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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following report documents the methodology, analyses, findings, and conclusions of our Traffic Impact Analysis for a proposed manufactured home park located along the westbound side of Lasater Road in the City of Dallas, Dallas County, Texas. It is proposed to construct 265 manufactured homes, with access to the site provided via two full movement driveways along Lasater Road.

Due to the development generating a maximum of 122 peak hour trips and 1,325 daily trips, a Traffic Impact Analysis was performed. As confirmed within the Traffic Study Scope Proposal, analysis of the Existing, 2022 Background, 2022 Project Buildout, and 2027 5-year Horizon Buildout conditions were conducted at the following intersections:

- Lasater Road and Lawson Road
- Lasater Road and East Site Driveway
- Lasater Road and West Site Driveway

As designed, both of the site driveways will operate at acceptable levels of service during both peak hours analyzed. With the addition of the site generated traffic, the intersection of Lawson Road and Lasater Road is anticipated to generally maintain the background levels of service. Several movements operate at levels of service " F " under the existing conditions and will continue to do so with the construction of The Project. As requested by the City of Dallas, the 2019 Existing traffic volumes were compared to the traffic signal warrants set forth within the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. It was determined that several of the warrants are met and as such it is recommended that the City investigate the possibility of future signalization for the intersection to address existing traffic conditions.

Based upon our Traffic Impact Analysis as detailed in the body of this report, it is the professional opinion of Dynamic Traffic, LLC that the adjacent street system of the City of Dallas will not experience any significant degradation in operating conditions with the development of The Project. The site driveways are located to provide safe and efficient access to the adjacent roadway system.

## INTRODUCTION

It is proposed to construct a manufactured home park on a parcel of land that is currently undeveloped, located along the westbound side of Lasater Road in the City of Dallas, Dallas County, Texas, see Figure 1 in Appendix B. The site is located within the MH - Manufactured Home Park district and encompasses 47.39 acres of land. It is proposed to construct 265 manufactured home units (The Project). It is proposed to construct two full movement driveways along Lasater Road for access to The Project.

Dynamic Traffic LLC has been retained to prepare this study to assess the traffic impact associated with the construction of The Project on the adjacent roadway network. This study documents the methodology, analyses, findings and conclusions of our study and includes:

- A Traffic Study Scope Proposal was submitted to The City of Dallas on December 2, 2019. A copy of it is contained in Appendix A.
- A detailed field inspection was conducted to obtain an inventory of existing roadway geometry, traffic control, and location and geometry of the existing intersection.
- Existing traffic data was collected via manual turning movement (MTM) counts during the weekday AM and weekday PM peak periods at the intersection of Lawson Road and Lasater Road.
- Automatic traffic recorder (ATR) counts were conducted for a 24 -hour period on Wednesday, November 20, 2019 along Lasater Road east of Stacey Street.
- Projections of traffic to be generated by the proposed development were prepared utilizing trip generation data as published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Site traffic was then assigned to the adjacent street system based upon the anticipated directional distribution.
- Capacity analyses were conducted for the Existing, 2022 Background, 2022 Buildout, and 2027 Buildout conditions for the study intersections.
- The proposed points of ingress and egress were inspected for adequacy of geometric design, spacing and/or alignment to streets and driveways on the opposite side of the street, relationship to other driveways adjacent to the development, and conformance with accepted design standards.


## EXISTING CONDITIONS

A review of the existing roadway conditions near the proposed site was conducted to provide the basis for assessing the traffic impact of the development. This included field investigations of the surrounding roadways and intersections as well as extensive analyses.

## Existing Roadway Conditions

The following is a description of the roadways in the study area:
Lawson Road is classified on the City of Dallas Thoroughfare Plan as a Principal Arterial (M-6-D(A)) roadway with 100' of right-of-way and a general north/south orientation. The roadway provides two lanes of travel in each direction to the north of its intersection with Lasater Road and one lane of travel in each direction to the south. The posted speed limit is 35 MPH to the north of its intersection with Lasater Road and 30 MPH to the south.

Lasater Road is classified on the City of Dallas Thoroughfare Plan as a Principal Arterial (M-6-D(A)) roadway with 100' of right-of-way and a general east/west orientation. The roadway provides one lane of travel in each direction. In the vicinity of the site the posted speed limit is 30 MPH .

## Existing Traffic Volumes

Manual turning movement (MTM) counts were conducted on Tuesday, November 19, 2019 and Wednesday, November 20, 2019 from 7:00 to 9:00 AM and from 2:00 to 6:00 PM at the intersection of Lasater Road and Lawson Road. Additionally, automatic traffic recorder (ATR) counts were conducted for a 24-hour period on Wednesday, November 20, 2019 along Lasater Road east of Stacey Street.

Review of the collected data reveals that the total volumes experienced at the intersection were higher on Wednesday, November 20, 2019. Therefore, the volumes collected on Wednesday, November 20, 2019 were utilized for analysis. Additionally, the weekday morning peak street hour (PSH) occurs between 7:15-8:15 AM and the weekday evening PSH occurs between 3:45-4:45 PM. Figure 2, located in Appendix C, shows the existing peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersection. All traffic counts are contained in Appendix C.

## FUTURE CONDITIONS

Traffic volumes and operational analyses were developed for both the 2022 Background and Buildout conditions, as well as the 2027 Buildout condition. The Background conditions provide a baseline for assessing the impact of the site development traffic on the roadway system. The process of developing the Background and Buildout traffic volumes and the subsequent analyses is outlined below.

Regardless of whether the subject site is developed or not, traffic volumes on the surrounding roadways are expected to increase as a result of developments throughout the region. As provided on the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) website, a background growth rate of $2.69 \%$ was calculated. Conservatively, a background growth rate of $3 \%$ was utilized.

Future 2022 and 2027 Background traffic volumes were developed by applying the background growth rate of $3.0 \%$ for two (2) and five (5) years, respectively, to the study area roadways existing traffic volumes. Figure 3, in Appendix B, shows the 2022 Background Traffic Volumes, while Figure 6 shows the 2027 Background Traffic Volumes.

## Traffic Generation

Trip generation projections for the proposed manufactured home park were prepared utilizing trip generation research data as published under Land Use Code (LUC) 240 - Mobile Home Park in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) publication, Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition. This publication sets forth trip generation rates based on traffic counts conducted at research sites throughout the country.

Table I
Trip Generation

| Land Use | AM PSH |  |  | PM PSH |  |  | Daily |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |  |
| 265 Unit Mobile Home Park | 21 | 48 | 69 | 76 | 46 | 122 | 1,325 |

Once the magnitude of the site generated traffic is known, it is necessary to assign the traffic to the adjacent street system. The distribution of new traffic to the surrounding roadways is based on the location of primary arterial roadways, major signalized intersections and existing traffic patterns. Table II summarizes the anticipated trip distribution for The Project.

Table II
Trip Distribution

| To/From | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: |
| Lasater Road - East | $35 \%$ |
| Lasater Road - West | $30 \%$ |
| Lawson Road - North | $25 \%$ |
| Lawson Road - South | $10 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Located in Appendix B, Figure 4 illustrates the site generated volumes. The site generated volumes were added to both the 2022 and 2027 Background traffic volumes to generate the 2022 and 2027 Buildout traffic volumes, which are shown in Figures 5 and 7, respectively.

