# KDOT Access M anagement Policy (AM P) 

(January 2013 Edition)

## Errata

KDOT intends to correct these errors during the next revision to the Policy. Corrections are denoted in "red" text with a solid line through the original text.

1) Table 4-4 (Distance traveled during driver's perception-reaction (d1), lateral movement and deceleration (d2), and downstream functional distance (d4)), Page 4-15

Correction to distance "d4 - Undeveloped (feet)" for 20 mph and page reference in "Source d 4 " in the footnotes.

Table 4-4. Distance travelled during driver's perception-reaction (d1), lateral movement and deceleration (d2), and downstream functional distance (d4)

| Speed <br> (mph) | d1- <br> Undeveloped <br> (feet) | d1- <br> Developed/ CBD $^{\mathbf{1}}$ <br> (feet) | d2-Deceleration <br> ² <br> (feet) | d4- <br> Undeveloped ${ }^{3}$ <br> (feet) | d4- <br> Developed/ CBD $^{3}$ <br> (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | 75 | 45 | 70 | 155115 | 85 |
| 25 | 95 | 55 | 115 | 155 | 120 |
| 30 | 110 | 65 | 160 | 200 | 155 |
| 35 | 130 | 80 | 220 | 250 | 195 |
| 40 | 145 | 90 | 275 | 305 | 245 |
| 45 | 165 | 100 | 350 | 360 | 295 |
| 50 | 185 | 110 | 425 | 425 | 355 |
| 55 | 205 | 125 | 515 | 495 | 415 |
| 60 | 220 | 135 | 605 | 570 | 480 |
| 65 | 240 | 145 | 715 | 645 | 550 |
| 70 | 255 | 155 | 820 | 730 | 625 |

${ }^{1}$ Source d1: M odified version of TRB, Access M anagement M anual, 2003, Table 8-3, p. 133
${ }^{2}$ Source d2: M odified version of TRB, Access M anagement M anual, 2003, Table 10-2, p. 172
${ }^{3}$ Source d4: M odified versions of AASHTO's A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, Table 3-2 3-1 (2011)
2) Section 4.3.1.a (Intersection influence area), Page 4-16

The description for Signalized locations includes an error. The second sentence should be corrected as follows:
"The storage is based on 2 times the 95 th percentile back of queue as determined by traffic modeling software, such as Synchro."
3) Figure 4-18 (Schematic of access window for direct drive access), Page 4-17

The schematic " $a$ " indication for a left turn reflects an error in the original AMM source table and should be changed to right turn for each direction of travel as shown in the modified figure.

Figure 4-18. Schematic of access window for direct drive access


Source: TRB, Access M anagement Manual, 2003, Figure 8-15. P. 135
Note: (a) Window for left and right turns; (b) window for right turns only; (c) no window
4) Table 4-7 (Signalized intersection spacing criteria for various speeds and cycle lengths), Page 4-19

The source for this table is NCHRP Report $420^{l}$, but the page and table numbers should be corrected as shown in the table below.

Table 4-7. Signalized intersection spacing criteria for various speeds and cycle lengths

| Cycle Length <br> (seconds) | Posted Speed Limit (mph) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 25 | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 5}$ |
|  | 1,100 | 1,320 | 1,540 | 1,760 | 1,980 | 2,200 | 2,420 | 2,640 | 2,860 |  |
| 70 | 1,280 | 1,540 | 1,800 | 2,060 | 2,310 | 2,590 | 2,830 | 3,090 | 3,350 |  |
| 80 | 1,470 | 1,760 | 2,060 | 2,350 | 2,640 | 2,940 | 3,230 | 3,520 | 3,810 |  |
| 90 | 1,650 | 1,980 | 2,310 | 2,640 | 2,970 | 3,300 | 3,630 | 3,960 | 4,290 |  |
| 100 | 1,840 | 2,200 | 2,570 | 2,940 | 3,300 | 3,670 | 4,040 | 4,410 | 4,780 |  |
| 110 | 2,020 | 2,420 | 2,830 | 3,230 | 3,630 | 4,040 | 4,440 | 4,850 | 5,250 |  |
| 120 | 2,200 | 2,640 | 3,080 | 3,520 | 3,960 | 4,400 | 4,840 | 5,280 | 5,720 |  |

Source: Adapted from Gluck, J., H.S. Levinson, and V. Stover, Impacts of Access M anagement Techniques, NCHRP Report 420, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C. (1999) pp. 31-67 p. 24, Table 20.

