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This memorandum summarizes transportation system needs anticipated for The Dalles over a 20-year period from 2015 through 2035. These needs include existing deficiencies identified in Technical Memorandum \#3 (and supplemental feedback from citizens and residents), improvements to achieve goals identified in Technical Memorandum \#2, and forecast needs associated with traffic growth through 2035. The analyses and findings contained in this memorandum will inform the identification and evaluation of future multimodal transportation system alternatives that address the needs.

Technical analyses summarized herein assume The Dalles will continue to see growth in employment and population between 2016 and 2035 within the existing Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). At the same time, the analyses assume all modal transportation systems will remain as they exist today, except where planned improvement projects are considered funded and certain to be implemented. This "do nothing" or "no-build" scenario is commonly used as a foundation that communities can compare to alternatives that include various projects, policies, pilot studies, and programs.

The remainder of this memorandum outlines the analyses and findings of the "no build" future transportation conditions. In addition, preliminary examples of improvement strategies the City and ODOT may consider to address some of the needs in the future are also highlighted.

## DEVELOPMENT OF YEAR 2035 TRAFFIC FORECASTS

Estimates of future traffic demand are based on population and employment forecasts in the year 2035, existing travel patterns, and transportation infrastructure (existing system and planned/funded improvements). The following section summarizes key aspects of The Dalles 2035 traffic volume estimate.

## Land Use and Population Projections

Land use plays an important role in developing a comprehensive transportation system. The amount of land that is planned to be developed, the type of land uses, and how the land uses are mixed together
will have a direct impact on how the transportation system will be used in the future. Understanding land use is critical to taking actions to maintain or enhance the transportation system.

## Travel Demand Modeling Tool

Based on a variety of data sources, ODOT's Transportation Planning Analysis Unit (TPAU) has created a travel demand model specific to The Dalles to help inform future demand and travel patterns. The travel demand model is comprised of multiple Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs) that encompass defined geographic areas and the land uses within them. The arterial and collector roadway network is integrated with the TAZs to reflect the existing motor vehicle transportation system.

Travel patterns between land uses in each TAZ and to and from the broader region have been estimated by City staff for both existing and long-term future conditions and integrated into the TPAU modeling effort. Each TAZ has been coded with a unique set of characteristics for land use, population, employment and households in the geographic area represented by the TAZ. The travel demand model in turn uses the coded information to predict future travel patterns between TAZs and the regional roadway network. The inputs into the model and TAZs are coded to represent the existing transportation system and anticipated future changes as accurately as possible. Each TAZ area is individually coded to reflect anticipated changes in population, businesses/employment opportunities and/or households.

## Growth Projections

The Dalles travel demand model is coded to assess travel patterns for base year 2010 and forecast year 2036 population, household, and employment (retail, service, and other) estimates for The Dalles by TAZ. Figures 4-1 and 4-2 illustrate the percent change in households and employment expected per acre between base year 2010 and forecast year 2036. Table 1 summarizes the collective changes in population, households, employment community-wide. As shown in Table 4-1, the change in population is projected to be 11.8 percent over the 26 -year period while the corresponding percent change in households is projected to be 13.4 percent and the change in employment is projected to be 15.2 percent.

Table 4-1: The Dalles Land Use Summary

| Land Use | 2010 | 2036 | Change | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population | 18,479 | 20,660 | 2,181 | $11.8 \%$ |
| Households | 7,378 | 8,369 | 991 | $13.4 \%$ |
| Employment | 8,435 | 9,714 | 1,279 | $15.2 \%$ |




## Travel Trends and Modeling Observations

In reviewing the future traffic volume projections, several trends and relationships should be considered as follows.

- The greatest increase in housing and employees per acre (density) is projected within several blocks of The Dalles Downtown where redevelopment is anticipated.
- While the downtown TAZs have the highest increase in density of anticipated housing and employees, these areas are relatively small.
- The total increase in employment projected by the travel demand model is highest in the industrial areas.
- As land uses change in proportion to each other (i.e., a more significant increase in employment relative to population and household growth), there will be a shift in the overall operation of the transportation system.
- By way of illustration, retail land uses typically generate a higher number of trips per acre of land than residential, industrial, or other land uses. As a result, the location and design of retail land uses in The Dalles has the potential to substantially affect localized transportation system operations (for example, at a traffic signal or driveway serving as a gateway to a retail development). Even within retail uses, the trip impact can vary between destination retail (businesses whose customers drive significant distances to reach the site - for example, a large home improvement store) vs. convenience retail (business who rely largely on traffic passing by the site to shop as a function of convenience - for example, a gas station or convenience market)
- Areas of The Dalles that are homogeneous in land use character can also affect transportation system design and operations.
- For example, the Port area primarily has employment-based land uses and, as a result, the local transportation system must support significant trips coming to or from that area during peak commuter periods (especially if shift changes coincide among employers).
- Similarly, residential subdivisions tend to have a relatively heavy egress travel pattern during the morning peak hour and a relatively heavy return-to-home travel pattern during the p.m. peak hour.
- Promoting a mix of residential, commercial, and employment land uses so that some residents may work and shop locally reduces the need for residents to travel longer distances (for example, as is being developed within the Lone Pine area).
- Parking demand is also heavily impacted by land use - mixed-use areas have the potential to make better use of shared parking arrangements (for example, office
space may use parking during the day that is shared with local residents overnight and on weekends when residential is highest and office demand lowest).
- Areas with significant future development potential may substantially impact the transportation system and should be thoughtfully considered. ODOT's travel demand model specifically considered the following local high-growth potential areas:
- Lands north of I-84, at the far west and east ends of the city, at the boundaries of the UGB;
- Vacant industrial land located near the I-84/ Chenoweth interchange;
- Land zoned for industrial/commercial uses at the Columbia Gorge Regional Airport; and,
- Future mixed-use development within the Lone Pine area.


## Planned and Funded Projects Assumed in the Travel Demand Model

The initial year 2035 modeling presented in this memorandum assumes that only new transportation projects that are both developed and funded will be available for use in 2035. Typically, such future projects could be part of the ODOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), or City/County projects. While ODOT's 2015-2018 STIP includes several projects within The Dalles, such as improvements to the Riverfront Trail, sign upgrades, signalization upgrades, and safety improvements, no capacity or operational projects are planned and funded at the study intersections. Accordingly, the Year 2035 modeling presented in this report reflects operations of the existing transportation system with year 2035 traffic volumes.

## FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS AND NEEDS

## Year 2035 Forecast Traffic Volumes

Year 2035 forecast traffic volumes on the arterial and collector street system were projected using the travel demand model to reflect anticipated land use changes assuming continued use of the existing transportation network. Turning and through movement volumes at the study intersections were derived from the travel demand model projections using the post-processing methodology presented in the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 255 Highway Traffic Data for Urbanized Area Project Planning and Design, in conjunction with engineering judgment and knowledge of the study area.

Figure 4-3 illustrates the year 2035 traffic volumes at the study intersections located within The Dalles UGB during the weekday p.m. peak hour while Figure 4-4 illustrates the corresponding intersection locations.



## Year 2035 Forecast Operations

The City of The Dalles seeks to maintain LOS D or better at signalized and unsignalized intersections. ODOT operation standards for existing and no-build future scenarios were previously documented in Technical Memorandum \#3 and are defined in Table 6 of the Oregon Highway Plan.

The traffic volumes shown in Figure $4-3$ were used to analyze traffic operations at the study intersections. Figure 4-4 and Table 4-2 summarize the results of the traffic operations analysis at the study intersections for the weekday p.m. peak hour. Figure 4-4 illustrates study intersections that exceed the applicable operational standards with red circles. Those intersections shown with yellow circles satisfy ODOT performance targets, but do not meet City standards. All other intersections are shown by green circles, indicating they are operating below the applicable performance thresholds. Note that the color-coding shown in Figure 4-4 only represents delay- and capacity-based performance measures. Additional performance measures and considerations including queuing and safety are addressed later in this memorandum. Year 2035 Future Traffic Condition operations analysis worksheets are included in Appendix $A$.