## Intersection Capacity Analysis

The methodology utilized in the capacity analyses is described in the Highway Capacity Manual, published by the Transportation Research Board. In general, the term Level of Service (LOS) is used to provide a "qualitative" evaluation of capacity based upon certain "quantitative" calculations related to empirical values, such as traffic volume and intersection control.

An unsignalized (STOP sign controlled) driveway or side street along a through route is seldom critical from an overall capacity standpoint, however, it may be of great significance to the capacity of the minor cross-route, and it may influence the quality of traffic flow on both. When analyzing an unsignalized intersection, it is assumed that both the major street through and right turn movements are unimpeded and have the right-of-way over all side street traffic and left turns from the major street. All other turning movements in the intersection cross, merge with, or are otherwise impeded by major street movements. Traffic delays at unsignalized intersections are determined by sequentially processing these impeded movements. Table III describes the level of service ranges for unsignalized (stop controlled) intersections.
Level of Service Criteria
Table III

for Unsignalized Intersections $|$\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}

\hline | Level of |
| :---: |
| Service | \& | Average Control Delay |
| :---: |
| (seconds per vehicle) | <br>

\hline a \& 0.0 to 10.0 <br>
\hline b \& 10.1 to 15.0 <br>
\hline c \& 15.1 to 25.0 <br>
\hline d \& 25.1 to 35.0 <br>
\hline e \& 35.1 to 50.0 <br>
\hline f \& greater than 50.0 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

It should be noted that the analyses within the Highway Capacity Manual assume a random arrival for all the movements, which may not be the case if an adjacent traffic signal is present that platoons vehicles.

Operational conditions at the study intersections were analyzed under the Existing, 2022 Background, 2022 Buildout, and 2027 Buildout conditions and are summarized in Tables IV-IX. It should be noted that the existing percentage of trucks and peak hour factors were used in the existing analysis. Copies of the capacity analysis worksheets are contained in Appendix D.

## Lawson Road and Lasater Road

Lasater Road intersects Lawson Road to form a four-leg intersection operating under four-way stop control. The eastbound approach of Lasater Road provides a shared left turn/through lane and a channelized right turn lane, while the westbound approach provides a shared left turn/through/right turn lane. The northbound approach of Lawson Road provides a dedicated left turn lane and a shared through/channelized right turn lane, while the southbound approach provides dedicated left turn, through, and right turn lanes.

Table IV

## Lawson Road and Lasater Road

Morning Peak Hour

| Condition |  | 2019 Existing |  | 2022 Background |  | 2022 Project Buildout |  | $\begin{gathered} 2027 \text { 5-year } \\ \text { Buildout } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach/ Movement |  | LOS | Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ (\mathrm{sec}) \end{gathered}$ | LOS | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec) } \end{gathered}$ | LOS | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec) } \end{gathered}$ |
| EB | LTR | c | 15 | c | 16 | c | 17 | c | 19 |
| WB | LTR | f | 70 | f | 97 | f | 125 | f | 182 |
| NB | L | c | 18 | c | 20 | c | 20 | c | 23 |
|  | TR | d | 28 | d | 32 | d | 33 | e | 44 |
| SB | L | c | 16 | c | 17 | c | 17 | c | 19 |
|  | T | b | 15 | c | 16 | c | 16 | c | 18 |
|  | R | b | 11 | b | 11 | b | 11 | b | 12 |
| Overall |  | e | 37 | e | 47 | f | 59 | f | 82 |

With the addition of site generated traffic, all movements of the intersection are anticipated to operate at background levels of service under both the buildout and 5 -year buildout conditions, with the exception of the northbound through/right movement degrading from level of service " D " in the buildout condition to level of service "E" in the 5 -year buildout condition. It should be noted that the westbound approach of Lasater Road operates with level of service " $F$ " under the existing conditions. As requested by the City of Dallas, a traffic signal warrant analysis was conducted for this intersection and is contained in a subsequent section of this report. See Table IV for individual movement levels of service and delay.

Table V
Lawson Road and Lasater Road
Evening Peak Hour

| Condition |  | 2019 Existing |  | 2022 Background |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2022 \text { Project } \\ \text { Buildout } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2027 \text { 5-year } \\ \text { Buildout } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach/ Movement |  | LOS | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ (\mathrm{sec}) \end{gathered}$ | LOS | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ (\mathrm{sec}) \end{gathered}$ | LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec) } \end{gathered}$ | LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Delay } \\ (\mathrm{sec}) \end{gathered}$ |
| EB | LTR | e | 41 | f | 58 | f | 87 | f | 135 |
| WB | LTR | c | 24 | d | 29 | e | 38 | f | 50 |
| NB | L | c | 15 | c | 17 | c | 17 | c | 19 |
|  | TR | d | 25 | d | 32 | e | 37 | e | 49 |
| SB | L | c | 22 | d | 26 | d | 32 | e | 40 |
|  | T | c | 19 | c | 22 | c | 24 | d | 29 |
|  | R | b | 11 | b | 11 | b | 12 | b | 12 |
| Overall |  | d | 27 | d | 34 | e | 46 | f | 65 |

With the addition of site generated traffic, all movements of the intersection are anticipated to operate at background levels of service under the Buildout condition, with the exception of the westbound approach movement and northbound through/right turn movement, which operates with levels of service "E". Under the 5 -year Buildout condition, all movements will operate with levels of service "E" or better with the exception of the eastbound approach, which operates with a level of service "F" under all conditions, and the westbound approach, which operates with a level of service "F". See Table V for individual movement levels of service and delays.

## Lasater Road and East Site Driveway

The east site driveway is proposed to intersect Lasater Road to form a T-intersection with the southbound approach of the site driveway operating under stop control. The eastbound approach of Lasater Road is proposed to provide a shared left turn/through lane, while the westbound approach is proposed to provide a shared through/right turn lane. The southbound approach of the site driveway is proposed to provide a shared left/right turn lane.

Table VI
Laster Road and East Site Driveway
Morning Peak Hour

| Condition | 2022 Project <br> Buildout |  | 2027 5-year <br> Horizon Buildout |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach/ <br> Movement | LOS | Delay <br> (sec) | LOS | Delay <br> (sec) |
| EB | L | a | 8 | a |
| SB | LR | b | 11 | b |

Table VII
Laster Road and East Site Driveway
Evening Peak Hour

| Condition | 2022 Project <br> Buildout |  | 2027 5-year <br> Horizon Buildout |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach/ <br> Movement | LOS | Delay <br> (sec) | LOS | Delay <br> (sec) |
| EB | L | a | 8 | a |
| SB | LR | b | 13 | b |

As designed, the intersection of Lasater Road and the east site driveway is anticipated to operate with levels of service "B" or better during both the 2022 and 2027 Buildout condition for the peak hours analyzed. See Tables VI and VII for the individual movement delays and levels of service.

