

## Dollar General Review Comments

Joe Bessman <Joe@transightconsulting.com>

Tue 4/23/2024 10:56 AM

To:Katie McDonald <Katie.McDonald@crookcountyor.gov>;Will VanVactor <Will.VanVactor@crookcountyor.gov>

Good morning Katie and Will,

Here are my comments and observations on the January 2024 TIA for Dollar General and site plan from Kimley Horn dated 8/21/2023:

- The traffic study does not include a site plan. Has review of the site plan by the traffic engineer been conducted as part of this application?
  - On the 8/21/2023 layout, why are the travel lanes switched showing outbound vehicles on the left side of the road? Please also update site plan with the TIA recommendations for a single-lane egress.
  - Within the northern parking module, how does a vehicle at the western edge back out within the narrowing taper of the pavement?
  - How does access spacing align with Banta Lane? It appears that about 285-feet of separation is provided which should be adequate, and no opposing driveways.
  - How do vehicles with trailers pull into the site? It appears that RV parking within the site would require backing out – is there an option even for a gravel turn-around area? My concern is having RVs and trucks with boat trailers pulling into the substandard shoulder.
- Trip generation shifted to ITE 814: Variety Store, which seems like the most appropriate classification for this type of use. This includes studies conducted at other Dollar General and similar stores. I agree with this approach.
- I calculate the same trip generation values shown in the report. I do note that there is no application of any pass-by rate for this use; while the ITE manual does not include specific data to Dollar General, use of the more general “Strip Retail” would be appropriate. The exclusion of trip characteristics provided by the applicant is conservative, but with such a limited study area probably has no appreciable impact regardless. No changes are requested.
- Distribution pattern is 75% west and 25% east. This seems reasonable as it follows the volume trends.
- Seasonal factors. The timing of the study is not ideal given the summertime trends of the area, and the 55% seasonal factor is beyond what would typically be considered reasonable. There’s not a good solution to this issue, and I think the applicant has provided a reasonable effort to replicate summertime conditions.
- Future build-out year of 2026. This seems reasonable.
- Growth rates within ODOT systems show declining volumes, the applicant applied a 2% annual growth. This seems very reasonable and appropriate.
- [Seasonally adjusted] traffic volumes at the Juniper Canyon/Banta Lane intersection show very low turning volumes.
- Volume development looks appropriate, and matches the trip generation table and description above.
- Resulting operations show very low delays, as would be expected given the travel volumes.
- Only a single outbound (shared) travel lane is identified, I agree with this assessment (particularly as it avoids the occlusion that occurs with side-by-side vehicles).
- Review of AASHTO intersection sight distance is premised on a 55 mph posted speed, and the correct values are cited. However, the applicant states “The Development’s access is *expected* [emphasis added] to meet these stopping and entering sight distances.” Please have the engineer field validate that AASHTO intersection sight distance (and stopping sight distance given the lack of left-turn lanes) are met.
- The applicant states that left-turn lanes are not warranted. I agree with this assessment and findings, but do note that safety is the primary concern within this area, and with the volume and speeds (not to mention the types of vehicles with trailers) this is an issue within this area.

Generally, with the traffic volumes on Juniper Canyon I agree with the applicant’s TIA and findings related to operations. My primary concern is area safety, particularly with the types of vehicles and tourists that this area caters to. My recommendations are as follows:

- Find a way to better accommodate larger vehicles or those with trailers, so that backing maneuvers aren't required within the site (gravel turn-around could be an option?)
- Validate that adequate sight lines are available. Based on streetview it appears that this would be the case but this needs to be field verified.
- It appears that Juniper Canyon meets the County's road standards for 14-feet of pavement, but the shoulder does not appear to meet the required aggregate gradation, grades, and compaction. With the high speeds and lack of turn lanes it seems that bringing the adjacent shoulder up to County standards would provide a low-cost safety benefit and be required as part of the frontage improvements. Since it is a fairly large parcel, at a minimum having these improvements surrounding the access (100' north) and development portion of the site would help improve safety for any evasive maneuvers near the access.
- Provide an updated site plan that matches the TIA recommendations for a single lane egress.

Please let me know if you have any questions on this!

Thank you,  
Joe

Joe Bessman, PE  
*(Licensed in OR, WA, ID)*  
Principal, Owner

Transight Consulting, LLC  
Bend, Oregon  
cell: (503) 997-4473  
email: [joe@transightconsulting.com](mailto:joe@transightconsulting.com)

Joe Bessman, PE  
*(Licensed in OR, WA, ID)*  
Principal, Owner

Transight Consulting, LLC  
Bend, Oregon  
cell: (503) 997-4473  
email: [joe@transightconsulting.com](mailto:joe@transightconsulting.com)

[CAUTION:This email originated from outside of the organization. DO NOT CLICK LINKS or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]