Key findings from the forecast weekday p.m. peak hour operational analysis includes:

- Compared to existing conditions, the forecast traffic conditions do not indicate a substantial increase in traffic demand and congestion, except along the US 197 corridor.
- The unsignalized US 197/I-84 EB Ramp intersection (Intersection \#31) has a volume-tocapacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) ratio of greater than 1.0 on the eastbound approach. This finding indicates eastbound I-84 off-ramp volumes are projected to exceed both the intersection's capacity and the intersection's $0.85 \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ target.
- The unsignalized US 197/US 30 intersection (Intersection \#29) has a v/c ratio of greater than 1.0 on the southbound left-turn approach lane. This finding indicates southbound volumes turning left to continue on US 197 are projected to exceed both the intersection's capacity and the intersection's $0.85 \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ target.
- While satisfying ODOT's mobility standard, the Lone Pine Boulevard eastbound left-turn movement at US 197 (Intersection \#34) is forecast to exceed the City's LOS D threshold. The projected delay impacts less than 50 vehicles during the weekday p.m. peak hour.
- The minor-street approaches to US 197 at Fremont Street/Columbia View Drive (Intersection \#30) are forecast to exceed the City's LOS D threshold but satisfy ODOT's mobility standard.
- The signals at the Webber Street interchange (at $6^{\text {th }}$ Street and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street) operate with permitted left-turn phasing on the north and south approaches. This signal phasing does not provide for the most efficient signal operations resulting in excess delay and queuing on the north and south approaches at both signals.

Table 4-2: Forecast 2035 Intersection Operations - Weekday PM Peak Hour

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Map } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Intersection | Level of Service (LOS) | Delay <br> (Sec) | Volume/ Capacity (V/C) | Unsignalized Critical Movement | ODOT V/C Target* | Meets Applicable Performance Thresholds? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Seven Mile Hill Rd/ Chenoweth Rd | B | 10.5 | 0.05 | SB | N/A | Yes |
| 2 | US 30/River Rd | C | 16.5 | 0.61 | WB | 0.90 | Yes |
| 3 | I-84 EB Ramps/River Rd | C | 16.6 | 0.13 | SB | 0.85 | Yes |
| 4 | I-84 WB Ramps/River Rd | D | 25.2 | 0.43 | NB | 0.85 | Yes |
| 5 | W 10th St/Hostetler Rd | B | 10.8 | 0.09 | WB | N/A | Yes |
| 6 | W 2nd St/Hostetler Rd | B | 11.9 | 0.03 | WB | N/A | Yes |
| 7 | I-84 EB Ramps/W 6th St | D | 33.2 | 0.49 | WB | 0.85 | Yes |
| 8 | Webber St/W 10th St | C | 17.1 | 0.17 | WB | N/A | Yes |
| 9 | Webber St/W 6th St | C | 20.4 | 0.76 | Signalized | N/A | Yes |
| 10 | Webber St/W 2nd St | C | 22.2 | 0.87 | Signalized | N/A | Yes |
| 11 | Webber St/W 1st St | B | 11.7 | 0.15 | WB | N/A | Yes |
| 12 | Cherry Heights Rd/W 10th St | C | 19.8 | N/A | AWSC | N/A | Yes |
| 13 | Cherry Heights Rd/W 6th St | C | 25.5 | 0.65 | Signalized | N/A | Yes |
| 14 | Mt Hood St/Skyline Rd | B | 11.1 | 0.03 | WB | N/A | Yes |
| 15 | Mt Hood St/Skyline Rd | C | 23.4 | N/A | AWSC | N/A | Yes |
| 16 | Union St/10th | B | 11 | N/A | AWSC | N/A | Yes |
| 17 | Union St/W 3rd St | C | 31.8 | 0.46 | Signalized | N/A | Yes |
| 18 | Union St/W 2nd St | B | 13.5 | 0.4 | Signalized | N/A | Yes |
| 19 | Kelly Ave/E 10th St | C | 18.9 | 0.29 | WB | N/A | Yes |
| 20 | Dry Hollow Rd/3 Mile Rd | B | 10 | 0.1 | EB | N/A | Yes |
| 21 | Dry Hollow Rd/16th PI/19th St | A | 8.7 | N/A | AWSC | N/A | Yes |
| 22 | Dry Hollow Rd/E 10th St | C | 16.7 | 0.22 | WB | N/A | Yes |
| 24 | Brewery Overpass Rd/US 30 | B | 11.8 | 0.30 | EB | 0.90 | Yes |
| 25 | Brewery Overpass Rd/ I-84 EB Ramps | C | 15.9 | 0.40 | WB | 0.85 | Yes |
| 26 | Brewery Overpass Rd/ I-84 WB Ramps | C | 16.2 | 0.25 | NB | 0.85 | Yes |
| 27 | Thompson St/E 10th St/ Old Dufur Rd | B | 10.4 | 0.10 | SB | N/A | Yes |
| 28 | E 2nd St/US 30 | B | 10.4 | 0.10 | SBL | 0.90 | Yes |
| 29 | US 197/US 30 | F | >50 | 1.13 | SBL | 0.85 | No |
| 30 | US 197/Fremont St/Columbia View Dr | F | 50.3 | 0.71 | EB | 0.90 | City No, ODOT Yes |
| 31 | US 197/I-84 EB Ramps | F | >50 | 1.08 | EB | 0.85 | No |
| 32 | US 197/I-84 WB Ramps | A | 9.6 | 0.14 | WB | 0.85 | Yes |
| 33 | US 197/Bret Clodfelter Wy | C | 22.8 | 0.31 | WB | 0.90 | Yes |
| 34 | US 197/Lone Pine Blvd | E | 40.4 | 0.26 | EB | 0.90 | City No, ODOT Yes |

[^0]* For critical movement at unsignalized intersections

As shown in Table 4-2, there is a need to increase capacity at two intersections that exceed their applicable v/c targets. At two other intersections on ODOT facilities, the delay exceeds City thresholds, but not ODOT's v/c target.

Congestion has been reported at several other intersections within The Dalles, although the forecast conditions do not indicate the delay and capacity will exceed applicable performance thresholds. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities and safety projects may be identified at these locations, as described below.

## Intersection Queues

A queuing analysis was conducted at the five signalized study intersections using Synchro 8 software. Table 4-3 summarizes the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues for movements with exclusive lanes during the weekday p.m. peak hour, rounded to the nearest 25 feet (approximately 1 vehicle length). The available storage lengths reflect the striped storage for each movement at the intersections.

Table 4-3: Forecast 2035 Signalized $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Queues - Weekday PM Peak Hour

| Map ID | Intersection | Movement | Weekday PM Queue (feet) | Available Storage (feet) | Adequate? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | Webber St/W 6th St | EBL | 25 | 250 | Yes |
|  |  | EBT/R | <400 | 705 | Yes |
|  |  | WBL | 25 | 150 | Yes |
|  |  | WBT | 300 | > 500 | Yes |
|  |  | WBR | 50 | 175 | Yes |
|  |  | NBL/T | 100 | 495 | Yes |
|  |  | NBR | 5 | 175 | Yes |
|  |  | SBL/T | 250 | 585 | Yes |
|  |  | SBR | 125 | 50 | No |
| 10 | Webber St/W 2nd St | EBL | 25 | 125 | Yes |
|  |  | EBT | 100 | 430 | Yes |
|  |  | WBL | 275 | 425 | Yes |
|  |  | WBT | 200 | 635 | Yes |
|  |  | WBR | 50 | 425 | Yes |
|  |  | NBL/T | 275 | 585 | Yes |
|  |  | NBR | 50 | 25 | No |
|  |  | SBL/T | 150 | 810 | Yes |
| 13 | Cherry Heights Rd/W 6th St | EBL | 100 | 100 | Yes |
|  |  | EBT | 375 | > 500 | Yes |
|  |  | EBR | 50 | > 500 | Yes |
|  |  | WBL | 50 | 965 | Yes |
|  |  | WBT | 250 | 965 | Yes |
|  |  | WBR | 0 | 75 | Yes |
|  |  | NBL | 150 | 100 | No |
|  |  | NBT/R | 75 | 360 | Yes |
|  |  | SBL | 25 | 200 | Yes |
|  |  | SBT/R | 300 | 200 | No |
| 17 | Union St/W 3rd St | EBT | 350 | 365 | Yes |
|  |  | NBT | 100 | > 500 | Yes |
|  |  | SBL | 75 | 75 | Yes |
|  |  | SBT | 50 | 205 | Yes |
| 18 | Union St/W 2nd St | WBL | 50 | 50 | Yes |
|  |  | WBT | 175 | 390 | Yes |
|  |  | NBT | 100 | 205 | Yes |
|  |  | SBT | 50 | 385 | Yes |

$\mathrm{EB}=$ Eastbound, $\mathrm{WB}=$ Westbound, $\mathrm{SB}=$ Southbound, $\mathrm{NB}=$ Northbound, L=Left-turn Lane, $\mathrm{T}=$ Through Lane, $\mathrm{R}=$ Right-turn Lane, $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{T}=$ Shared Left-Through Lane, $\mathrm{T} / \mathrm{R}=$ Shared Through-Right Lane $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{R}=$ Shared Left and Right-turn Lane

As shown in Table 4-3, all of the signalized study intersections are forecasted to have one or more movements where the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues exceed the available storage for that movement. The worksheets used to evaluate future queuing at the signalized study intersections are included in Appendix G.