## Lasater Road and West Site Driveway

The west site driveway is proposed to intersect Lasater Road to form a T-intersection with the southbound approach of the site driveway operating under stop control. The eastbound approach of Lasater Road is proposed to provide a shared left turn/through lane, while the westbound approach is proposed to provide a shared through/right turn lane. The southbound approach of the site driveway is proposed to provide a shared left/right turn lane.

Table VIII
Laster Road and West Site Driveway
Morning Peak Hour

| Condition | 2022 Project <br> Buildout |  | 2027 5-year <br> Horizon Buildout |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach/ <br> Movement | LOS | Delay <br> (sec) | LOS | Delay <br> (sec) |
| EB | L | a | 8 | a |
| SB | LR | b | 10 | b |

Table IX
Laster Road and West Site Driveway
Evening Peak Hour

| Condition | 2022 Project <br> Buildout |  | 2027 5-year <br> Horizon Buildout |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach/ <br> Movement | LOS | Delay <br> (sec) | LOS | Delay <br> (sec) |  |
| EB | L | a | 8 | a | 8 |
| SB | LR | b | 11 | b | 12 |

As designed, the intersection of Lasater Road and the west site driveway is anticipated to operate with levels of service "B" or better during both the 2022 and 2027 Buildout condition for the peak hours analyzed. See Tables VIII and IX for the individual movement delays and levels of service.

## Link Capacity Analysis

Another measure of a project's impact to the surrounding roadway network is its impact to specific roadway links, or sections of road between intersections. The capacity of a roadway link is primarily a function of its geometric cross section, inclusive of the lane widths, type of divider, number of lanes, etc., however the functional classification of the roadway and its geographic location (urban, suburban, rural, etc.) also play a part. The NCTCOG has developed hourly service capacities per lane within their Dallas-Fort Worth Regional Travel Model, which are summarized in the table below.

Table X
Hourly Service Volume Capacity
per Lane by Area Type and Roadway Function

| Area Type | Principal Arterial |  |  <br> Frontage Road |  |  <br> Local Street |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Divided or <br> One-Way | Undivided <br> Two-Way | Divided or <br> One-Way | Undivided <br> Two-Way | Divided or <br> One-Way | Undivided <br> Two-Way |
|  | 725 | 650 | 725 | 650 | 475 | 425 |
| Outer Business | 775 | 725 | 775 | 725 | 500 | 450 |
| Urban <br> Residential | 850 | 775 | 825 | 750 | 525 | 475 |
| Suburban <br> Residential | 900 | 875 | 900 | 825 | 575 | 525 |
| Rural | 1025 | 925 | 975 | 875 | 600 | 550 |

In order to determine the operational capacity of the roadway link, the volume on the roadway is compared to the link capacity to calculate a ratio of volume to capacity (V/C). Specific levels of service ranges are then assigned to V/C ratios as detailed in Table XI below.

Table XI
Level of Service Criteria for Roadway Links

| Demand / Capacity Ratio (D/C) |  | Level of <br> Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Greater Than | Less Than/Equal To | A or B |
| - | 0.45 | C |
| 0.45 | 0.65 | D |
| 0.65 | 0.80 | E |
| 0.80 | 1.00 | F |
| 1.00 | - |  |

The V/C ratios along Lasater Road were calculated for the 2019 Existing volumes, 2022 Background volumes, 2022 Buildout volumes, and 2027 Buildout volumes. It should be noted that the peak hour capacity numbers were converted to daily capacities using the assumption that the peak hour represents $10 \%$ of the daily capacity. The following table summarizes the results of these analyses.

Table XII
Roadway Link Levels of Service

| Roadway Link | Capacity | 2019 Existing |  |  | 2022 Background |  |  | 2022 Buildout |  |  | 2022 Buildout |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Vol | V/C | LOS | Vol | V/C | LOS | Vol | V/C | LOS | Vol | V/C | LOS |
| Lasater Road | 15,500 | 5656 | 0.36 | A or B | 6180 | 0.40 | A or B | 7041 | 0.45 | C | 8025 | 0.52 | C |

As shown in Table XII above, Lasater Road currently operates at link levels of service "B" and will operate at a link level of service "C" under both of the 2022 Buildout and 2027 Buildout scenarios.

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS

As requested by the City of Dallas, a traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of Lawson Road and Lasater Road has been prepared based upon the criteria set forth within the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Utilizing the 2019 existing traffic volumes illustrated in Figure 2, the intersection satisfies both Warrant 2 - Four Hour Volumes and Warrant 3 - Peak Hour Volumes. It is recommended that the City investigate the possibility of future signalization for the intersection to address existing traffic conditions. Figures I and II below show the existing traffic volumes for Warrants 2 and 3, respectively. The calculations are contained in Appendix E.

Figure I
Warrant 2 Curve


Figure II
Warrant 3 Curve


## TURN LANE ASSESSMENT

## Turn Lane Analysis

The traffic volumes along Lasater Road, as well as those projected for the site, were compared to national criteria to determine if a left turn lane is warranted at the site driveway. The curve warrants set forth by the American Association of State Transportation and Highway Officials (AASHTO) in their publication A policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets do not include criteria for roadways with speed limits less than 40 MPH . Conservatively, the 2027 Buildout traffic volumes were compared to criteria for a 40 MPH roadway and it was determined that both driveways do not meet the warrant for a left turn lane during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours. The calculations are contained in Appendix F.

In addition, Chapter 2 of the TxDOT Access Management Manual was reviewed to see if a right turn lane would be required. Based upon Table 2-3: Auxiliary Lane Thresholds, the volumes do not warrant the construction of a right turn lane at either of the two proposed driveways to Lasater Road. A copy of this study is contained in Appendix F.

## FINDINGS \& CONCLUSIONS

## Findings

Based upon the detailed analyses as documented herein, the following findings are noted:

- The proposed manufactured home park will generate 21 entering trips and 48 exiting trips during the weekday morning peak hour and 76 entering trips and 46 exiting trips during the weekday evening peak hour that are "new" to the adjacent roadway network.
- Access to the site is proposed to be provided via two full movement driveways along Lasater Road.
- With the addition of site generated traffic, the intersection of Lawson Road and Lasater Road will continue to operate at Background levels of service under the Buildout condition with the exception of the northbound through/right turn movement during the morning peak hour and the westbound approach movement and northbound through/right turn movement, which operate with levels of service "E".
- Under the 5-year Buildout condition, all movements will operate with levels of service " E " or better with the exception of the westbound approach during the morning peak hour and the eastbound and westbound approaches during the evening peak hour, which operate with levels of service " $F$ " under all conditions.
- The 2019 Existing volumes at intersection of Lasater Road and Lawson Road were compared to the traffic signal warrants set forth with the MUTCD. It was determined that Signal Warrants 2 and 3 are satisfied under the existing conditions. It is recommended that the City investigate the possibility of future signalization for the intersection to address existing traffic conditions.
- As designed, the intersection of Lasater Road and the east site driveway is anticipated to operate with levels of service "B" or better under both the 2022 and 2027 Buildout conditions for all peak hours analyzed.
- As designed, the intersection of Lasater Road and the west site driveway is anticipated to operate with levels of service "B" or better under both the 2022 and 2027 Buildout conditions for all peak hours analyzed.
- In accordance with the City of Dallas and TxDOT, left and right turn lanes are not warranted at both of the proposed site driveways.


