Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. Project Description for Unsignalized Intersection Priority: 6

Client: Town of Addison Date: 1/2/18 Program: ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan Prepared By: CMP KHA No.: 063543021 Checked By: EPE

Corridor : Project Name: GPS ID: 90109 Oaks N Dr Intersection of Oaks N Dr and driveway (Lat. 32.9521; Long. -96.8145) Town: Addison

| Unit Price | Item Cost |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 10.00 | \$ - |
| 15.00 | \$ - |
| 45.00 | \$ - |
| 1,500.00 | \$ 3,000.00 |
| 50.00 | \$ - |
| 9.00 | \$ - |
| 2.80 | \$ - |
| 8.50 | \$ - |
| 5,000.00 | \$ - |
| 2,000.00 | \$ - |
| 2,000.00 | \$ - |
| 5,000.00 | |
| 500.00 | |
| 2,000.00 | • |
| Subtotal: | \$ 3,000.00 |
| | |
| , (, | , , , , , , , , |
| imated Project Cost: | \$ 5,000.00 |
| ÿ | Subtotal: : (% +/-) 20% |

Project Location








Field Observations


| Intersection Issues | Crosswalk | | | | Possible Solutions |
|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| | N | E | S | W | Fossible Solutions |
| Path of travel pavement condition Path of travel running slope is greater than 5% Path of travel cross slope is greater than 2% for stop control approaches | All driveway path of travel issues and possible solutions provided in driveway shapefile (TRPEDDRV) | | | | |
| Path of travel cross slope is greater than 5% for free-flow approaches. Crosswalk width is less than 6' Crosswalk striping condition | | | | | |

| Curb Ramp ID ('z' or 'i' in ramp label indicates no | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|----------|----------------|---|--|--|--|
| Curb Ramp Issues | | | existing ramp) | Possible Solutions | | | |
| | 1 <i>z</i> | 2z | | | | | |
| Curb ramp does not exist and is needed | Χ | Χ | | Install curb ramp; if median improvement, see shapefile | | | |
| Curb ramp does not land in crosswalk | İ | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| No 4' x 4' clear space at base of curb ramp | İ | | | | | | |
| Curbed side is not 90° or has traversable adjacent surface | <u> </u> | | | | | | |
| Flare cross slope is greater than 10% | Ĭ | ļ | | | | | |
| Curb ramp running slope is greater than 8.3% | | | | | | | |
| Blended transition running slope is greater than 5% | ! | | | | | | |
| Cut-thru ramp running slope is greater than 5% | i . | | | | | | |
| Curb ramp cross slope is greater than 2% | <u> </u> | | | | | | |
| Cut-thru ramp cross slope is greater than 2% | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| Curb ramp width is less than 48" | | | | | | | |
| Cut-thru ramp width is less than 60" | <u> </u> | | | | | | |
| Permanent obstruction (>0.25") in curb ramp/landing/flares | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| Temporary obstruction (>0.25") in curb ramp/landing/flares | <u> </u> | ļ | | | | | |
| No textured surface at base of curb ramp | ļ | ļ | | | | | |
| No color contrast at base of curb ramp | į | ļ | | | | | |
| Landing area does not exist and is needed | ļ | ļ | | | | | |
| Landing area is less than 5' x 5' or slopes greater than 2% | ļ | ļ | | ļ | | | |
| Curb ramp transition onto roadway is greater than 0.25" | ļ | | | | | | |
| Counter slope of the gutter or street at the foot of the curb ramp is | İ | l | | | | | |
| greater than 5% | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| Ponding occurs at base of curb ramp | i | İ | | | | | |

Photographs



Corner 1 No Ramp (1z)



Corner 2 No Ramp (2z)

Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Disclaimer:

The Engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or over the Contractor's methods of determining prices or over competitive bidding or market conditions. Opinions of probable costs provided herein are based on the information known to Engineer at this time and represent only the Engineer's judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry. The Engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from its opinions of probable costs.

Project Location Map Sources:

Esri, DeLorme, NAVTEQ, USGS, Intermap, iPC, NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), TomTom, 2013, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, USDA, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrip, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community