Based on the forecast queuing analysis, the following signalized intersection improvement needs were identified:

- Webber Street Interchange (Intersections \#9 and \#10) - Queue storage to accommodate forecast demand queues at the Webber $/ 6^{\text {th }}$ Street and Webber $/ 2^{\text {nd }}$ Street intersections would require extending the right-turn lane beyond the queue in the shared through/left lanes. Due to restrictions in width under the I-84 overpass, extending these turn lanes beyond 100 feet is not feasible within the constraints of the existing structure.
- Cherry Heights Road/W 6th Street (Intersection \#13) - The southbound queue extends beyond the left-turn lane storage length, reducing the approach capacity. Review of approach volumes indicates an imbalance in lane utilization between the left lane (20 vehicles/hour) and shared through/right lanes ( 346 vehicles/hour). The northbound leftturn lane needs to be extended to 150 feet by reallocating existing pavement width.


## Unsignalized Intersection Queues

The operational analysis of unsignalized intersections estimates queuing at unsignalized intersections. Based on review of the analysis results, we did not identify any unsignalized queues that exceed available storage. Additional consideration of storage lengths and turn lane needs at unsignalized intersections are identified as safety needs.

## Roadway Connectivity

Within most of the City, the existing grid network generally provides users with a variety of travel options and serves as emergency access routes during incidents. A review of the existing street connectivity needs and constraints revealed the following:

- There is an established grid system within and adjacent to the downtown core. Outside of the downtown area, connectivity is limited by topography, the I-84 corridor, the US 197 corridor, and the Union Pacific Railroad corridor and undeveloped properties. Specific constraints include:
- Access to/from residential areas off of Columbia View Drive is limited to a single unsignalized intersection at US 197.
- Access to the mixed-use development off of Lone Pine Boulevard is limited to a single point of access on US 197.
- Connections from The Dalles to The Dalles Municipal Airport and the surrounding industrial areas are limited to US 197.
- Railroad crossings and I-84 concentrate north-south travel to/from The Port industrial area to River Road (Chenoweth Interchange) and Webber Street.
- Despite the grid system in the downtown area and to the south, there are limited east-west connections from the west side of the City to the east side, with the exception of I-84.
- Significant grade changes limit connections across the southern UGB boundary, although current connections provide adequate capacity.
- The Mid-Columbia Medical Center (MCMC) has limited collector or arterial connection options to the east to Thompson Street (refer to Figure 4-5). Completing a connection to Thompson Street could improve emergency response time by providing alternative routes to the hospital and could alleviate other north/south routes currently in use. Examples of connections that could be considered for completion are:
- Extend E $19^{\text {th }}$ Street from MCMC to Thompson Street
- Extend E $16^{\text {th }}$ Street from Oakwood Drive to Quinton Street
- Extend Oakwood Drive from E $16^{\text {th }}$ Street to E $14^{\text {th }}$ Street
- Complete E $16^{\text {th }}$ Street from Golden Way to Thompson Street
- The downtown core of The Dalles includes a one-way couplet (East $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street and East $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street). There have been requests to evaluate the impacts to the downtown area if the one-way couplet was converted into two-way streets. Consideration will need to be given to the roundabout at East $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street and Brewery Grade as the west leg of the roundabout currently accommodates the one-way couplet configuration. Consideration will also need to be given to the costs of upgrading the signalized intersections along both streets to allow for two-way travel. The evaluation of this concept will be provided in Technical Memorandum \#5.
- Traffic volume
- Roundabout
- Signal modifications
- Loading/unloading, freight.


## Roadway Safety Needs \& Considerations

Several study intersections were identified in Technical Memorandum \#3 as exceeding the critical crash rate, the $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile crash rate, or having more than 50-percent left-turn or angle crash type proportion. These include:

- US 197/Fremont Street/Columbia View Drive (Intersection \#30)
- Exceeds Critical Crash Rate during the study period. The posted speed on the uncontrolled US 197 approaches is 45 miles per hour (MPH). Fourteen of the 15 reported crashes ( 93 percent) were left-turn crashes. Safety improvement needs may include changes to traffic control or speed reduction on US 197.
- US 197/US 30 (Intersection \#29)
- Exceeds Critical Crash Rate during the study period. The posted speed on the uncontrolled US 197 approaches is 45 miles per hour (MPH). Speed and weather factors
have been indicated in the 12 reported crashes at this intersection. Safety improvement needs may include changes to traffic control or speed reduction measures.
- I-84 EB Ramps/River Road (Intersection \#3)
- This intersection exceeded the $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile crash rates for similar intersections throughout the state. Two of the four crashes at this location were injury B and C. Two of the four crashes were turning movement related; indicating that sight distance may need to be evaluated.
- Kelly Avenue/East $10^{\text {th }}$ Street (Intersection \#19)
- This intersection exceeded the $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile crash rates for similar intersections throughout the state. Four of the six reported crashes resulted in injury B or C. Four crashes were angle collisions with reports that the driver failed to obey the stop sign. Advanced stop-ahead warning signage or larger stop signs may be needed to reduce potential for running the stop sign.
- Dry Hollow Road/East $10^{\text {th }}$ Street (Intersection \#22)
- This intersection exceeded the $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile crash rates for similar intersections throughout the state with a total of six crashes. Four crashes were angle collisions and two crashes resulted in injuries. Advanced stop-ahead warning signage may be needed to reduce potential for running the stop sign.
- US 197/I-84 Eastbound Ramps (Intersection \#31)
- Six of the nine reported crashes were either angle or turning movement related. The majority of these involved an eastbound vehicle making a left-turn from the ramp. Turn lanes or changes in traffic control may be needed to address the reported crash types.
- US 197/I-84 Westbound Ramps (Intersection \#32)
- Three of the six reported crashes were angle or turning movement related. No exclusive left-turn or right-turn lanes are provided along any approach to the intersection. Turn lanes or changes in traffic control may be needed to address the reported crash types.
- Webber St/W 2nd Street (Intersection \#10)
- 14 crashes were reported at the intersection over the 5 -year period, including 10 crashes caused by angle or turning movement. A majority of these crashes involve a northbound left-turn vehicle. Converting the northbound left-turn phase to protected only phasing may be needed to address reported crash types.
- US 197/Bret Clodfelter Way (Intersection \#33)
- 5 crashes were reported at this intersection over the study period, all of them including angle or turning movement collisions where the driver was cited as not yielding right-ofway. Turn lanes or changes in traffic control may be needed to address the reported crash types.

Increases in congestion associated with the forecast employment and population growth could affect crash patterns observed at the aforementioned intersections and throughout the City. Based on input from the Technical and Public Advisory Committee members, additional safety improvement needs identified for mitigation include:

- W $6^{\text {th }}$ Street from River Road to Chenoweth Loop Road and from Hostetler Street to Snipes Street
- A two-way left-turn lane is provided on W $6^{\text {th }}$ Street from Snipes to Webber Street, but is not provided along this segment of $W 6^{\text {th }}$ Street. A TWLTL is expected to reduce leftturn and rear-end crashes related to traffic turning at public and private accesses.
- As shown in Figure 4-5, there were 27 crashes along the segments of $W$ 6 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street where no TWLTL or left-turn lane exists today. Of these 27 crashes, the majority were rear-end crashes (14) or angle/left-turn crashes (12). Of the 14 rear-end crashes, 10 occurred in the northbound direction.
- $1^{\text {st }}$ Street/Union Street
- At this rail crossing, southbound traffic turning left onto $1^{\text {st }}$ Street has the potential to create a queue across the railroad tracks during peak periods of vehicular traffic. (See Exhibit 4-1)
- $1^{\text {st }}$ Street/Madison Street
- $1^{\text {st }}$ Street parallels the railroad and intersects with Madison Street at the railroad crossing. Because the existing traffic gate blocks the northbound lane along Madison Street, the geometry of the intersection allows vehicles attempting an eastbound leftturn movement from $1^{\text {st }}$ Street to avoid the traffic gate when a train is present. (See Exhibit 4-2)


Exhibit 4-1 UPRR Railroad Crossing at Union
Street


Exhibit 4-2 UPRR Railroad Crossing at Madison Street

Figure 4-5-Reported Crashes on W 6 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street

- E $10^{\text {th }}$ Street/Thompson Street
- While projected to satisfy the City and ODOT's intersection capacity standard, stakeholder comments indicate the Old Dufur Road skewed approach and the undefined nature of the intersection contribute to driver confusion and influence the perceived safety of pedestrians and bicyclists (see Exhibit 4-3). The existing configuration includes stop sign control on the northbound Thompson Street and westbound East $10^{\text {th }}$ Street approaches.
- E $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street/US 30
- The intersection has eastbound and westbound free-flow through movements; however, the eastbound left-turn, westbound right-turn, and southbound movements are all stop-controlled. Westbound vehicles along US 30 are shifted to the north to allow for an easier eastbound left-turn movement onto East $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street. Exhibit 4-4 illustrates the existing intersection configuration.
- The current intersection has drainage and lack of storm inlets.