## Conclusions

Based upon our Traffic Impact Analysis as detailed in the body of this report, it is the professional opinion of Dynamic Traffic, LLC that the adjacent street system of the City of Dallas will not experience any significant degradation in operating conditions with the development of The Project. The site driveways are located to provide safe and efficient access to the adjacent roadway system.

## Appendix A Traffic Study Scope

# Traffic Study Scope Proposal 

Manufactured Home Development
Block 8838 - Tracts 14, 15, 22, 24 \& 26
14707 Lasater Road
City of Dallas, Dallas County, TX
DT \# 2450-99-015T

Dynamic Traffic has prepared the following study scoping document for the proposed construction of a 265 unit manufactured home development located along the eastern side of Lasater Road in the City of Dallas, Dallas County, Texas. Based upon the requirements set forth within the Dallas Street Design Manual, dated September 2019, Appendix A-6, Section A, there are eleven (11) modules by which to determine the scope of the traffic study associated with the proposed project. They are as follows:

1. Project Description: It is proposed to construct a 265 unit manufactured home development along the eastern side of Lasater Road. The property is designated as Block 8838 - Tracts 14, $15,22,24 \& 26$ and is currently undeveloped. The property is located within the MH (Manufactured Home Park) Zoning District. It is currently anticipated that two full movement access points will be provided to the development from Lasater Road.
2. Proposed Study Locations:
a. Lasater Road \& Lawson Road
b. Lasater Road \& Site Roadways
3. Proposed Roadway Links:
a. Lasater Road south of Stacey Street
4. Proposed Study Hours:
a. Weekday AM Peak Hours (7:00-9:00 AM)
b. Weekday PM Peak Hours (4:00-6:00 AM)
5. Development Phase: There is no proposed phasing for the project at this time. It is anticipated that the full buildout of the project will be 2022.
6. Proposed Study Scenarios:
a. Existing
b. 2022 Background
c. 2022 Project Buildout
d. 2027 5-year Horizon
7. Preliminary Site Traffic Generation: Trip generation projections for The Project were prepared utilizing trip generation research data as published under Land Use Code 240 Mobile Home Park in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) publication, Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition. The following table summarizes the anticipated trip generation for the project.

|  | AM PSH |  |  | PM PSH |  |  | Daily |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total | Traffic |
| 265 Manufactured Homes | 21 | 48 | 69 | 76 | 46 | 122 | 1325 |

8. Proposed Traffic Growth: Based upon historical count data as provided on the NTCOG website, we have calculated an average annual growth rate of $2.69 \%$. Consequently, we propose to utilize a background growth rate of $3 \%$ per year.
9. Proposed Trip Distribution: The trip distribution will be based on the existing turning movement counts and automatic traffic recorder data.
10. Preliminary Traffic Study Elements: The following elements are proposed to be included in traffic study:
a. Intersection level of service analysis utilizing Synchro 10.
b. Roadway link capacity analyses based upon the NTCOG standards.
c. Site Access, including driveway location, spacing and sight distances.
11. Site Location Map: A Site Location Map is enclosed illustrating all traffic signals and proposed study intersections/roadway segments within a one-mile radius from the subject property. Note that there are no DART stops within one mile of the site.


| From: | Nevarez, David [david.nevarez@dallascityhall.com](mailto:david.nevarez@dallascityhall.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, December 9, 2019 7:33 PM |
| To: | Justin Taylor |
| Cc: | Avatapalli, Shailaja |
| Subject: | RE: TIA Requirements |
| Categories: | Filed by Newforma |

Justin,
The signal warrant analysis is for Lasater at Lawson. Please consider school traffic in your analysis. Please confirm with the school if they have any special events or hours on the date of your observations.
https://www.mesquiteisd.org/school-basics/calendar-test

David Nevarez, P.E., PTOE
City of Dallas | Sustainable Development \& Construction | (214) 671.5115

From: Justin Taylor
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2019 3:28 PM
To: Nevarez, David
Cc: Avatapalli, Shailaja
Subject: RE: TIA Requirements

## External Email!

David - I am just following up on the email below to confirm the requirements for the Traffic Study. Thanks in advance for your help.

## Justin Taylor, PE, PTOE, LEED AP

Principal
Dynamic Traffic

## 1904 Main Street | Lake Como, New Jersey 07719 <br> PH: (732) 681-0760 Ext. 1131 | Fax: (732) 974-3521 | Cell: (732) 766-2485

## From: Justin Taylor

Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2019 2:14 PM
To: 'Nevarez, David' [david.nevarez@dallascityhall.com](mailto:david.nevarez@dallascityhall.com)
Cc: Avatapalli, Shailaja [s.avatapalli@dallascityhall.com](mailto:s.avatapalli@dallascityhall.com)
Subject: RE: TIA Requirements
David - thanks for the quick response. To answer your question, we do not currently anticipate any cross connection to Shannon Road, the only access points would be the 2 full movement roadway connections to Lasater Road. We will get moving right away on the traffic study. Just to clarify, we do not need to study Lasater Road and Lawson Road because it is an unsignalized intersection, correct? And you are looking for a traffic signal warrant analysis for the site driveways, including the school peak hour, correct?

## Justin Taylor, PE, PTOE, LEED AP

Principal
Dynamic Traffic
1904 Main Street | Lake Como, New Jersey 07719
PH: (732) 681-0760 Ext. 1131 | Fax: (732) 974-3521 | Cell: (732) 766-2485

From: Nevarez, David [mailto:david.nevarez@dallascityhall.com]
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2019 4:44 PM
To: Justin Taylor [itaylor@dynamictraffic.com](mailto:itaylor@dynamictraffic.com)
Cc: Avatapalli, Shailaja [s.avatapall@dallascityhall.com](mailto:s.avatapall@dallascityhall.com)
Subject: RE: TIA Requirements
Justin,
During your field observations, you'll see that Lawson at Lasater is not signalized. A signal was not warranted in 2016 when we did our last study. We also received a TIA for this site in recent weeks. I believe the case got denied which explains why the site is now being developed with mobile homes. Let me know if you need me to check.

In any case, your study should include a traffic signal warrant analysis including school traffic peak hours. Also, will the site plan provide access directly to Shannon Road?

David Nevarez, P.E., PTOE
City of Dallas | Sustainable Development \& Construction | (214) 671.5115
From: Justin Taylor [itaylor@dynamictraffic.com](mailto:itaylor@dynamictraffic.com)
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2019 10:53 AM
To: Nevarez, David [david.nevarez@dallascityhall.com](mailto:david.nevarez@dallascityhall.com)
Cc: Avatapalli, Shailaja [s.avatapalli@dallascityhall.com](mailto:s.avatapalli@dallascityhall.com)
Subject: RE: TIA Requirements

## External Email!

David - we won the job and are now proceeding with the TIA. Based on our conversation and the information within the Dallas Street Design Manual, I've prepared the attached Scoping proposal for the traffic study. Could you please review and let me know if the scope is acceptable? Also, are you the right person talk to about obtaining the traffic signal timing for the intersection of Lasater Road and Lawson Road?

