		1	0	0	1		
	·		5		·	č	5	·		
Major/Minor					Maior 1			Maior 2		
Conflicting Flow All	266		1//			Λ	152		 	
Connicting Flow All Stage 1	200		144		0	0	100	0		
Stage 7	144		-		-	-	-	-		
Sidye Z	2 5 1 0		- 2 210		-	-	- ว ว10	-		
Politicaria Politi	3.010 700		3.310		-	-	2.210	-		
Put Capacity-1 Ividiteuvei	123		903		-	-	1420	-		
Stage 2	000		-		-	-	-	-		
Slaye Z	903		-		-	-	-	-		
May Capacity 1 Manauver	U 715		002		-	-	1420	-		
Mov Capacity 2 Manauver	710		903		-	-	1420	-		
Store 1	710		-		-	-	-	-		
Stage 1	000		-		-	-	-	-		
Stage 2	893		-		-	-	-	-		
Approach	WB				NB		SB			
HCM Control Delay s	10.2				0		11		 	
HCM LOS	R				-		-			
	U									
Minor Lane / Major Mvmt		NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT				
Cap, veh/h		-	-	762	1428	-				
HCM Control Delay, s		-	-	10.2	7.548	0				
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		-	-	0.09	0.01	-				
HCM Lane LOS		-	-	B	A	А				
HCM 95th-tile O. veh		-	-	0.3	0.0	-				
					2.0					
Notes										

Intersection										
Intersection Delay, s/veh	0.5									
Movement	WBL		WBR		NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT		
Vol, veh/h	5		2		54	4	2	100		
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0		0		0	0	0	0		
Sign Control	Stop		Stop		Free	Free	Free	Free		
RT Channelized	None		None		None	None	None	None		
Storage Length	0		0			0	0			
Median Width	12				0			0		
Grade, %	0%				0%			0%		
Peak Hour Factor	0.85		0.85		0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85		
Heavy Vehicles, %	2		2		2	2	2	2		
Mvmt Flow	6		2		64	5	2	118		
Number of Lanes	1		0		1	0	0	1		
Maior/Minor					Maior 1			Maior 2		
Conflicting Flow All	188		66		0	0	68	0		
Stage 1	66		-		-	-	-	-		
Stage 2	122		-		-	-	-	-		
Follow-up Headway	3.518		3.318		-	-	2.218	-		
Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver	801		998		-	-	1533	-		
Stage 1	957		-		-	-	-	-		
Stage 2	903		-		-	-	-	-		
Time blocked-Platoon. %	0		0		-	-	0	-		
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	800		998		-	-	1533	-		
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	800		-		-	-	-	-		
Stage 1	957		-		-	-	-	-		
Stage 2	902		-		-	-	-	-		
Approach	WB				NB		SB			
HCM Control Delay s	93				0		01			
HCM LOS	Δ				-		-			
	7.									
Minor Lano / Major Mumt		NRT	NRD	W/RI n1	SDI	SBT				
		NDT	NDK		3DL	301				
UCM Control Dolore		-	-	848 0.2	1033	-				
HCM Long V/C Datio		-	-	9.3	1.352	U				
		-	-	0.01	0.00	-				
		-	-	A	A	А				
HUIVI YOIN-IIIE Q, VEN		-	-	0.0	0.0	-				
Notes										

Intersection										
Intersection Delay, s/veh	0.7									
Movement	WBL		WBR		NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT		
Vol, veh/h	10		4		138	6	3	83		
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0		0		0	0	0	0		
Sign Control	Stop		Stop		Free	Free	Free	Free		
RT Channelized	None		None		None	None	None	None		
Storage Length	0		0			0	0			
Median Width	12				0			0		
Grade, %	0%				0%			0%		
Peak Hour Factor	0.85		0.85		0.87	0.87	0.85	0.85		
Heavy Vehicles, %	2		2		2	2	2	2		
Mvmt Flow	12		5		159	7	4	98		
Number of Lanes	1		0		1	0	0	1		
Maior/Minor					Maior 1			Maior 2		
Conflicting Flow All	267		162		0	0	166	0		
Stage 1	162		-		-	-	-	-		
Stage 2	105		-		-	-	-	-		
Follow-up Headway	3.518		3.318		-	-	2.218	-		
Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver	722		883		-	-	1412	-		
Stage 1	867		-		-	-	-	-		
Stage 2	919		-		-	-	-	-		
Time blocked-Platoon, %	0		0		-	-	0	-		
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	720		883		-	-	1412	-		
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	720		-		-	-	-	-		
Stage 1	867		-		-	-	-	-		
Stage 2	916		-		-	-	-	-		
Ū										
Approach	WB				NB		SB			
HCM Control Delay s	9.8				0		03			
HCM LOS	A				-		- 0.0			
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~									
Minor Lano / Major Mumt		NDT	NDD	\//D1 n1	CDI	CDT				
		INDI	NDK	VVDLIII	3DL	SDI				
Cap, ven/n		-	-	/60	1412	-				
HUNI CONTROL Delay, S		-	-	9.8	1.556	0				
HUM Lane V/C Ratio		-	-	0.02	0.00	-				
		-	-	A	A	А				
		-	-	U. I	0.0	-				
Notes										

#### UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

Level-of-Service	Average Total Delay sec/veh
А	<u>&lt;</u> 10
В	> 10 and <u>&lt;</u> 15
С	> 15 and <u>&lt;</u> 25
D	> 25 and <u>&lt;</u> 35
E	> 35 and <u>&lt;</u> 50
F	> 50

### SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

Level-of-Service	Average Total Delay sec/veh
А	<u>&lt;</u> 10
В	> 10 and <u>&lt;</u> 20
С	> 20 and <u>&lt;</u> 35
D	> 35 and <u>&lt;</u> 55
E	> 55 and <u>&lt;</u> 80
F	> 80

# Table 4-3Fort Collins (City Limits)Motor Vehicle LOS Standards (Intersections)

	Land	Use (from str	ucture plan)	
		Othe	er corridors with	in:
Intersection type	Commercial corridors	Mixed use districts	Low density mixed use residential	All other areas
Signalized intersections (overall)	D	E*	D	D
Any Leg	E	E	D	E
Any Movement	E	E	D	E
Stop sign control (arterial/collector or local— any approach leg)	N/A	F**	F**	E
Stop sign control (collector/local—any approach leg)	N/A	С	С	С
<ul> <li>* mitigating measures required</li> <li>** considered normal in an urban</li> </ul>	environment			

## APPENDIX D

Intersection												
Intersection Delay, s/veh	2.9											
Movement		ГРТ					NDI	NDT		CDI	СПТ	000
	EBL	EBI	EBR	O		WBR	INBL			SBL	<u>281</u>	SBR
Vol, veh/h	54	1005	5	2	811	25	0	0	/	37	0	100
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	_ 0	_ 0	_ 0	_ 0	_ 0	_ 0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Storage Length	175		0	150		0	0		0	120		0
Median Width		12			12			12			12	
Grade, %		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.89	0.89	0.89
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	64	1182	6	2	882	27	0	0	8	42	0	112
Number of Lanes	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
Maior/Minor		Maior 1			Maior 2			Minor 1			Minor 2	
Conflicting Flow All	909	0 N	0	1188	0 Najoi 2	0	1757	2225	59/	1617	221/	151
Stane 1		-	-	-	-	-	1312	1312		800	800	-07
Stage 7		_		_	_	_	1/15	013		718	1315	_
Follow-up Headway	2 22	_	-	2 22	_	_	3 52	4 02	3 3 2	3 52	4 02	3 32
Pot Canacity-1 Maneuver	7/5	_		583	_	_	5/	13	1/18	60	1.02	552
Stare 1	740	_			_	_	167	207		300	356	
Stage 7		_		_	_	_	562	350		386	226	_
Time blocked-Platoon %	0	_		0	_	_	002	0	0	0	0	0
Mov Canacity 1 Maneuver	745			583			40	30	1/18	63	30	553
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	745			505			40	30		63	30	555
Stano 1		_		_		_	152	207		274	37	
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	446	349	-	346	207	-
Approach	EB			WB			NB			SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	0.5			0			13.2			39.3		
HCM LOS	-			-			В			E		
Minor Lano / Major Mumt		NRI n1	FRI	FRT	FRD	\//RI	W/RT	\//RD	SBI n1	SBI n2		
		440	7/5	LDI	LDIV	FUD	VVDI	WDI	JULIII	20112		
Uap, VEII/II		440 100	/40 10 000	-	-	ᲔᲢᲐ 11 100	-	-	03 101	270 25 7		
HCM Long V/C Datio		13.2	10.282	-	-	11.190	-	-		20.7		
		0.02	U.U9	-	-	U.UU	-	-	U.44	0.42		
		В	В	-	-	B	-	-	۲ م	D		
HUIVI YSIN-IIIE Q, VEN		U. I	0.3	-	-	0.0	-	-	1.7	2.0		
Notes												