Exhibit 4-3 Existing Alignment at E $10{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street/Old Dufur Road/Thompson Street Source: Google Maps

Exhibit 4-4 Existing Alignment of US 30/State Road (E $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Street) Source: Google Maps

## ODOT ARTS Program

In addition to the projects listed above, the ODOT All Roads Transportation Safety (ARTS) program has programmed systemic sign upgrades and illumination along US 197 and West $6^{\text {th }}$ Street.

## Access Management

Spacing requirements for public roadways and private driveways can have a profound impact on transportation system operations as well as land development. As the City continues to grow, its street system will become more heavily traveled. Consequently, it will become increasingly important to manage access on the arterial and collector street system as new development occurs in order to preserve those streets' function for carrying through traffic.

Future access management on highways and City collector and arterial facilities could benefit both safety and operations; however, access management strategies and implementation require careful consideration to balance the needs for access to developed land with the need to ensure movement of traffic in a safe and efficient manner. Future streetscape projects, redevelopment, or changes in land use may provide opportunities for shared access, creation of easements for future shared access, reduction in the number of driveways, or alternative connectivity to lower-order facilities. These topics will be addressed later in the TSP update process.

As part of the I-84 Chenoweth Road IAMP, future access locations and public street connections were evaluated for properties and streets located in the IAMP Access Study Area. Access locations were evaluated based on ODOT's Division 51 Access Management standards, the City of The Dalles access spacing standards, and an assessment of traffic operations and safety as described in Action 3C. 3 of the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan.

Under ODOT's current access management policy, the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan stipulates that the desired distance between an interchange ramp terminal and the first major approach (public or private) on the crossroad should be 1,320 feet ( $1 / 4$ mile). Currently there are four private accesses and two public street connections within 1,320 feet of the interchange ramp terminals. Public street connections are located on River Road at West 6th Street, and West 6th Street at Division Street. Existing private accesses are located on West 6th Street and US 30.

## Bicycle Needs

Bicycle needs were evaluated at a qualitative level in the context of future system needs. ${ }^{1}$ The Dalles Bicycle Advisory Committee provided extensive feedback and guidance related to bicycle system needs. The Advisory Committee feedback was reviewed along with those bicycle facilities identified in Technical Memorandum \#3 as having a bicycle level of traffic stress (LTS) rating of 3 or $4^{2}$.

## Downtown Bicycle Considerations

Bicycle corridor needs through the downtown area were noted in light of the lack of existing facilities on the East $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street and East $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street corridors. Given current right-of-way and building constraints in the downtown area, opportunities to widen East $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street or East $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street to provide dedicated bicycle facilities are limited. While many cyclists share the roadway with motor vehicles, there is a need to accommodate bicycle travel for a wider range of users through downtown.

[^1]
## East-West Bicycle Connectivity Considerations

The existing conditions analysis documented that there are limited east-west bicycle connections through The Dalles. The northwest side of the City has several schools, a new transit center (under construction on West $7^{\text {th }}$ Street), a new aquatic center, and may be home to the Gorge Youth Center in the future. A high priority has been placed on providing safe and efficient bicycle facilities between these locations and to residential areas.

Input from The Dalles Ad-Hoc Bicycle Advisory Committee identified several specific needs, including new bicycle routes and right-of-way for multi-use paths based on their discussion during a November 18, 2015 meeting. The needs are generally illustrated in Figure 4-6. The type of treatments (bicycle lanes, shared roadway, bicycle boulevard, etc.), an evaluation of need for pavement widening, and cost estimates for each project will be described in Technical Memorandum \#5.

## Pedestrian Needs

Within The Dalles, sidewalks are provided on one or both sides of some of the arterials and collectors, as summarized in Technical Memorandum \#3. Generally, sidewalks are provided on both sides of the street throughout The Dalles Historic Downtown and on at least one side of residential streets south of downtown. Ideally, future plans for improvements to the pedestrian system should focus on strategic improvements to improve east-west connectivity throughout The Dalles and connectivity between residential areas and schools as identified in the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Action Plans, and trail improvements to complete The Dalles Riverfront Trail.

Pedestrian needs identified to date include:

- Areas to the west of Webber Street (and south of I-84) and areas east of Thompson Street generally have the fewest pedestrian facilities. The areas to the west of Webber Street in need of pedestrian facilities have some key attractors and generators (school, transit center, and planned youth center).
- Given it is one of a few east-west arterials in The Dalles, pedestrian improvements to $10^{\text {th }}$ Street and/or $7^{\text {th }}$ Street (West of Cherry Heights Rd) may be prioritized to provide an eastwest pedestrian route and align with future bicycle route needs.
- Improvements to the shared-use paths within The Dalles could also be considered.
- The majority of The Dalles Riverfront Trail is completed, but a workgroup is tasked with identifying options to complete two short missing segments.
- Additional shared-use paths along Chenowith Creek and Mill Creek, were identified in the 2006 TSP, but have not been completed. Constructing new accesses to the trail should also be considered in the future.
- Needs previously identified through SRTS plans include:
- Sidewalk and sidewalk connections around Chenoweth Elementary on W $10^{\text {th }}$ Street, W $7^{\text {th }}$ Street, Hostetler Street, and Chenowith Loop Road
- Sidewalk and sidewalk connections around Dry Hollow Elementary on E $16^{\text {th }}$ Place and E $19^{\text {th }}$ Street - add sidewalk on side with gravel up Dry Hollow
- Intersection signage and pavement markings, including crossing warning signs and markings at:
- West $10^{\text {th }}$ Street/Hostetler Street (Chenowith Elementary)
- East $16^{\text {th }}$ Place/East $19^{\text {th }}$ Street/Dry Hollow Road (Dry Hollow Elementary)
- West $14^{\text {th }}$ Street/Bridge Street (Colonel Wright Elementary)
- West $14^{\text {th }}$ Street/Trevitt Street (Colonel Wright Elementary)
- West $16^{\text {th }}$ Street/Bridge Street (Colonel Wright Elementary)
- West $16^{\text {th }}$ Street/Trevitt Street (Colonel Wright Elementary)


## Transit

A new transit center is currently under construction in the southwest corner of the West $7^{\text {th }}$ Street/ Chenoweth Loop Road intersection. West $7^{\text {th }}$ Street has been widened and extended to Chenowith Loop Road. The transit center is expected to be completed in 2016, with park-and-ride space and bus service provided by Columbia Area Transit, Mid-Columbia Council of Government (MCCOG) Link, and possibly Greyhound. There is a high priority to provide pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between the new transit center's location on the west side of the City to the Downtown area. As noted in the previous Pedestrian and Bicycle Needs sections, a priority on improving pedestrian and bicycle facilities on West $7^{\text {th }}$ Street will provide east-west connectivity between the transit center, proposed youth center, schools, and the Downtown area.

MCCOG's Link service provides dial-a-ride service (door-to-door, on request). The City could consider investing in a fixed-route service to provide regular services to key destinations (e.g., MCMC, Columbia Gorge Community College, downtown, Aquatic Center, etc.). A fixed route system could help reduce single-occupant motor vehicle trips and provide accessibility and connectivity, consistent with TSP Goal \#2C.

## SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

The needs identified in this memorandum are generally reflected in Figure 4-6. They include needs identified in the existing analysis and inventory, needs based on feedback from various stakeholders, and capacity analyses prepared based on modeling of projected future traffic volumes.