## Justin Taylor, PE, PTOE, LEED AP

Principal
Dynamic Traffic
1904 Main Street | Lake Como, New Jersey 07719
PH: (732) 681-0760 Ext. 1131 | Fax: (732) 974-3521 | Cell: (732) 766-2485

From: Nevarez, David [mailto:david.nevarez@dallascityhall.com]
Sent: Friday, November 8, 2019 4:52 PM
To: Justin Taylor [itaylor@dynamictraffic.com](mailto:itaylor@dynamictraffic.com)
Cc: Avatapalli, Shailaja [s.avatapalli@dallascityhall.com](mailto:s.avatapalli@dallascityhall.com)
Subject: RE: TIA Requirements

Justin,

Do you allow the utilization of ITE Land Use Code 240 - Mobile Home Park for a manufactured home development?
$>$ Yes, we reserve the right to request trip generation based on actual conditions at other existing, similar developments, upon review of the land use statement.

Do you have a specific threshold for determining the locations? Thanks in advance for the help with this!
$>$ There is no specific threshold. Please provide a site location map to help understand the scope of the study. Our determination of scope is based on the amount of site generated traffic and location. We may add any intersection of interest if it's not included in the analysis.

David Nevarez, P.E., PTOE
City of Dallas | Sustainable Development \& Construction | (214) 671.5115

From: Justin Taylor
Sent: Friday, November 8, 2019 8:32 AM
To: Nevarez, David
Subject: RE: TIA Requirements

## External Email!

David - I'm just following up on the email below. I'm not trying to be pushy, just wanted to make sure I'd written your email address down correctly.

Justin Taylor, PE, PTOE, LEED AP

Principal
Dynamic Traffic

## 1904 Main Street | Lake Como, New Jersey 07719 <br> PH: (732) 681-0760 Ext. 1131 | Fax: (732) 974-3521 | Cell: (732) 766-2485

From: Justin Taylor
Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2019 12:01 PM
To: 'david.nevarez@dallascityhall.com' [david.nevarez@dallascityhall.com](mailto:david.nevarez@dallascityhall.com)
Subject: TIA Requirements

David - it was a pleasure speaking with you today. I found the TIA requirements in the Streets Design Manual, thanks for the direction. After reading thru it, I just have 2 follow up questions. First of all, do you allow the utilization of ITE Land Use Code 240 - Mobile Home Park for a manufactured home development? And second, I'm still a little unclear on the study area determination. I would typically follow the ITE guidance for study locations of 100 new peak hour trips, but I noticed reference to all signalized intersections within a $1 / 2$ mile radius in several locations. Do you have a specific threshold for determining the locations? Thanks in advance for the help with this!

Justin Taylor, PE, PTOE, LEED AP
Principal
(1) DYNAMIC

Appendix $B$
Traffic Volume Figures







## Appendix C

Traffic Counts

1904 Main Street, Lake Como, NJ 07719
245 Main Street - Suite \#110, Chester, NJ 07930
732-681-0760

E/W:Lasater Rd
N/S:Lawson Rd
Town/County: Dallas/Dallas County
Job \#: 2450-99-015T

File Name : Lawson Rd @ Lasater Rd-11-19-19
Site Code : 00000000
Start Date : 11/19/2019
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Cars - Medium - Articulated

|  | Lasater Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Lasater Road Westbound |  |  |  |  | Lawson Road Northbound |  |  |  |  | Lawson Road Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | u-Tum | App. Toal | Left | Thru | Right | u-Turn | App. Toal | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | App. Toal | Left | Thru | Right | u-Tum | po. Toal | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 0 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 25 | 11 | 63 | 54 | 0 | 128 | 17 | 33 | 4 | 0 | 54 | 17 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 44 | 251 |
| 07:15 AM | 0 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 27 | 19 | 65 | 28 | 0 | 112 | 66 | 57 | 11 | 0 | 134 | 15 | 33 | 15 | 0 | 63 | 336 |
| 07:30 AM | 1 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 38 | 22 | 62 | 50 | 0 | 134 | 50 | 65 | 15 | 0 | 130 | 27 | 30 | 9 | 0 | 66 | 368 |
| 07:45 AM | 0 | 40 | 7 | 0 | 47 | 12 | 57 | 43 | 0 | 112 | 28 | 66 | 23 | 0 | 117 | 28 | 35 | 6 | 1 | 70 | 346 |
| Total | 1 | 93 | 43 | 0 | 137 | 64 | 247 | 175 | 0 | 486 | 161 | 221 | 53 | 0 | 435 | 87 | 116 | 39 | 1 | 243 | 1301 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 19 | 12 | 0 | 31 | 9 | 35 | 45 | 0 | 89 | 14 | 66 | 8 | 0 | 88 | 43 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 283 |
| 08:15 AM | 0 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 32 | 6 | 41 | 24 | 0 | 71 | 17 | 30 | 6 | 0 | 53 | 34 | 35 | 2 | 0 | 71 | 227 |
| 08:30 AM | 0 | 21 | 10 | 0 | 31 | 5 | 38 | 39 | 0 | 82 | 11 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 42 | 19 | 29 | 1 | 0 | 49 | 204 |
| 08:45 AM | 0 | 16 | 8 | 0 | 24 | 9 | 26 | 25 | 0 | 60 | 9 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 33 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 137 |
| Total | 0 | 75 | 43 | 0 | 118 | 29 | 140 | 133 | 0 | 302 | 51 | 144 | 21 | 0 | 216 | 107 | 105 | 3 | 0 | 215 | 851 |