Intersection												
Intersection Delay, s/veh	5.3											
	501	EDT			WDT		ND	NDT			ODT	000
Movement	EBL	EBI	EBK	WBL	WRI	WBR	NBL	NRI	NRK	SBL	SRI	SBK
Vol, veh/h	91	944	16	2	947	49	5	2	0	29	4	90
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Storage Length	175		0	150		0	0		0	120		0
Median Width		12			12			12			12	
Grade, %		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	100	1037	18	2	1041	54	6	2	0	34	5	106
Number of Lanes	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
Maior/Minor		Maior 1			Maior 2			Minor 1			Minor 2	
Conflicting Flow All	1095	0 Nilajoi 1	0	1055	0	0	1773	23/15	527	1702	2327	5/17
Stage 1	- 1075	-	-	-	-	-	1246	1246	- 527	1072	1072	
Stage 2	-	_	-	-	_	-	527	1099	-	720	1255	-
Follow-up Headway	2 22	_	-	2 22	_	-	3 52	4 02	3 3 2	3 5 2	4 02	3 32
Pot Canacity-1 Maneuver	633	-	-	656	-	-	53	36	496	51	37	481
Stare 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	184	244	-	235	295	-
Stage 7	-	_	-	_	-	-	502	244	-	385	273	-
Time blocked-Platoon %	0	_	-	0	-	-	0	207	0	0	0	0
Mov Canacity-1 Maneuver	633	_	-	656	-	-	32	30	496	42	31	481
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver		_	-		-	-	32	30		42	31	
Stage 1	-	_	-	_	-	-	155	205	-	198	294	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	384	286	-	320	203	-
Approach	ГР			<u>ח</u> וען			ND			CD		
Approach	EB									5B		
HCM Control Delay, s	1			0			158.8			/0.5		
HCM LUS	-			-			F			F		
Minor Lane / Major Mvmt		NBLn1	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	SBLn1	SBLn2		
Cap, veh/h		31	633	-	-	656	-	-	42	190		
HCM Control Delay, s		158.8	11.751	-	-	10.506	-	-	165.1	52.8		
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.27	0.16	-	-	0.00	-	-	0.54	0.64		
HCM Lane LOS		F	В	-	-	В	-	-	F	F		
HCM 95th-tile Q, veh		0.8	0.6	-	-	0.0	-	-	2.0	3.7		
Notes												

Intersection									
Intersection Delay, s/veh	2.4								
Movement	WBL		WBR		NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Vol. veh/h	43		6		52	27	11	94	
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0		0		0	0	0	0	
Sign Control	Stop		Stop		Free	Free	Free	Free	
RT Channelized	None		None		None	None	None	None	
Storage Length	0		0			0	0		
Median Width	12				12			12	
Grade, %	0%				0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.85		0.85		0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	
Heavy Vehicles, %	2		2		2	2	2	2	
Mvmt Flow	51		7		61	32	13	111	
Number of Lanes	1		0		1	0	0	1	
Major/Minor					Major 1			Major 2	
Conflicting Flow All	213		77		0	0	93	0	
Stage 1	77		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	136		-		-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Headway	3.518		3.318		-	-	2.218	-	
Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver	775		984		-	-	1501	-	
Stage 1	946		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	890		-		-	-	-	-	
Time blocked-Platoon, %	0		0		-	-	0	-	
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	768		984		-	-	1501	-	
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	768		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	946		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	882		-		-	-	-	-	
Approach	WB				NB		SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	9.9				0		0.8		
HCM LOS	А				-		-		
Minor Lane / Major Mvmt		NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT			
Cap, veh/h		-	-	789	1501	-			
HCM Control Delay, s		-	-	9.9	7.419	0			
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		-	-	0.07	0.01	-			
HCM Lane LOS		-	-	А	А	А			
HCM 95th-tile Q, veh		-	-	0.2	0.0	-			
Notes									