The preliminary needs identified include improvements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities to enhance east-west connectivity throughout the City and between key attractors and destinations. The needs also consider intersection capacity improvements, vehicular connectivity, and safety improvements. The needs included as part of this memorandum were reviewed by the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members as well as at the February 10 Public Workshop. Alternatives to address the identified needs are provided in Technical Memorandum \#5, with additional information to facilitate evaluation of the alternatives.

## APPENDICES

## Appendix A Year 2035 Future Traffic Conditions Worksheets

## Appendix B 2035 Future Queuing Worksheets

## Appendix A Year 2035 Future Traffic Condition Worksheet

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  | 7 | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | * | 7 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 38 | 525 | 51 | 27 | 503 | 192 | 75 | 63 | 40 | 165 | 133 | 313 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 38 | 525 | 51 | 27 | 503 | 192 | 75 | 63 | 40 | 165 | 133 | 313 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1662 | 1711 |  | 1662 | 1733 | 1458 |  | 1647 | 1488 |  | 1686 | 1403 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.30 | 1.00 |  | 0.27 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.65 | 1.00 |  | 0.75 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 533 | 1711 |  | 464 | 1733 | 1458 |  | 1095 | 1488 |  | 1301 | 1403 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 39 | 541 | 53 | 28 | 519 | 198 | 77 | 65 | 41 | 170 | 137 | 323 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 155 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 39 | 590 | 0 | 28 | 519 | 88 | 0 | 142 | 12 | 0 | 307 | 168 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 2\% | 3\% | 4\% | 0\% | 1\% | 1\% | 6\% |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 6 | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  | 4 |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 33.4 | 30.3 |  | 31.6 | 29.4 | 29.4 |  | 19.5 | 19.5 |  | 18.5 | 18.5 |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 33.4 | 30.3 |  | 31.6 | 29.4 | 29.4 |  | 19.5 | 19.5 |  | 18.5 | 18.5 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.51 | 0.46 |  | 0.48 | 0.45 | 0.45 |  | 0.30 | 0.30 |  | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Clearance Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.0 | 4.5 |  | 2.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 322 | 785 |  | 262 | 771 | 649 |  | 323 | 439 |  | 364 | 393 |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.01 | c0.34 |  | 0.00 | 0.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.06 |  |  | 0.05 |  | 0.06 |  | 0.13 | 0.01 |  | c0. 24 | 0.12 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.12 | 0.75 |  | 0.11 | 0.67 | 0.14 |  | 0.44 | 0.03 |  | 0.84 | 0.43 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 9.2 | 14.7 |  | 10.2 | 14.5 | 10.8 |  | 18.8 | 16.5 |  | 22.4 | 19.4 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.1 | 4.6 |  | 0.1 | 2.8 | 0.2 |  | 0.7 | 0.0 |  | 15.5 | 0.3 |
| Delay (s) | 9.2 | 19.3 |  | 10.3 | 17.3 | 11.0 |  | 19.5 | 16.5 |  | 37.9 | 19.7 |
| Level of Service | A | B |  | B | B | B |  | B | B |  | D | B |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 18.7 |  |  | 15.3 |  |  | 18.9 |  |  | 28.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 20.4 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | C |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.76 |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 66.0 | Sum of lost time (s) | 15.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $71.6 \%$ | ICU Level of Service | C |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 18 | 84 | 54 | 378 | 260 | 97 | 190 | 95 | 76 | 45 | 137 | 55 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 18 | 84 | 54 | 378 | 260 | 97 | 190 | 95 | 76 | 45 | 137 | 55 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.94 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 0.97 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1662 | 1594 |  | 1498 | 1683 | 1430 |  | 1650 | 1458 |  | 1632 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.58 | 1.00 |  | 0.49 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.62 | 1.00 |  | 0.89 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1014 | 1594 |  | 769 | 1683 | 1430 |  | 1052 | 1458 |  | 1460 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 20 | 95 | 61 | 430 | 295 | 110 | 216 | 108 | 86 | 51 | 156 | 62 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 20 | 126 | 0 | 430 | 295 | 44 | 0 | 324 | 40 | 0 | 260 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 1\% | 7\% | 11\% | 4\% | 4\% | 2\% | 4\% | 2\% | 6\% | 3\% | 0\% |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 6 | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 17.7 | 16.6 |  | 36.3 | 30.2 | 30.2 |  | 30.2 | 30.2 |  | 29.2 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 17.7 | 16.6 |  | 36.3 | 30.2 | 30.2 |  | 30.2 | 30.2 |  | 29.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.23 | 0.22 |  | 0.48 | 0.40 | 0.40 |  | 0.40 | 0.40 |  | 0.39 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 5.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.0 | 4.5 |  | 2.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 2.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 247 | 350 |  | 511 | 673 | 572 |  | 420 | 583 |  | 564 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Prot | 0.00 | 0.08 |  | c0.16 | 0.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.02 |  |  | c0.24 |  | 0.03 |  | c0.31 | 0.03 |  | 0.18 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.08 | 0.36 |  | 0.84 | 0.44 | 0.08 |  | 0.77 | 0.07 |  | 0.46 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 22.4 | 24.9 |  | 15.0 | 16.5 | 14.0 |  | 19.7 | 14.0 |  | 17.3 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.1 | 1.1 |  | 11.8 | 0.8 | 0.1 |  | 8.2 | 0.0 |  | 0.2 |  |
| Delay (s) | 22.4 | 26.0 |  | 26.7 | 17.3 | 14.1 |  | 27.9 | 14.0 |  | 17.5 |  |
| Level of Service | C | C |  | C | B | B |  | C | B |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 25.6 |  |  | 21.7 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  | 17.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 22.2 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | C |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.87 |  | 15.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 75.5 | Sum of lost time (s) | D |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $78.0 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | * | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | F |  | * | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 88 | 338 | 155 | 43 | 225 | 2 | 201 | 54 | 37 | 18 | 101 | 214 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 88 | 338 | 155 | 43 | 225 | 2 | 201 | 54 | 37 | 18 | 101 | 214 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.94 |  | 1.00 | 0.90 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1614 | 1716 | 1473 | 1662 | 1750 | 1488 | 1630 | 1623 |  | 1662 | 1547 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.43 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.39 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.26 | 1.00 |  | 0.69 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 739 | 1716 | 1473 | 682 | 1750 | 1488 | 451 | 1623 |  | 1212 | 1547 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 97 | 371 | 170 | 47 | 247 | 2 | 221 | 59 | 41 | 20 | 111 | 235 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 97 | 371 | 56 | 47 | 247 | 1 | 221 | 82 | 0 | 20 | 285 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 2\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  | 2 | 6 |  | 6 | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 37.1 | 30.1 | 30.1 | 30.5 | 26.8 | 26.8 | 42.1 | 35.2 |  | 26.8 | 24.9 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 37.1 | 30.1 | 30.1 | 30.5 | 26.8 | 26.8 | 42.1 | 35.2 |  | 26.8 | 24.9 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.41 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.34 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.46 | 0.39 |  | 0.29 | 0.27 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 368 | 568 | 487 | 268 | 515 | 438 | 367 | 628 |  | 366 | 423 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.02 | c0. 22 |  | 0.01 | 0.14 |  | c0.08 | 0.05 |  | 0.00 | c0.18 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.09 |  | 0.04 | 0.05 |  | 0.00 | 0.20 |  |  | 0.01 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.26 | 0.65 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.48 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.13 |  | 0.05 | 0.67 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 17.4 | 25.9 | 21.1 | 21.0 | 26.3 | 22.6 | 16.9 | 18.0 |  | 22.9 | 29.4 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.1 | 2.7 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 3.3 |  |
| Delay (s) | 17.5 | 28.6 | 21.2 | 21.1 | 27.0 | 22.6 | 18.8 | 18.0 |  | 22.9 | 32.7 |  |
| Level of Service | B | C | C | C | C | C | B | B |  | C | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 25.0 |  |  | 26.1 |  |  | 18.6 |  |  | 32.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 25.5 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | C |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.65 |  | 20.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 90.9 | Sum of lost time (s) | D |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $73.1 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |


c Critical Lane Group

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  | \% | $\uparrow \uparrow$ |  |  | 4 |  |  | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 677 | 69 | 74 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 43 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 677 | 69 | 74 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 43 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Lane Width | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 16 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  |  |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor |  |  |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  |  |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.95 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.97 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  |  |  | 1662 | 3152 |  |  | 1847 |  |  | 1643 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.80 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  |  |  | 1662 | 3152 |  |  | 1512 |  |  | 1643 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 744 | 76 | 81 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 47 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 809 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% | 14\% | 4\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Turn Type |  |  |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |  | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | , |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  |  |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  |  | 26.0 |  |  | 26.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  |  |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  |  | 26.0 |  |  | 26.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  | 0.49 | 0.49 |  |  | 0.38 |  |  | 0.38 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  |  |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  |  |  | 806 | 1529 |  |  | 578 |  |  | 628 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  | c0.26 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  | 0.05 |  |  |  | c0.09 |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  | 0.10 | 0.53 |  |  | 0.25 |  |  | 0.14 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  |  |  | 9.4 | 12.1 |  |  | 14.3 |  |  | 13.7 |  |
| Progression Factor |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  |  |  | 0.2 | 1.3 |  |  | 1.0 |  |  | 0.5 |  |
| Delay (s) |  |  |  | 9.7 | 13.4 |  |  | 15.3 |  |  | 14.2 |  |
| Level of Service |  |  |  | A | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 13.1 |  |  | 15.3 |  |  | 14.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 13.5 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | B |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.40 |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 68.0 | Sum of lost time (s) | 9.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $44.5 \%$ | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 91 | 118 | 76 | 30 | 2 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 91 | 118 | 76 | 30 | 2 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 0 | 7 | 50 | 0 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 5 | 108 | 140 | 90 | 36 | 2 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 409 | 23 | 57 | 249 | 29 | 51 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 409 | 23 | 57 | 249 | 29 | 51 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | Stop | - | Yield | - | None |
| Storage Length | 150 | 0 | - | - | 300 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 470 | 26 | 66 | 286 | 33 | 59 |



[^2]Synchro 8 Report

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection <br> Int Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 207 | 71 | 71 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 2 | 232 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 207 | 71 | 71 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 2 | 232 |
| 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 | - | - | Free | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | Stop |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | 115 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 6 |
| Mumt Flow | 0 | 252 | 87 | 87 | 244 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 2 | 283 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 244 | 0 | - |  | 252 | 0 | 0 | 669 | 669 | 244 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 417 | 417 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 252 | 252 |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.1 | - | - |  | 4.1 | - | - | 6.71 | 6.5 | 6.26 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 5.71 | 5.5 |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | 5.71 | 5.5 |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.2 | - | - |  | 2.2 | - | - | 3.779 | 4 | 3.354 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1334 | - | 0 |  | 1325 | - | - | 381 | 381 | 785 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | 0 |  | - | - | - | 607 | 595 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | 0 |  | - | - | - | 727 | 702 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1334 | - | - |  | 1325 | - | - | 356 | 0 | 785 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 356 | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - |  |  |  | - | - | 567 | 0 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 727 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  |  |  | 2.1 |  |  | 12.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | WBR | BLn1 | BLn2 |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1334 | - | 1325 | - | - | 356 | 785 |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - |  | 0.065 | - | - | 0.13 | 0.36 |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 0 | - | 7.9 | - | - | 16.6 | 12.1 |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | A | - | - | C | B |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | 0.2 | - | - | 0.4 | 1.6 |  |  |  |




[^3]Synchro 8 Report

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 31 | 20 | 138 | 43 | 14 | 133 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 31 | 20 | 138 | 43 | 14 | 133 |
| 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 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 82 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 38 | 24 | 168 | 52 | 17 | 162 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 7.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 5 | 2 | 57 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 127 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 5 | 2 | 57 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 127 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| 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 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 6 | 2 | 68 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 151 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 6 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 69 | 45 | 664 | 222 | 159 | 545 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 69 | 45 | 664 | 222 | 159 | 545 |
| 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 | - | - | - | 125 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 73 | 47 | 699 | 234 | 167 | 574 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 56 | 115 | 283 | 37 | 78 | 235 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 56 | 115 | 283 | 37 | 78 | 235 |
| 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 | 175 | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 60 | 122 | 301 | 39 | 83 | 250 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 62 | 28 | 144 | 66 | 28 | 175 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 62 | 28 | 144 | 66 | 28 | 175 |
| 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 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 16 | 3 | 10 | 8 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 64 | 29 | 148 | 68 | 29 | 180 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 19.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBU | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBU | NBL | NBT | NBR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 70 | 228 | 30 | 0 | 46 | 288 | 123 | 0 | 13 | 55 | 19 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 70 | 228 | 30 | 0 | 46 | 288 | 123 | 0 | 13 | 55 | 19 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.92 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.92 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 15 |
| Mumt Flow | 0 | 83 | 271 | 36 | 0 | 55 | 343 | 146 | 0 | 15 | 65 | 23 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach |  | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach |  | WB |  |  |  | EB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left |  | SB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay |  | 21.3 |  |  |  | 21.9 |  |  |  | 12.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS |  | C |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $15 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $42 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $63 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $22 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 87 | 298 | 30 | 334 | 123 | 208 |
| LT Vol | 13 | 70 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 88 |
| Through Vol | 55 | 228 | 0 | 288 | 0 | 68 |
| RT Vol | 19 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 123 | 52 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 104 | 355 | 36 | 398 | 146 | 248 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.212 | 0.672 | 0.06 | 0.74 | 0.236 | 0.467 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.36 | 6.818 | 6.034 | 6.696 | 5.806 | 6.785 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 487 | 529 | 593 | 541 | 618 | 530 |
| Service Time | 5.424 | 4.565 | 3.781 | 4.441 | 3.551 | 4.834 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.214 | 0.671 | 0.061 | 0.736 | 0.236 | 0.468 |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.4 | 22.5 | 9.2 | 26.2 | 10.3 | 15.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | A | D | B | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.8 | 5 | 0.2 | 6.3 | 0.9 | 2.5 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | SBU | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Trafic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 88 | 68 | 52 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 88 | 68 | 52 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 105 | 81 | 62 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Number OLanes |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay |  | 15.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS |  | C |  |  |
| Lane |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 17 | 61 | 89 | 21 | 55 | 123 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 17 | 61 | 89 | 21 | 55 | 123 |
| 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 | 75 | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 7 | 12 | 4 | 11 | 2 | 4 |
| Mvmt Flow | 18 | 64 | 94 | 22 | 58 | 129 |



[^4]Synchro 8 Report

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 23.4 | $C$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | EBU | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBU | NBL | NBT | NBR |
| Movement | 0 | 5 | 236 | 142 | 0 | 44 | 230 | 2 | 0 | 143 | 26 | 52 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 5 | 236 | 142 | 0 | 44 | 230 | 2 | 0 | 143 | 26 | 52 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0.92 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.92 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.92 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 6 | 306 | 184 | 0 | 57 | 29 | 3 | 0 | 186 | 34 | 68 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Confficting Approach Left | SB | NB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | SB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| HCM Control Delay | 27.8 | 24.3 | 17.1 |
| HCM LOS | C | C |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $65 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $12 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $96 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $24 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 221 | 383 | 276 | 49 |
| LT Vol | 143 | 5 | 44 | 2 |
| Through Vol | 26 | 236 | 230 | 47 |
| RT Vol | 52 | 142 | 2 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 287 | 497 | 358 | 64 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.532 | 0.798 | 0.692 | 0.132 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.676 | 5.776 | 6.948 | 7.442 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 540 | 627 | 520 | 480 |
| Service Time | 4.728 | 3.822 | 4.999 | 5.518 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.531 | 0.793 | 0.688 | 0.133 |
| HCM Control Delay | 17.1 | 27.8 | 24.3 | 11.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | D | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 3.1 | 7.9 | 5.3 | 0.5 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBU | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBU | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBU | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 31 | 186 | 15 | 0 | 13 | 270 | 53 | 0 | 24 | 51 | 4 | 0 | 59 | 62 | 25 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 31 | 186 | 15 | 0 | 13 | 270 | 53 | 0 | 24 | 51 | 4 | 0 | 59 | 62 | 25 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 33 | 196 | 16 | 0 | 14 | 284 | 56 | 0 | 25 | 54 | 4 | 0 | 62 | 65 | 26 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Confficting Approach Left | SB | 1 | EB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | SB | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | 1 | WB | 1 |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 12 | 1 | 1 |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.6 | $B$ | $A$ | 10.2 |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |


| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1WBLn1 SBLn1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $30 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $65 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $42 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 79 | 232 | 336 | 146 |
| LT Vol | 24 | 31 | 13 | 59 |
| Through Vol | 51 | 186 | 270 | 62 |
| RT Vol | 4 | 15 | 53 | 25 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 83 | 244 | 354 | 154 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.133 | 0.336 | 0.467 | 0.236 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.772 | 5.067 | 4.858 | 5.517 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 624 | 713 | 746 | 655 |
| Service Time | 3.78 | 3.067 | 2.858 | 3.521 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.133 | 0.342 | 0.475 | 0.235 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.7 | 10.6 | 12 | 10.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | B | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.5 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 0.9 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 57 | 67 | 11 | 74 | 17 | 119 | 162 | 9 | 34 | 169 | 5 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 57 | 67 | 11 | 74 | 17 | 119 | 162 | 9 | 34 | 169 | 5 |
| 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 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Mumt Flow | 8 | 58 | 68 | 11 | 76 | 17 | 121 | 165 | 9 | 35 | 172 | 5 |