*** BREAK ***

| 02:00 PM | 2 | 19 | 7 | 0 | 28 | 8 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 38 | 5 | 23 | 9 | 0 | 37 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 128 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02:15 PM | 0 | 31 | 9 | 0 | 40 | 16 | 37 | 22 | 0 | 75 | 9 | 22 | 9 | 0 | 40 | 18 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 36 | 191 |
| 02:30 PM | 0 | 25 | 14 | 0 | 39 | 8 | 27 | 20 | 0 | 55 | 5 | 23 | 10 | 0 | 38 | 22 | 23 | 3 | 0 | 48 | 180 |
| 02:45 PM | 0 | 23 | 18 | 0 | 41 | 17 | 38 | 30 | 0 | 85 | 12 | 26 | 17 | 0 | 55 | 12 | 23 | 2 | 0 | 37 | 218 |
| Total | 2 | 98 | 48 | 0 | 148 | 49 | 122 | 82 | 0 | 253 | 31 | 94 | 45 | 0 | 170 | 65 | 74 | 7 | 0 | 146 | 717 |
| 03:00 PM | 1 | 38 | 14 | 0 | 53 | 10 | 42 | 20 | 0 | 72 | 23 | 45 | 23 | 0 | 91 | 25 | 36 | 6 | 0 | 67 | 283 |
| 03:15 PM | 0 | 45 | 15 | 0 | 60 | 9 | 26 | 30 | 0 | 65 | 27 | 85 | 19 | 0 | 131 | 51 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 88 | 344 |
| 03:30 PM | 0 | 30 | 10 | 0 | 40 | 17 | 33 | 30 | 0 | 80 | 9 | 37 | 20 | 0 | 66 | 25 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 52 | 238 |
| 03:45 PM | 8 | 45 | 19 | 0 | 72 | 7 | 24 | 23 | 0 | 54 | 12 | 29 | 21 | 0 | 62 | 53 | 77 | 5 | 0 | 135 | 323 |
| Total | 9 | 158 | 58 | 0 | 225 | 43 | 125 | 103 | 0 | 271 | 71 | 196 | 83 | 0 | 350 | 154 | 175 | 13 | 0 | 342 | 1188 |
| 04:00 PM | 1 | 59 | 21 | 0 | 81 | 20 | 22 | 29 | 0 | 71 | 18 | 29 | 25 | 0 | 72 | 54 | 51 | 8 | 0 | 113 | 337 |
| 04:15 PM | 3 | 51 | 28 | 0 | 82 | 9 | 24 | 26 | 0 | 59 | 26 | 42 | 24 | 1 | 93 | 49 | 40 | 1 | 0 | 90 | 324 |
| 04:30 PM | 3 | 56 | 22 | 0 | 81 | 14 | 27 | 10 | 0 | 51 | 11 | 28 | 29 | 0 | 68 | 39 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 64 | 264 |
| 04:45 PM | 2 | 53 | 24 | 0 | 79 | 17 | 36 | 36 | 0 | 89 | 12 | 30 | 29 | 0 | 71 | 28 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 52 | 291 |
| Total | 9 | 219 | 95 | 0 | 323 | 60 | 109 | 101 | 0 | 270 | 67 | 129 | 107 | 1 | 304 | 170 | 138 | 10 | 1 | 319 | 1216 |
| 05:00 PM | 0 | 59 | 23 | 0 | 82 | 12 | 31 | 24 | 0 | 67 | 12 | 25 | 30 | 0 | 67 | 37 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 283 |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 69 | 20 | 0 | 89 | 14 | 44 | 25 | 0 | 83 | 7 | 28 | 18 | 0 | 53 | 45 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 79 | 304 |
| 05:30 PM | 0 | 57 | 21 | 0 | 78 | 19 | 28 | 24 | 0 | 71 | 9 | 30 | 22 | 0 | 61 | 32 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 57 | 267 |
| 05:45 PM | 1 | 82 | 25 | 0 | 108 | 29 | 31 | 19 | 0 | 79 | 13 | 25 | 32 | 0 | 70 | 29 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 51 | 308 |
| Total | 1 | 267 | 89 | 0 | 357 | 74 | 134 | 92 | 0 | 300 | 41 | 108 | 102 | 0 | 251 | 143 | 108 | 3 | 0 | 254 | 1162 |
| Grand Total | 22 | 910 | 376 | 0 | 1308 | 319 | 877 | 686 | 0 | 1882 | 422 | 892 | 411 | 1 | 1726 | 726 | 716 | 75 | 2 | 1519 | 6435 |
| Apprch \% | 1.7 | 69.6 | 28.7 | 0 |  | 17 | 46.6 | 36.5 | 0 |  | 24.4 | 51.7 | 23.8 | 0.1 |  | 47.8 | 47.1 | 4.9 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Total \% | 0.3 | 14.1 | 5.8 | 0 | 20.3 | 5 | 13.6 | 10.7 | 0 | 29.2 | 6.6 | 13.9 | 6.4 | 0 | 26.8 | 11.3 | 11.1 | 1.2 | 0 | 23.6 |  |
| Cars | 21 | 878 | 356 | 0 | 1255 | 318 | 853 | 664 | 0 | 1835 | 398 | 877 | 396 | 1 | 1672 | 702 | 703 | 75 | 2 | 1482 | 6244 |
| \% Cars | 95.5 | 96.5 | 94.7 | 0 | 95.9 | 99.7 | 97.3 | 96.8 | 0 | 97.5 | 94.3 | 98.3 | 96.4 | 100 | 96.9 | 96.7 | 98.2 | 100 | 100 | 97.6 | 97 |
| Medium | 1 | 26 | 19 | 0 | 46 | 1 | 21 | 17 | 0 | 39 | 22 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 49 | 18 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 163 |
| \% Medium | 4.5 | 2.9 | 5.1 | 0 | 3.5 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 0 | 2.1 | 5.2 | 1.3 | 3.6 | 0 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 1.9 | 2.5 |
| Articulated \% Articulated | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 28 |

1904 Main Street, Lake Como, NJ 07719
245 Main Street - Suite \#110, Chester, NJ 07930
732-681-0760

E/W:Lasater Rd
N/S:Lawson Rd
Town/County: Dallas/Dallas County
Job \#: 2450-99-015T

File Name : Lawson Rd @ Lasater Rd-11-20-19
Site Code : 00000000
Start Date : 11/20/2019
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Cars - Medium - Articulated

|  | Lasater Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Lasater Road Westbound |  |  |  |  | Lawson Road Northbound |  |  |  |  | Lawson Road Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | U-Tum | App. Toal | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | App. Toal | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | App. Toal | Left | Thru | Right | U-Tum | App. Toal | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 0 | 16 | 8 | 0 | 24 | 12 | 62 | 50 | 0 | 124 | 19 | 37 | 3 | 0 | 59 | 16 | 17 | 9 | 0 | 42 | 249 |
| 07:15 AM | 0 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 65 | 23 | 0 | 109 | 74 | 49 | 10 | 0 | 133 | 15 | 34 | 14 | 0 | 63 | 326 |
| 07:30 AM | 1 | 22 | 18 | 0 | 41 | 24 | 61 | 47 | 0 | 132 | 52 | 56 | 14 | 0 | 122 | 29 | 28 | 9 | 0 | 66 | 361 |
| 07:45 AM | 0 | 35 | 6 | 0 | 41 | 13 | 53 | 40 | 0 | 106 | 25 | 57 | 21 | 0 | 103 | 33 | 37 | 7 | 1 | 78 | 328 |
| Total | 1 | 88 | 38 | 0 | 127 | 70 | 241 | 160 | 0 | 471 | 170 | 199 | 48 | 0 | 417 | 93 | 116 | 39 | 1 | 249 | 1264 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 16 | 13 | 0 | 29 | 8 | 40 | 51 | 0 | 99 | 12 | 67 | 8 | 0 | 87 | 45 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 293 |
| 08:15 AM | 0 | 17 | 12 | 0 | 29 | 6 | 39 | 23 | 0 | 68 | 15 | 31 | 5 | 0 | 51 | 36 | 32 | 2 | 0 | 70 | 218 |
| 08:30 AM | 0 | 20 | 12 | 0 | 32 | 5 | 36 | 40 | 0 | 81 | 12 | 32 | 3 | 0 | 47 | 20 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 49 | 209 |
| 08:45 AM | 0 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 23 | 9 | 29 | 30 | 0 | 68 | 7 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 32 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 142 |
| Total | 0 | 66 | 47 | 0 | 113 | 28 | 144 | 144 | 0 | 316 | 46 | 151 | 20 | 0 | 217 | 111 | 102 | 3 | 0 | 216 | 862 |