Intersection										
Intersection Delay, s/veh	2.6									
Movement	WBL		WBR		NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT		
Vol. veh/h	43		18		126	16	13	80		
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0		0		0	0	0	0		
Sign Control	Stop		Stop		Free	Free	Free	Free		
RT Channelized	None		None		None	None	None	None		
Storage Length	0		0			0	0			
Median Width	12				12			12		
Grade, %	0%				0%			0%		
Peak Hour Factor	0.85		0.85		0.93	0.93	0.87	0.87		
Heavy Vehicles, %	2		2		2	2	2	2		
Mvmt Flow	51		21		135	17	15	92		
Number of Lanes	1		0		1	0	0	1		
	·		5		·			•		
Maior/Minor					Maior 1			Maior 2		
Conflicting Flow All	266		144		0	0	153	0		
Stage 1	144		-		-	-	-	-		
Stage 2	122		_		-	-	-	-		
Follow-up Headway	3 518		3 318		-	-	2 218	-		
Pot Canacity-1 Maneuver	723		903		_	_	1428	-		
Stare 1	883		700		_	_	-	_		
Stage 2	003 003		_		_	_	_	_		
Time blocked Platoon %	703		0				0			
Mov Canacity_1 Maneuver	715		003			_	1/28			
Mov Capacity-7 Maneuver	715		705			_	1420			
Stago 1	202		-		-	-	-	_		
Stage 2	000		-		-	-	-	-		
Slaye 2	095		-		-	-	-	-		
Approach	WB				NB		SB			
HCM Control Delay s	10.2				0		11			
HCM LOS	R				-		-			
	U									
Minor Lane / Major Mymt		NRT	NRR	W/RI n1	SRI	SRT				
			NDIN	740	1/20	501				
Uap, VEII/II		-	-	/0Z	1420 7 540	-				
HCM Long V/C Datio		-	-	10.2	7.040 0.01	U				
		-	-	0.09	0.01	-				
		-	-	B	A	А				
HUM YOLD-LINE Q, VED		-	-	0.3	0.0	-				
Notes										

Intersection									
Intersection Delay, s/veh	0.5								
Movement	WBL		WBR		NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Vol. veh/h	5		2		54	4	2	100	
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0		0		0	0	0	0	
Sign Control	Stop		Stop		Free	Free	Free	Free	
RT Channelized	None		None		None	None	None	None	
Storage Length	0		0			0	0		
Median Width	12				0			0	
Grade, %	0%				0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.85		0.85		0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	
Heavy Vehicles, %	2		2		2	2	2	2	
Mvmt Flow	6		2		64	5	2	118	
Number of Lanes	1		0		1	0	0	1	
Major/Minor					Major 1			Major 2	
Conflicting Flow All	188		66		0	0	68	0	
Stage 1	66		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	122		-		-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Headway	3.518		3.318		-	-	2.218	-	
Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver	801		998		-	-	1533	-	
Stage 1	957		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	903		-		-	-	-	-	
Time blocked-Platoon, %	0		0		-	-	0	-	
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	800		998		-	-	1533	-	
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	800		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	957		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	902		-		-	-	-	-	
Approach	WB				NB		SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	9.3				0		0.1		
HCM LOS	А				-		-		
Minor Lane / Major Mvmt		NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT			
Cap, veh/h		-	-	848	1533	-			
HCM Control Delay, s		-	-	9.3	7.352	0			
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		-	-	0.01	0.00	-			
HCM Lane LOS		-	-	A	A	А			
HCM 95th-tile Q, veh		-	-	0.0	0.0	-			
Notes									
Notes									

Intersection									
Intersection Delay, s/veh	0.7								
Movement	WBL		WBR		NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Vol. veh/h	10		4		138	6	3	83	
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0		0		0	0	0	0	
Sign Control	Stop		Stop		Free	Free	Free	Free	
RT Channelized	None		None		None	None	None	None	
Storage Length	0		0			0	0		
Median Width	12				0			0	
Grade, %	0%				0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.85		0.85		0.87	0.87	0.85	0.85	
Heavy Vehicles, %	2		2		2	2	2	2	
Mvmt Flow	12		5		159	7	4	98	
Number of Lanes	1		0		1	0	0	1	
Major/Minor					Major 1			Major 2	
Conflicting Flow All	267		162		0	0	166	0	
Stage 1	162		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	105		-		-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Headway	3.518		3.318		-	-	2.218	-	
Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver	722		883		-	-	1412	-	
Stage 1	867		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	919		-		-	-	-	-	
Time blocked-Platoon, %	0		0		-	-	0	-	
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	720		883		-	-	1412	-	
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	720		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	867		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	916		-		-	-	-	-	
Approach	WB				NB		SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	9.8				0		0.3		
HCM LOS	А				-		-		
Minor Lane / Major Mvmt		NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT			
Cap, veh/h		-	-	760	1412	-			
HCM Control Delay, s		-	-	9.8	7.556	0			
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		-	-	0.02	0.00	-			
HCM Lane LOS		-	-	А	А	А			
HCM 95th-tile Q, veh		-	-	0.1	0.0	-			
Notes									