[^5]Synchro 8 Report

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBL | NBL | NBT |  |  |  |
| Movement | 69 | 7 | 11 | 78 | SBT | SBR |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 69 | 7 | 11 | 78 | 77 | 45 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 45 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | - | None | - | None | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | 0 | - | - | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 96 | 96 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 72 | 7 | 11 | 81 | 11 | 0 |  |
| Mvmt Flow |  |  |  |  | 80 | 47 |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 8.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBU | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBU | NBL | NBT | NBR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 82 | 13 | 0 | 16 | 93 | 11 | 0 | 18 | 83 | 25 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 82 | 13 | 0 | 16 | 93 | 11 | 0 | 18 | 83 | 25 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.92 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.92 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 101 | 16 | 0 | 20 | 115 | 14 | 0 | 22 | 102 | 31 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay |  |  | 8.7 |  |  | 8.9 |  |  |  | 8.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |
| Lane |  | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vol Left, \% |  | 14\% | 0\% | 13\% | 12\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vol Thru, \% |  | 66\% | 86\% | 78\% | 88\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vol Right, \% |  | 20\% | 14\% | 9\% | 0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Vol by Lane |  | 126 | 95 | 120 | 69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LT Vol |  | 18 | 0 | 16 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Through Vol |  | 83 | 82 | 93 | 61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Vol |  | 25 | 13 | 11 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Flow Rate |  | 156 | 117 | 148 | 85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Geometry Grp |  | , | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree of Util (X) |  | 0.197 | 0.155 | 0.193 | 0.112 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (Hd) |  | 4.55 | 4.766 | 4.699 | 4.745 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Convergence, Y/N |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cap |  | 787 | 751 | 763 | 754 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service Time |  | 2.584 | 2.804 | 2.735 | 2.784 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.198 | 0.156 | 0.194 | 0.113 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay |  | 8.7 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 8.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th-tile Q |  | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBL | NBR | SEL | SER |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 94 | 86 | 0 | 69 | 84 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 94 | 86 | 0 | 69 | 84 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 102 | 93 | 0 | 75 | 91 |





| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Minor1 |  |  |  |  | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 673 | 651 | 270 |  | 669 | 645 | 247 |  | 278 | 0 | 0 | 259 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 352 | 352 | - |  | 286 | 286 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 321 | 299 | - |  | 383 | 359 | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 4.1 | - | - | 4.1 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.1 | 5.5 | - |  | 6.1 | 5.5 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |  | 6.1 | 5.5 | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 4 | 3.3 |  | 3.5 | 4 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 | - | - | 2.2 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 372 | 390 | 774 |  | 374 | 393 | 797 |  | 1296 | - | - | 1317 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 669 | 635 | - |  | 726 | 679 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 695 | 670 | - |  | 644 | 631 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 312 | 372 | 774 |  | 320 | 375 | 797 |  | 1296 | - | - | 1317 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 312 | 372 | - |  | 320 | 375 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 659 | 615 | - |  | 715 | 669 | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 616 | 660 | - |  | 564 | 611 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 15.8 |  |  |  | 16.7 |  |  |  | 0.6 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBLn1 | NBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1296 | - | - | 408 | 395 | 1317 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.015 | - |  | 0.186 | 0.219 | 0.031 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.8 | - | - | 15.8 | 16.7 | 7.8 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | C | C | A | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.1 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 9.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBL | EBT |  |  |  |
| Movement | 324 | 395 | 285 | 32 | 40 | 382 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 324 | 395 | 0 | 32 | 40 | 382 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| Sign Control | - | None | - | None | - | Yield |
| RT Channelized | 175 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Storage Length | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 381 | 465 | 335 | 38 | 47 | 449 |
| Mvmt Flow |  |  |  |  |  |  |



[^6]Synchro 8 Report


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  |  |  |  |  | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 596 | 676 | 261 |  |  |  | 261 | 0 | 0 | 403 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 268 | 268 | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 328 | 408 | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.28 |  |  |  | 4.1 | - | - | 4.1 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.4 | 5.5 | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.4 | 5.5 | - |  |  |  |  | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 4 | 3.372 |  |  |  | 2.2 | - | - | 2.2 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 470 | 378 | 763 |  |  |  | 1315 | - | - | 1167 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 782 | 691 | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 734 | 600 | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 468 | 0 | 763 |  |  |  | 1315 | - | - | 1167 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 468 | 0 | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 780 | 0 | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 733 | 0 | - |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBREBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1315 | - | 754 | 1167 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.002 | - | 0.303 | 0.003 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.7 | 0 | 11.8 | 8.1 | 0 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B | A | A | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | 1.3 | 0 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^7]Synchro 8 Report


| Major/Minor |  |  | Minor1 |  |  |  | Major1 |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All |  |  |  | 481 | 450 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 452 | 450 | 0 |
| Stage 1 |  |  |  | 450 | 450 | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 |  |
| Stage 2 |  |  |  | 31 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 452 | 450 |  |
| Critical Hdwy |  |  |  | 6.43 | 6.5 | 6.2 | - | - | - | 6.4 | 6.5 |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 |  |  |  | 5.43 | 5.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.4 | 5.5 |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy |  |  |  | 3.527 | 4 | 3.3 | - | - | - | 3.5 | 4 |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver |  |  |  | 542 | 508 | 1031 | - | - | - | 569 | 508 |  |
| Stage 1 |  |  |  | 640 | 575 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 645 | 575 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver |  |  |  | 542 | 0 | 1031 | - | - | - | 569 | 0 |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver |  |  |  | 542 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 569 | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 |  |  |  | 640 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| Stage 2 |  |  |  | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 645 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s |  |  |  | 15.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | - 546 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | - 0.398 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | - 15.9 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | - C | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | - 1.9 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^8]| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 6.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 100 | 23 | 114 | 75 | 0 | 36 | 54 | 39 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 1 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 100 | 23 | 114 | 75 | 0 | 36 | 54 | 39 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 |  | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mumt Flow | 111 | 26 | 127 | 83 | 0 | 40 | 60 | 43 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 1 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |  |  |  | Minor1 |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 40 | 0 | 0 |  | 152 | 0 |  | 0 | 498 | 518 | 89 | 520 | 561 | 20 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | 311 | 311 | - | 187 | 187 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | 187 | 207 |  | 333 | 374 |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.1 | - | - |  | 4.1 | - |  | - | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.25 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | 6.1 | 5.5 | - | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - |  |  | - |  | - | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.2 | - | - |  | 2.2 | - |  | - | 3.5 | 4 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.345 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1583 | - | - |  | 1441 | - |  | - | 486 | 465 | 975 | 470 | 439 | 1049 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | 704 | 662 | - | 819 | 749 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | 819 | 734 | - | 685 | 621 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1583 | - | - |  | 1441 | - |  | - | 436 | 403 | 975 | 388 | 381 | 1049 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | 436 | 403 | - | 388 | 381 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | 649 | 610 | - | 755 | 705 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | 770 | 691 | - | 586 | 573 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 3.1 |  |  |  | 5.2 |  |  |  | 16.2 |  |  | 14.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | R SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 424 | 1583 | - | - | 1441 | - | - | - 403 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.246 | 0.07 | - |  | 0.058 | - | - | - 0.047 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 16.2 | 7.4 | 0 | - | 7.7 | 0 | - | 14.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | A | A | - | A | A | - | - B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 1 | 0.2 | - | - | 0.2 | - | - | - 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^9]Synchro 8 Report