*** BREAK ***

| 02:00 PM | 2 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 26 | 6 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 34 | 6 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 34 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 117 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02:15 PM | 0 | 26 | 8 | 0 | 34 | 13 | 38 | 25 | 0 | 76 | 7 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 34 | 15 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 30 | 174 |
| 02:30 PM | 0 | 28 | 16 | 0 | 44 | 9 | 29 | 24 | 0 | 62 | 5 | 26 | 12 | 0 | 43 | 24 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 49 | 198 |
| 02:45 PM | 0 | 25 | 16 | 0 | 41 | 16 | 38 | 34 | 0 | 88 | 14 | 27 | 14 | 0 | 55 | 13 | 26 | 2 | 0 | 41 | 225 |
| Total | 2 | 96 | 47 | 0 | 145 | 44 | 124 | 92 | 0 | 260 | 32 | 91 | 43 | 0 | 166 | 65 | 71 | 7 | 0 | 143 | 714 |
| 03:00 PM | 1 | 37 | 13 | 0 | 51 | 10 | 48 | 17 | 0 | 75 | 28 | 51 | 29 | 0 | 108 | 28 | 34 | 5 | 0 | 67 | 301 |
| 03:15 PM | 0 | 54 | 16 | 0 | 70 | 9 | 21 | 28 | 0 | 58 | 28 | 80 | 22 | 0 | 130 | 57 | 30 | 1 | 0 | 88 | 346 |
| 03:30 PM | 0 | 29 | 9 | 0 | 38 | 18 | 31 | 33 | 0 | 82 | 10 | 30 | 21 | 0 | 61 | 25 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 51 | 232 |
| 03:45 PM | 8 | 41 | 20 | 0 | 69 | 8 | 26 | 23 | 0 | 57 | 12 | 30 | 22 | 0 | 64 | 51 | 76 | 5 | 0 | 132 | 322 |
| Total | 9 | 161 | 58 | 0 | 228 | 45 | 126 | 101 | 0 | 272 | 78 | 191 | 94 | 0 | 363 | 161 | 165 | 12 | 0 | 338 | 1201 |
| 04:00 PM | 1 | 67 | 19 | 0 | 87 | 19 | 22 | 29 | 0 | 70 | 20 | 34 | 25 | 0 | 79 | 59 | 59 | 10 | 0 | 128 | 364 |
| 04:15 PM | 3 | 61 | 24 | 0 | 88 | 8 | 24 | 25 | 0 | 57 | 32 | 37 | 22 | 1 | 92 | 55 | 35 | 1 | 0 | 91 | 328 |
| 04:30 PM | 3 | 67 | 23 | 0 | 93 | 11 | 32 | 10 | 0 | 53 | 12 | 30 | 28 | 0 | 70 | 36 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 63 | 279 |
| 04:45 PM | 2 | 46 | 25 | 0 | 73 | 17 | 42 | 38 | 0 | 97 | 13 | 34 | 31 | 0 | 78 | 30 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 298 |
| Total | 9 | 241 | 91 | 0 | 341 | 55 | 120 | 102 | 0 | 277 | 77 | 135 | 106 | 1 | 319 | 180 | 139 | 12 | , | 332 | 1269 |
| 05:00 PM | 0 | 68 | 19 | 0 | 87 | 14 | 29 | 23 | 0 | 66 | 14 | 28 | 31 | 0 | 73 | 36 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 296 |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 70 | 19 | 0 | 89 | 16 | 43 | 29 | 0 | 88 | 8 | 29 | 17 | 0 | 54 | 38 | 30 | 1 | 0 | 69 | 300 |
| 05:30 PM | 0 | 66 | 20 | 0 | 86 | 18 | 23 | 27 | 0 | 68 | 10 | 27 | 23 | 0 | 60 | 33 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 58 | 272 |
| 05:45 PM | 1 | 75 | 29 | 0 | 105 | 28 | 26 | 22 | 0 | 76 | 14 | 25 | 33 | 0 | 72 | 24 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 46 | 299 |
| Total | 1 | 279 | 87 | 0 | 367 | 76 | 121 | 101 | 0 | 298 | 46 | 109 | 104 | 0 | 259 | 131 | 109 | 3 | 0 | 243 | 1167 |
| Grand Total | 22 | 931 | 368 | 0 | 1321 | 318 | 876 | 700 | 0 | 1894 | 449 | 876 | 415 | 1 | 1741 | 741 | 702 | 76 | 2 | 1521 | 6477 |
| Apprch \% | 1.7 | 70.5 | 27.9 | 0 |  | 16.8 | 46.3 | 37 | 0 |  | 25.8 | 50.3 | 23.8 | 0.1 |  | 48.7 | 46.2 | 5 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Total \% | 0.3 | 14.4 | 5.7 | 0 | 20.4 | 4.9 | 13.5 | 10.8 | 0 | 29.2 | 6.9 | 13.5 | 6.4 | 0 | 26.9 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 1.2 | 0 | 23.5 |  |
| Cars | 21 | 899 | 350 | 0 | 1270 | 317 | 851 | 673 | 0 | 1841 | 423 | 862 | 398 | 1 | 1684 | 720 | 689 | 76 | 2 | 1487 | 6282 |
| \% Cars | 95.5 | 96.6 | 95.1 | 0 | 96.1 | 99.7 | 97.1 | 96.1 | 0 | 97.2 | 94.2 | 98.4 | 95.9 | 100 | 96.7 | 97.2 | 98.1 | 100 | 100 | 97.8 | 97 |
| Medium | 1 | 25 | 17 | 0 | 43 | 1 | 21 | 23 | 0 | 45 | 23 | 11 | 17 | 0 | 51 | 15 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 165 |
| \% Medium | 4.5 | 2.7 | 4.6 | 0 | 3.3 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 0 | 2.4 | 5.1 | 1.3 | 4.1 | 0 | 2.9 | 2 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 1.7 | 2.5 |
| Articulated \% Articulated | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 30 |