## APPENDIX E

Intersection												
Intersection Delay, s/veh	3.3											
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Vol, veh/h	61	1005	5	2	811	29	0	0	7	39	0	104
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None	-		None
Storage Length	175	-	-	150	-	-	-	-	-	120	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	85	85	85	92	92	92	85	85	85	89	89	89
Heavy Vehicles. %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	72	1182	6	2	882	32	0	0	8	44	0	117
Maior/Minor	Maior1			Maior2			Minor1			Minor2		
Conflicting Flow All	013	0	0	1188	0	0	177/	2246	59/	1637	2224	157
Conincting 1 low All	/15	0	0	1100	0	0	1220	12240	574	002	2234 002	-107
Stage 7							11527	017		725	1222	
Follow up Hoadway	- ר ר -	-	-	- ว วว	-	-	2 5 2	102	3 3 3	252	1002	3 3 3
Pot Canacity 1 Manouvor	Z.ZZ 7/2	-	-	5.22	-	-	5.52	4.02	J.JZ 110	5.52	4.02	5.52
Stago 1	142	-	-	000	-	-	162	41 ววว	440	200	4Z 255	551
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	103 540	222	-	299 277	300	-
Jidyt Z Time blocked Distoon %	-	-	-	-	-	-	502	349	-	311		-
Mov Conacity 1 Manouver	740	-	-	E02	-	-	20	27	110	41	20	551
Nov Capacity 2 Manauver	742	-	-	000	-	-	აი აი	נ <i>כו</i>	440	01 41	აი აი	551
Nov Capacity-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-	-	30 147	37	-	01	30	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	147	200	-	270	354	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	441	348	-	334	200	-
Approach	EB			WB			NB			SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	0.6			0			13.2			42.2		
HCM LOS							В			E		
Minor Lane / Major Mvmt		NBLn1	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	SBLn1	SBLn2		
Capacity (veh/h)		448	742	-	-	583	-	-	61	291		
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.018	0.097	-	-	0.004	-	-	0.479	0.452		
HCM Control Delay (s)		13.2	10.371	-	-	11,198	-	-	109.5	27.2		
HCM Lane LOS		R				<i>7</i> 0 R			F	27.2 D		
HCM 95th %tile O(veh)		0.056	0 32	_	-	0.011	-	_	1 874	2 224		
		0.000	0.02			0.011			1.07-1	2.227		
Notes												

Intersection												
Intersection Delay, s/veh	7											
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Vol, veh/h	100	944	16	2	947	54	5	2	0	34	4	99
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None		-	None
Storage Length	175	-	-	150	-	-	-	-	-	120	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	91	91	91	91	91	91	85	85	85	85	85	85
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	110	1037	18	2	1041	59	6	2	0	40	5	116
Major/Minor	Major1			Major2			Minor1			Minor2		
Conflicting Flow All	1100	0	0	1055	0	0	1793	2370	527	1815	2350	550
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1266	1266	-	1075	1075	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	_	-	-	527	1104	-	740	1275	-
Follow-up Headway	2.22	-	-	2.22	-	-	3.52	4.02	3.32	3.52	4.02	3.32
Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver	630	-	-	656	-	-	51	34	496	49	35	479
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	179	238	-	234	294	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	502	285	-	375	236	-
Time blocked-Platoon, %		-	-		-	-						
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	630	-	-	656	-	-	29	28	496	40	29	479
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-	-	29	28	-	40	29	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	148	196	-	193	293	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	373	284	-	306	195	-
Approach	EB			WB			NB			SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	1.1			0			172.5			88.4		
HCM LOS				-			F			F		
Minor Lane / Major Mvmt		NBLn1	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	SBLn1	SBLn2		
Capacity (veh/h)		29	630	-		656	-		40	182		
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.284	0.174	-	-	0.003	-	-	0.667	0.739		
HCM Control Delay (s)		172 5	11 918	-	-	10,506	-	-	200.6	66.2		
HCM Lane LOS		, <u>, 2</u> .5 F	R			R			200.0 F	50.2 F		
HCM 95th %tile O(veh)		0 887	0.628	-	-	0.01	-	-	, 2 437	4 729		
		0.007	0.020			0.01			2.107			
Notes												