[^0]5) Table 4-8 (Access spacing on one-way frontage road in the vicinity of exit ramp), Page 4-24

The source note for this table should indicate that the table has been modified (see correction below).
Table 4-8. Access spacing on one-way frontage road in vicinity of exit ramp

| Total Volume (vph) ${ }^{1}$ | Access Point Volume(vph) | Number of Weaving Lanes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  |  | Spacing (feet) |  |  |
| <2000 | All | 250 | 250 | 250 |
| >2000 | <250 | 460 | 460 | 560 |
|  | 250 | 520 | 460 | 560 |
|  | 500 | 590 | 460 | 560 |
|  | 750 | 790 | 460 | 560 |
|  | 1000 | 980 | 460 | 560 |
| >2500 | <250 | 920 | 460 | 560 |
|  | 250 | 950 | 460 | 560 |
|  | 500 | 980 | 460 | 560 |
|  | 750 | 980 | 590 | 690 |
|  | 1000 | 980 | 790 | 890 |
| >2500 | <250 | 980 | 750 | 850 |
|  | 250 | 980 | 820 | 920 |
|  | 500 | 980 | 980 | 980 |
|  | 750 | 980 | 980 | 980 |
|  | 1000 | 980 | 980 | 980 |

[^1]6) Table 4-10 (Minimum corner clearances by area type), Page 4-29

The footnote in this table should be modified as shown.
Table 4-10. M inimum corner clearances by area type

| Area Type (highway) | Minimum Corner Clearance Distance (side road) (feet) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Undeveloped | 155 |
| Developed | 115 |
| CBD | 85 |

Source: Adapted from AASHTO's A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, Table 3-1 (2011) Frontage and backage roads and Table 4-6
7) Figure 4-31 (Stopping sight distance profile for a crest vertical curve), Page 4-32

The footnote for this figure should be modified to indicate that the graphic is based on Figure 3-42 of the Green Book. ${ }^{2}$ In addition, a "Stopping Sight Distance" label should be added to the figure as shown.

Figure 4-31. Stopping sight distance profile for a crest vertical curve


Source: Based on AASHTO's A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (2011 Edition), Figure 3-42, pg. 3-152 pg. 3-14-and 3-15-h1 = 3.5 feet; h2 $=2.0$ feet

[^2]8) Table 4-19 (Access median design guidelines), Page 4-48

The design guideline table cites the Gattis, et al. reference but should also show in the citation that the table has been modified as demonstrated as shown below.

Table 4-19. Access median design guidelines


Source: Adapted from NCHRP Report 659, Guide for the Geometric Design of Driveways, Exhibit 5-32, p. 45
9) Section 4.4.8 (Profiles of the access and crossroad approach), Page 4-57

The last sentence of the descriptive text in Section 4.4 .8 should be clarified in the following manner:
"The appropriate vertical curve fadius length and length of tangent from the point of vertical intersection to the roadway centerline are provided for approach grades from 1 to 8 percent."
10) Table 4-24 (Access surface material and thickness), Page 4-66

The information shown in Table 4-24 is not correct. See corrected values below:
Table 4-24. Access surface material and thickness

|  | Surface type and thickness (inches) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Access Type | Turf | Gravel | Asphalt | Concrete |
| 1,2 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 86 |
| 3 | NA | NA | 6 | 86 |
| 4 | NA | 6 | 6 | 86 |
| 5,6 <br> Commercial/other | NA | NA | 68 | 8 |
| 5,6 <br> Industrial | NA | NA | 810 | 128 |

11) Section 4.5.2 (Auxiliary lane warrants - left-turn lanes), Page 4-70

On page 4-70 there are two errors that should be corrected. The operational warrant for left-turn lane warrants for two-lane highways should refer to Table 4-27 (current reference mistakenly refers to Table 4-23). Similarly, the operational warrant reference for four-lane highways refers to Table 4-24 but actually should show Table 4-28. See changes below:

- Operational warrant-The operational criterion is triggered if one of the following occurs:
- Left-turn lane warrants for two-lane highways-Utilize the information provided in Fable 4-23 Table 4-27 for guidance based on operations.
- Left-turn lane warrants for four-lane highways-Utilize the information provided in Fable 4-24 Table 4-28 for guidance based on operations.


## 12) Section 4.5.3.a (Right-turn lane design), Page 4-74

The description for Signalized locations includes an error. The second sentence should be corrected as follows:
"The storage is based on 2 times the 95th percentile back of queue as determined by traffic modeling software, such as Synchro."
13) Table 4-29 (Queue storage length adjustments for trucks), Page 4-75

Included in the right-turn lane section of the Policy is Table 4-29. This table is similar to an earlier table (Table 4-5, Page 4-16). Consequently, Table 4-29 should be removed and replaced by the content from Table 4-5 as shown below:

Table 4-29. Queue storage length adjustments for trucks

| PorcentTrucks | Storage-Length(ft) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\leq 5$ | 25 |
| 10 | 30 |
| 15 | 35 |

Source: Stover, V. G., and F. J. Koepke, Transportation and Land Development, 2nd edition, ITE, 2002, page 5-52.

| Percent Trucks <br> (\%) | Average Storage Length per <br> Vehicle (Feet) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\leq 5$ | 25 |
| $6 \leq 10$ | 30 |
| $11 \leq 15$ | 32 |
| $16 \leq 20$ | 35 |
| $>20$ | 38 |

Source: Adapted from V. Stover and F. Koepke, Transportation and Land Development (2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Edition), Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2002.
14) Section 4.5.3.b (Left-turn lane design), Page 4-76

The through-lane taper for left-turn lane transitions is calculated using a speed and offset based equation. The equations in the Policy are correct, but their limits not correct. The following changes should be made to these equation limits:
$\mathrm{L}=(\mathrm{WS} 2 / 60)$ for speeds less than of 45 mph or less
and
$\mathrm{L}=\mathrm{WS}$ for speeds of 4550 mph or more
15) Table 4-33 (Acceleration lane lengths), Page 4-81

The source information should indicate the table has been adapted to accurately reflect the truncated content from the original source (see below).