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - |  | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 252 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR | NEL | NER |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 47 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 47 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | - | None | - | None | - |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | 10 | - | - | 0 |  | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 51 |
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | SBL | SBR | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 407 | 0 | 217 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 407 | 0 | 217 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | - | - | None | - |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 442 | 0 | 236 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 275 | 197 | 120 | 0 | 226 | 133 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 275 | 197 | 120 | 0 | 226 | 133 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 175 | - | - | - | 0 | 100 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 306 | 219 | 133 | 0 | 251 | 148 |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection } \\ \text { Int Delay, s/veh } & 18.3\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 85 | 33 | 28 | 89 | 37 | 91 | 30 | 155 | 0 | 123 | 219 | 86 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 85 | 33 | 28 | 89 | 37 | 91 | 30 | 155 | 0 | 123 | 219 | 86 |
| 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 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 175 | - | - | 260 | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | $\stackrel{-}{-}$ |  | 0 |  | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 97 | 38 | 32 | 101 | 42 | 103 | 34 | 176 | 0 | 140 | 249 | 98 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Minor1 |  |  |  |  | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 894 | 821 | 298 |  | 856 | 870 | 176 |  | 347 | 0 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 577 | 577 | - |  | 244 | 244 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 317 | 244 | - |  | 612 | 626 | - |  |  | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.1 | 6.55 | 6.22 |  | 7.11 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 4.1 | - | - | 4.1 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.1 | 5.55 |  |  | 6.11 | 5.5 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.1 | 5.55 |  |  | 6.11 | 5.5 | - |  |  | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 4.045 | 3.318 |  | 3.509 | 4 | 3.3 |  | 2.2 | - | - | 2.2 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 264 | 306 | 741 |  | 279 | 292 | 872 |  | 1223 | - | - | 1412 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 506 | 497 | - |  | 762 | 708 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 698 | 699 | - |  | 482 | 480 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 185 | 268 | 741 |  | 216 | 256 | 872 |  | 1223 | - | - | 1412 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 185 | 268 | - |  | 216 | 256 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 492 | 448 | - |  | 741 | 688 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 562 | 680 | - |  | 381 | 432 | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 50.3 |  |  |  | 42.8 |  |  |  | 1.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBLn1 | VBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1223 | - | - | 235 | 328 | 1412 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.028 | - |  | 0.706 | 0.752 | 0.099 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8 | - | - | 50.3 | 42.8 | 7.8 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | F | E | A | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | - | 4.7 | 5.8 | 0.3 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 30.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 311 | 0 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 439 | 47 | 51 | 218 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 311 | 0 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 439 | 47 | 51 | 218 | 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 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 2 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 334 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 472 | 51 | 55 | 234 | 0 |
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2 |  |  | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 107 | 112 | 638 | 0 | 0 | 234 | 372 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 107 | 112 | 638 | 0 | 0 | 234 | 372 |
| 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 | - | - | Stop | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 |  | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 |
| Mumt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 118 | 123 | 701 | 0 | 0 | 257 | 409 |


| Major/Minor |  |  | Minor1 |  |  |  | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All |  |  |  | 1409 | 1613 | 701 | 666 | 0 | 0 | 701 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 |  |  |  | 947 | 947 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 |  |  |  | 462 | 666 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy |  |  |  | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.24 | 4.17 | - | - | 4.1 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 |  |  |  | 5.4 | 5.5 | - | - | - |  |  | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 |  |  |  | 5.4 | 5.5 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy |  |  |  | 3.5 | 4 | 3.336 | 2.263 | - | - | 2.2 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver |  |  |  | 154 | 105 | 435 | 900 | - | - | 905 | - |  |
| Stage 1 |  |  |  | 380 | 342 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 |  |  |  | 638 | 460 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver |  |  |  | 120 | 0 | 435 | 900 | - | - | 905 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver |  |  |  | 120 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 |  |  |  | 295 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 |  |  |  | 638 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s |  |  |  | 13.5 |  |  | 1.4 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 900 | - | - 577 | 905 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.137 | - | - 0.27 | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9.6 | 0 | - 13.5 | 0 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - B | A | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.5 | - | - 1.1 | 0 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 44 | 40 | 652 | 93 | 20 | 562 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 44 | 40 | 652 | 93 | 20 | 562 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - | Stop | - | None | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | 50 | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 47 | 43 | 701 | 100 | 22 | 604 |  |
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 33 | 220 | 188 | 504 | 362 | 12 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 33 | 220 | 188 | 504 | 362 | 12 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 75 | 0 | 50 | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 0 |
| Mumt Flow | 36 | 239 | 204 | 548 | 393 | 13 |
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# Appendix B Year 2035 Future Queuing Worksheet 

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 39 | 594 | 28 | 519 | 198 | 142 | 41 | 307 | 323 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.10 | 0.72 | 0.08 | 0.66 | 0.26 | 0.42 | 0.08 | 0.81 | 0.57 |
| Control Delay | 7.5 | 21.4 | 7.4 | 20.5 | 3.3 | 23.8 | 0.9 | 41.1 | 12.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 7.5 | 21.4 | 7.4 | 20.5 | 3.3 | 23.8 | 0.9 | 41.1 | 12.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 7 | 150 | 5 | 177 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 116 | 34 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 18 | \#406 | 15 | 297 | 35 | 101 | 4 | \#259 | 113 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 703 |  | 1481 |  | 491 |  | 582 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) | 250 |  | 150 |  | 175 |  | 175 |  | 60 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 470 | 878 | 544 | 987 | 916 | 445 | 659 | 508 | 679 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.08 | 0.68 | 0.05 | 0.53 | 0.22 | 0.32 | 0.06 | 0.60 | 0.48 |

## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\square$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 20 | 156 | 430 | 295 | 110 | 324 | 86 | 270 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.07 | 0.50 | 0.87 | 0.41 | 0.16 | 0.73 | 0.13 | 0.45 |
| Control Delay | 12.6 | 25.7 | 35.8 | 17.7 | 4.4 | 30.1 | 5.2 | 17.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 12.6 | 25.7 | 35.8 | 17.7 | 4.4 | 30.1 | 5.2 | 17.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 5 | 47 | 138 | 82 | 0 | 114 | 2 | 77 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 15 | 97 | \#279 | 180 | 30 | \#255 | 27 | 150 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 430 |  | 634 |  | 582 |  | 810 |
| Turn Bay Length (f) | 125 |  | 425 |  | 425 |  | 25 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 526 | 909 | 499 | 943 | 849 | 457 | 676 | 622 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.04 | 0.17 | 0.86 | 0.31 | 0.13 | 0.71 | 0.13 | 0.43 |

## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $\dagger$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 97 | 371 | 170 | 47 | 247 | 2 | 221 | 100 | 20 | 346 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.25 | 0.62 | 0.27 | 0.15 | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.78 |
| Control Delay | 19.4 | 32.9 | 5.9 | 18.9 | 32.7 | 0.0 | 23.1 | 15.4 | 15.9 | 37.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 19.4 | 32.9 | 5.9 | 18.9 | 32.7 | 0.0 | 23.1 | 15.4 | 15.9 | 37.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 30 | 174 | 0 | 14 | 110 | 0 | 72 | 21 | 6 | 130 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 82 | 370 | 51 | 46 | 247 | 0 | 149 | 70 | 21 | 287 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1481 |  |  | 965 |  |  | 356 |  | 1149 |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) | 100 |  |  |  |  | 75 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 478 | 778 | 761 | 470 | 793 | 729 | 500 | 941 | 595 | 821 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.48 | 0.22 | 0.10 | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.44 | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.42 |

Intersection Summary


## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

|  |  | $\leftarrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | WBL | WBT | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group | 77 | 820 | 143 | 118 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0.10 | 0.53 | 0.25 | 0.18 |
| v/c Ratio | 9.9 | 13.4 | 15.8 | 9.8 |
| Control Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Delay | 9.9 | 13.4 | 15.8 | 9.8 |
| Total Delay | 16 | 113 | 40 | 19 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 37 | 162 | 78 | 49 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 390 | 202 | 385 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 40 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 806 | 1540 | 578 | 656 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0.10 | 0.53 | 0.25 | 0.18 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |

Intersection Summary


[^0]:    AWSC = All-way stop control, $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}=$ Not applicable, $\mathrm{EB}=$ Eastbound, $\mathrm{WB}=$ Westbound, $\mathrm{SB}=$ Southbound, $\mathrm{NB}=$ Northbound

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Future forecast volumes are not expected to increase to a great enough degree on a typical weekday to warrant a future conditions evaluation of bicycle level of traffic stress.
    ${ }^{2}$ Bicycle needs aim to reduce the LTS to a rating of 2 , which is considered appealing to a majority of the bike-riding population and therefore, is the desired target on most arterials and collectors.
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