Intersection												
Intersection Delay, s/veh	2.5											
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Vol, veh/h	0	0	2	43	0	6	4	59	27	11	98	0
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	-	None	-		None	-	-	None	-	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	0	0	2	51	0	7	5	69	32	13	115	0
Maior/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Maior1			Maior2		
Conflicting Flow All	239	252	115	237	236	85	115	0	0	101	0	0
Stage 1	141	141	-	95	95	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 7	98	111	-	142	141	-	-	-	_	-	-	-
Follow-up Headway	3 518	4 018	3 318	3 518	4 018	3 318	2 218	-	_	2 218	-	-
Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver	715	651	937	717	665	974	1474	-	-	1491	-	-
Stane 1	862	780	-	912	816	-	-	-	_	-	-	-
Stage 7	908	804	_	861	780	-	-	-	_	-	-	-
Time blocked-Platoon %	700	001		001	700			-	_		-	-
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	703	643	937	708	656	974	1474	-	_	1491	-	-
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	703	643	-	708	656	-	-	-	_	-	-	-
Stane 1	859	773	_	908	813	-	-	-	_	-	-	-
Stage 2	898	801	-	851	773	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Approach	FR			W/R			NR			SB		
HCM Control Dolay s	0.0			10.2			0.2			0.0		
HCM LOS	0.9 A			10.3 B			0.5			0.0		
Minor Lane / Major Mvmt		NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR			
Capacity (veh/h)		1474	-	-	937	732	1491	-	-			
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.003	-	-	0.003	0.079	0.009	-	-			
HCM Control Delay (s)		7.45	0	-	8.9	10.3	7.436	0	-			
HCM Lane LOS		А	А		А	В	А	А				
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)		0.01	-	-	0.008	0.256	0.026	-	-			
Notes												

Intersection												
Intersection Delay, s/veh	2.8											
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Vol, veh/h	0	0	6	43	0	18	6	134	16	13	88	0
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	93	93	87	87	85
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	0	0	7	51	0	21	7	144	17	15	101	0
Maior/Minor	Minor2			Minor1			Maior1			Maior2		
Conflicting Flow All	308	306	101	302	298	153	101	0	0	161	0	0
Stage 1	131	131	-	167	167	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	177	175	-	135	131	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Headway	3.518	4.018	3.318	3.518	4.018	3.318	2.218	-	-	2.218	-	-
Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver	644	608	954	650	614	893	1491	-	-	1418	-	-
Stage 1	873	788	-	835	760	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	825	754	-	868	788	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Time blocked-Platoon, %								-	-		-	-
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	621	598	954	637	604	893	1491	-	-	1418	-	-
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	621	598	-	637	604	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	869	779	-	831	756	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	801	750	-	852	779	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Approach	FB			WB			NB			SB		
HCM Control Delay s	8.8			10.8			0.3			1		
HCM LOS	A			В			0.0			·		
Minor Lane / Major Mymt		NRI	NRT		FRI n1	WRI n1	SBI	SBT	SBD			
		1401	NDT	NDR		404	1/10	501	JUK			
Capacity (VEII/II)			-	-	904 0 007	070	1410 0.011	-	-			
HCM Control Doloy (c)		0.000 7 104	-	-	0.007	U. 1U3 10 0	U.UTT 7 E44	-	-			
HCM Lang LOS		/.4∠0 ∧	U A	-	0.0 ^	1U.Ŏ D	000.1	0	-			
		A 0.01/	A		A 0.022	0 2 4 2 D	A 0.022	А				
		0.014	-	-	0.022	0.343	0.032	-	-			
Notes												