Table 4-33. Acceleration lane lengths

| Posted Speed <br> $(\mathbf{m p h})$ | Acceleration Lane <br> Length (from stop <br> condition) (feet) | Acceleration Lane Length <br> (from free-flow right $^{\text {condition) (feet) }}{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45 | 560 | 490 |
| 50 | 720 | 660 |
| 55 | 960 | 990 |
| 60 | 1200 | 1140 |
| 65 | 1410 | 1350 |
| 70 | 1620 | 1560 |

Source: Adapted from AASHTO's A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (2011 Edition), tTable 10-3
Taper lengths equal 300 feet for speeds $\leq 60 \mathrm{mph}$ and 600 feet for speeds $>60 \mathrm{mph}$
${ }^{1} 0$-mph design speed
${ }^{2} 15$-mph design speed

## 16) Section 4.6.1.a (Object markers for mailboxes), Page 4-87

The title for this section needs to be corrected as follows:
4.6.1.fa Object markers for mailboxes
17) Table 4-35 (Criteria for allowing on-street parking), Page 4-89

Table 4-35 provides criteria for on-street parking based on volume and speed. A citation was not included; however, the original source is from a 2002 ITE Journal article as shown below.

Table 4-35. Criteria for allowing on-street parking

| Parking Type | Criteria |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Volume (ADT) $^{1}$ | Speed (mph) |
| No parking allowed | $\geq 20,000$ | $\geq 35$ |
| Parallel | $\leq 15,000$ | $\leq 30$ |
| Angle (including back-in) | $\leq 10,000$ - multi-lane <br> $\leq 5,000-$ one-lane | $<20$ |

[^3]18) Table 5-1 (Access Types), Page 5-2

Table 5-1 lists the access types by volume and provides typical use examples. The text in the table should be modified as shown below.

Table 5-1. Access types

| Type | Traffic Volume | Use |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Low volume <br> $0-49$ vehicles per day maximum, in/out <br> bound traffic count | Non-commercial-farm, agriculture, field, <br> timber, cultivated, pasture, duplex, single <br> family residential/home, apartment building <br> containing five or fewer dwelling units, other |
| 2 | Low volume <br> $0-49$ vehicles per day maximum, in/out <br> bound traffic count | Special-use-city water treatment plant, <br> microwave station, pipeline checkpoint, <br> telephone repeater stations, utilities (electric, <br> gas, telephone, and water) check/ <br> maintenance stations, Corps of Engineers <br> dike roads, other |
| 3 | Low volume <br> $0-49$ vehicles per day maximum, in/out <br> bound traffic count | Emergency facility-fire station, paramedic <br> facility |
| 4 | Low volume <br> $0-49$ vehicles per day maximum, in/out <br> bound traffic count | Commercial-small business, cemetery, <br> nursing home, other |
| 5 | Medium volume <br> $50-499$ vehicles per day and less than 50 <br> vehicles per peak hour of the generator of the <br> highway (in/out bound traffic count) | Commercial, industrial, institutional, <br> recreational, local road connections, including <br> shared access, other |
| 6 | High volume <br> 500 or more vehicles per day or 50 or more <br> vehicles per peak hour of the generator <br> highway (in/out bound traffic count) | Commercial, industrial, institutional, <br> recreational, local road connections, including <br> shared access, other |

## 19) Section 5.4.1a (Basic TIS Contents), Page 5-14

Section 5.4.1a, Basic TIS Contents, should contain the text changes shown below:

- Proposed site access characteristics
- Access type (see Table 5-1)
- Access width and radii (see Section 4.4.1)
- Access surfacing (see Section 4.4.11)
- Drainage method and material (see Section 4.4.10)
- Adjacent access spacing-upstation and downstation, both sides of highway
- Intersection influence area (see Section 4.3.1)
- Sight distance -upstation stopping and downstation intersection, vertical and horizontal (see Section 4.3.7)
- Auxiliary lane warranted? -yes or no (see Section 4.5)
- Shared?-yes or no


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Gluck, J., H.S. Levinson, and V. Stover. NCHRP Report 420. Impacts of Access M anagement. TRB, Washington, D.C. 1999, Table 20, p. 24.

[^1]:    Source: M odified from TII's Development of Improved Guidelines for Frontage Road
    ${ }^{1}$ Total volume is the volume of the exit ramp plus the upstream one-way frontage road volume.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ AASHTO, A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 6 th Edition, Washington, D.C., 2011, Figure 3-42, p. 3-152.

[^3]:    Note: ADTs are total, two-way, except for the one-lane reference.
    ${ }^{1}$ This does not imply absolute conditions, but guides the successful application
    Source: Adapted from Edwards, J. D., "Changing On-Street Parallel Parking to Angle Parking", ITE Journal, Washington, D.C., February 2002, pp. 28-3.