Intersection									
Intersection Delay, s/veh	0.5								
Movement	EBL		EBR	NBL	NBT		SBT	SBR	
Vol, veh/h	0		4	7	58		105	0	
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Sign Control	Stop		Stop	Free	Free		Free	Free	
RT Channelized	-		None	-	None		-	None	
Storage Length	0		-	-	-		-	-	
Veh in Median Storage, #	0		-	-	0		0	-	
Grade, %	0		-	-	0		0	-	
Peak Hour Factor	85		85	85	85		85	85	
Heavy Vehicles, %	2		2	2	2		2	2	
Mvmt Flow	0		5	8	68		124	0	
Major/Minor	Minor2			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	209		124	124	0		-	0	
Stage 1	124		-	-	-		-	-	
Stage 2	85		-	-	-		-	-	
Follow-up Headway	3.518		3.318	2.218	-		-	-	
Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver	779		927	1463	-		-	-	
Stage 1	902		-	-	-		-	-	
Stage 2	938		-	-	-		-	-	
Time blocked-Platoon, %					-		-	-	
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	774		927	1463	-		-	-	
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	774		-	-	-		-	-	
Stage 1	902		-	-	-		-	-	
Stage 2	932		-	-	-		-	-	
5									
Approach	EB			NB			SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	8.9			0.8			0		
HCM LOS	A			0.0			0		
Minor Lane / Major Mvmt		NBL	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR			
Capacity (veh/h)		1463	-	927	-	-			
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.006	-	0.005	-	-			
HCM Control Delay (s)		7.475	0	8.9	-	-			
HCM Lane LOS		A	Ă	A					
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)		0.017	-	0.015	-	-			
Notes									

Intersection									
Intersection Delay, s/veh	0.5								
Movement	EBL		EBR	NBL	NBT		SBT	SBR	
Vol, veh/h	0		8	8	144		93	0	
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0		0	0	0		0	0	
Sign Control	Stop		Stop	Free	Free		Free	Free	
RT Channelized	-		None	-	None		-	None	
Storage Length	0		-	-	-		-	-	
Veh in Median Storage, #	0		-	-	0		0	-	
Grade, %	0		-	-	0		0	-	
Peak Hour Factor	85		85	85	87		85	85	
Heavy Vehicles, %	2		2	2	2		2	2	
Mvmt Flow	0		9	9	166		109	0	
Major/Minor	Minor2			Major1			Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	293		109	109	0		-	0	
Stage 1	109		-	-	-		-	-	
Stage 2	184		-	-	-		-	-	
Follow-up Headway	3.518		3.318	2.218	-		-	-	
Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver	698		945	1481	-		-	-	
Stage 1	916		-	-	-		-	-	
Stage 2	848		-	-	-		-	-	
Time blocked-Platoon, %					-		-	-	
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	693		945	1481	-		-	-	
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	693		-	-	-		-	-	
Stage 1	916		-	-	-		-	-	
Stage 2	842		-	-	-		-	-	
Approach	EB			NB			SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	8.8			0.4			0		
HCM LOS	A								
Minor Lane / Major Mvmt		NBL	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR			
Capacity (yeh/h)		1481	-	945	-	-			
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.006	-	0.01	-	-			
HCM Control Delay (s)		7 446	0	8.8	-	-			
HCM Lane LOS		Α	Ă	о.о А					
HCM 95th %tile O(veh)		0.019	-	0.03	-	-			
		0.017		0.00					
Notes									

Intersection									
Intersection Delay, s/veh	0.5								
Movement	WBL		WBR		NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Vol, veh/h	5		2		54	4	2	100	
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0		0		0	0	0	0	
Sign Control	Stop		Stop		Free	Free	Free	Free	
RT Channelized	-		None		-	None	-	None	
Storage Length	0		-		-	-	-	-	
Veh in Median Storage, #	0		-		0	-	-	0	
Grade, %	0		-		0	-	-	0	
Peak Hour Factor	85		85		85	85	85	85	
Heavy Vehicles, %	2		2		2	2	2	2	
Mvmt Flow	6		2		64	5	2	118	
Major/Minor	Minor1				Major1		Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	188		66		0	0	68	0	
Stage 1	66		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	122		-		-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Headway	3.518		3.318		-	-	2.218	-	
Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver	801		998		-	-	1533	-	
Stage 1	957		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	903		-		-	-	-	-	
Time blocked-Platoon, %					-	-		-	
Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver	800		998		-	-	1533	-	
Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver	800		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	957		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	902		-		-	-	-	-	
5									
Approach	WB				NB		SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	9.3				0		0.1		
HCMIOS	A				0		011		
Minor Lane / Maior Mvmt		NBT	NBR	WBLn1	SBL	SBT			
Canacity (veh/h)		-	-	848	1533				
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		-	_	0.01	0.002	_			
HCM Control Delay (s)		-	_	9.01 9.2	7 352	0			
HCM Lane LOS				Δ	Δ	Δ			
HCM 95th %tile O(veh)		_	-	0 020	0.005	-			
				0.027	0.000				
Notes									

Intersection									
Intersection Delay, s/veh	0.7								
Movement	WBL		WBR		NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Vol, veh/h	10		4		138	6	3	83	
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0		0		0	0	0	0	
Sign Control	Stop		Stop		Free	Free	Free	Free	
RT Channelized	-		None		-	None	-	None	
Storage Length	0		-		-	-	-	-	
Veh in Median Storage, #	0		-		0	-	-	0	
Grade, %	0		-		0	-	-	0	
Peak Hour Factor	85		85		85	85	85	85	
Heavy Vehicles, %	2		2		2	2	2	2	
Mymt Flow	12		5		162	7	4	98	
			-						
Maior/Minor	Minor1				Maior1		Maior2		
Conflicting Flow All	271		166			0	160	0	
Connicting Flow An	166		100		0	0	107	0	
Stage 7	100		-		-	-	-	-	
	2 5 1 0		- 2 210		-	-	- 2 210	-	
Politicare approximation of the second secon	3.310 710		3.310 070		-	-	2.210	-	
Stage 1	/10		0/0		-	-	1409	-	
	003		-		-	-	-	-	
Slaye Z	919		-		-	-	-	-	
May Canadity 1 Manager	71/		070		-	-	1400	-	
Nov Capacity 2 Manauver	/10		8/8		-	-	1409	-	
Nov Capacity-2 Maneuver	/ 10		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	863		-		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	916		-		-	-	-	-	
Approach	WB				NB		SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	9.9				0		0.3		
HCM LOS	А								
Minor Lane / Maior Mymt		NBT	NBR	WBI n1	SBI	SBT			
Canacity (veh/h)		-	-	756	1/00				
HCM Lane V/C Patio		-	-	0 0 0 0 0	0 002	-			
HCM Control Dolay (c)		-	-	0.022	7 561	-			
HCM Lang LOS		-	-	7.9 A	7.001 A	0 A			
HOM OF the Will Olyah				A 0.047		A			
		-	-	0.007	0.000	-			
Notes									

## APPENDIX F



#### PEDESTRIAN INFLUENCE AREA



MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care TIS, March 2013

		Pe	destrian L	OS Work	sheet			
		Pr	oject Location C	Classification:	Other			
	Description of	Destination		Level of Ser	vice (minimun	n based on pro	ject location c	lassification)
	Applicable Destination Area Within 1320'	Area Classification		Directness	Continuity	Street Crossings	Visual Interest & Amenities	Security
r	Noighborhood to the		Minimum	С	С	С	С	С
1	- north	Residential	Actual	В	С	A	С	С
			Proposed	В	С	A	С	С
	Noighborhood to the		Minimum	С	С	С	С	С
2	east	Residential	Actual	A	В	А	С	С
			Proposed	A	В	A	С	С
	Noishbarbardta		Minimum	С	С	С	С	С
3	weighborhood to the	Residential	Actual	A	С	А	С	C
			Proposed	A	С	A	С	C
	Marron Dark to the		Minimum	С	С	С	С	C
4	southwest	Recreational	Actual	A	В	В	В	B
			Proposed	A	В	В	В	В
			Minimum	С	С	С	C	C
5	to the south	Recreational	Actual	A	В	В	B	B
			Proposed	A	В	В	B	 B
			Minimum					
6			Actual					
		-	Proposed					
			Minimum		1			
7			Actual					
			Proposed					
			Minimum					
8			Actual					
			Proposed					
			Minimum					
9			Actual					
			Proposed					
			Minimum					-
10		F	Actual					
			Proposed					



#### BICYCLE INFLUENCE AREA



MorningStar Assisted Living/Memory Care TIS, March 2013

		Bicycle L	.OS Worksheet		
			Leve	el of Service – Connec	ctivity
		-	Minimum	Actual	Proposed
		Base Connectivity:	С	А	А
	Specific connections to	priority sites:			
	Description of Applicable Destination Area Within 1320'	Destination Area Classification			
1	Warren Park to the south	Recreational	В	А	А
2	Collindale Golf Course to the south	Recreational	В	А	А
3					
4					