1904 M ain Street, Lake Como, NJ 07719 245 M ain Street - Suite \#110, Chester, NJ 07930 732-681-0760

Latitude: 0 ' 0.0000 Undefined


## Appendix D <br> Capacity Analysis

| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 36.8 |
| Intersection LOS | E |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{1}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 88 | 43 | 66 | 219 | 161 | 163 | 229 | 53 | 122 | 132 | 30 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 88 | 43 | 66 | 219 | 161 | 163 | 229 | 53 | 122 | 132 | 30 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 97 | 47 | 73 | 241 | 177 | 179 | 252 | 58 | 134 | 145 | 33 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.2 |  |  | 69.8 |  |  | 24.2 |  |  | 14.8 |  |  |
| HCMLOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 | SBLn3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $0 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 163 | 282 | 132 | 446 | 122 | 132 | 30 |
| LT Vol | 163 | 0 | 1 | 66 | 122 | 0 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 229 | 88 | 219 | 0 | 132 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 53 | 43 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 179 | 310 | 145 | 490 | 134 | 145 | 33 |
| Geometry Grp | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.434 | 0.691 | 0.331 | 1.007 | 0.323 | 0.325 | 0.068 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.994 | 8.263 | 8.394 | 7.399 | 8.864 | 8.273 | 7.464 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 403 | 440 | 431 | 490 | 408 | 437 | 478 |
| Service Time | 6.694 | 5.963 | 6.094 | 5.136 | 6.564 | 5.973 | 5.245 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.444 | 0.705 | 0.336 | 1 | 0.328 | 0.332 | 0.069 |
| HCM Control Delay | 18.4 | 27.5 | 15.2 | 69.8 | 15.7 | 14.9 | 10.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | COS | D | C | F | C | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.1 | 5.1 | 1.4 | 13.7 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.2 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 26.9 |
| Intersection LOS | D |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 15 | 236 | 86 | 46 | 104 | 87 | 76 | 131 | 97 | 201 | 196 | 17 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 15 | 236 | 86 | 46 | 104 | 87 | 76 | 131 | 97 | 201 | 196 | 17 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 17 | 265 | 97 | 52 | 117 | 98 | 85 | 147 | 109 | 226 | 220 | 19 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 40.9 |  |  | 23.8 |  |  | 22.9 |  |  | 20.3 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | E |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 | SBLn3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $0 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 76 | 228 | 337 | 237 | 201 | 196 | 17 |
| LT Vol | 76 | 0 | 15 | 46 | 201 | 0 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 131 | 236 | 104 | 0 | 196 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 97 | 86 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 85 | 256 | 379 | 266 | 226 | 220 | 19 |
| Geometry Grp | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.23 | 0.627 | 0.842 | 0.618 | 0.552 | 0.506 | 0.04 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 9.708 | 8.816 | 8.002 | 8.358 | 8.802 | 8.265 | 7.484 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 369 | 410 | 454 | 431 | 409 | 436 | 477 |
| Service Time | 7.483 | 6.59 | 5.757 | 6.121 | 6.566 | 6.029 | 5.248 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.23 | 0.624 | 0.835 | 0.617 | 0.553 | 0.505 | 0.04 |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.4 | 25.4 | 40.9 | 23.8 | 22 | 19.3 | 10.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | D | E | C | C | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.9 | 4.1 | 8.3 | 4 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 0.1 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 47.4 |
| Intersection LOS | E |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 94 | 46 | 70 | 232 | 171 | 173 | 243 | 56 | 129 | 140 | 32 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 94 | 46 | 70 | 232 | 171 | 173 | 243 | 56 | 129 | 140 | 32 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 103 | 51 | 77 | 255 | 188 | 190 | 267 | 62 | 142 | 154 | 35 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 16.2 |  |  | 96.6 |  |  | 27.5 |  |  | 15.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 | SBLn3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $0 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 173 | 299 | 141 | 473 | 129 | 140 | 32 |
| LT Vol | 173 | 0 | 1 | 70 | 129 | 0 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 243 | 94 | 232 | 0 | 140 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 56 | 46 | 171 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 190 | 329 | 155 | 520 | 142 | 154 | 35 |
| Geometry Grp | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.465 | 0.74 | 0.358 | 1.095 | 0.344 | 0.35 | 0.073 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 9.308 | 8.574 | 8.696 | 7.583 | 9.175 | 8.583 | 7.852 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 390 | 424 | 417 | 478 | 394 | 422 | 459 |
| Service Time | 7.008 | 6.274 | 6.396 | 5.319 | 6.875 | 6.283 | 5.552 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.487 | 0.776 | 0.372 | 1.088 | 0.36 | 0.365 | 0.076 |
| HCM Control Delay | 19.8 | 32 | 16.2 | 96.6 | 16.6 | 15.8 | 11.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | D | C | F | C | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.4 | 5.9 | 1.6 | 17 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.2 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 34.4 |
| Intersection LOS | D |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 16 | 251 | 91 | 49 | 110 | 92 | 81 | 139 | 103 | 213 | 208 | 18 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 16 | 251 | 91 | 49 | 110 | 92 | 81 | 139 | 103 | 213 | 208 | 18 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 18 | 282 | 102 | 55 | 124 | 103 | 91 | 156 | 116 | 239 | 234 | 20 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 57.7 |  |  | 28.9 |  |  | 27.7 |  |  | 23.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 | SBLn3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $0 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 81 | 242 | 358 | 251 | 213 | 208 | 18 |
| LT Vol | 81 | 0 | 16 | 49 | 213 | 0 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 139 | 251 | 110 | 0 | 208 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 103 | 91 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 91 | 272 | 402 | 282 | 239 | 234 | 20 |
| Geometry Grp | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.258 | 0.703 | 0.934 | 0.687 | 0.614 | 0.565 | 0.044 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 10.2 | 9.303 | 8.362 | 8.773 | 9.236 | 8.697 | 7.913 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 351 | 386 | 434 | 412 | 390 | 414 | 450 |
| Service Time | 7.995 | 7.098 | 6.136 | 6.555 | 7.022 | 6.482 | 5.697 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.259 | 0.705 | 0.926 | 0.684 | 0.613 | 0.565 | 0.044 |
| HCM Control Delay | 16.5 | 31.5 | 57.7 | 28.9 | 25.8 | 22.3 | 11.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | D | F | D | D | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1 | 5.2 | 10.6 | 5 | 3.9 | 3.4 | 0.1 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 58.8 |
| Intersection LOS | F |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  | \% | $\hat{1}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 101 | 46 | 75 | 246 | 183 | 173 | 243 | 58 | 134 | 140 | 32 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 101 | 46 | 75 | 246 | 183 | 173 | 243 | 58 | 134 | 140 | 32 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 111 | 51 | 82 | 270 | 201 | 190 | 267 | 64 | 147 | 154 | 35 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 16.9 |  |  | 125.7 |  |  | 28.3 |  |  | 16.1 |  |  |
| HCMLOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 | SBLn3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $0 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 173 | 301 | 148 | 504 | 134 | 140 | 32 |
| LT Vol | 173 | 0 | 1 | 75 | 134 | 0 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 243 | 101 | 246 | 0 | 140 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 58 | 46 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 190 | 331 | 163 | 554 | 147 | 154 | 35 |
| Geometry Grp | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.463 | 0.742 | 0.379 | 1.178 | 0.356 | 0.347 | 0.073 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 9.541 | 8.801 | 8.853 | 7.654 | 9.4 | 8.806 | 8.074 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 380 | 413 | 410 | 476 | 386 | 411 | 446 |
| Service Time | 7.241 | 6.501 | 6.553 | 5.362 | 7.1 | 6.506 | 5.774 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.5 | 0.801 | 0.398 | 1.164 | 0.381 | 0.375 | 0.078 |
| HCM Control Delay | 20.2 | 32.9 | 16.9 | 125.7 | 17.2 | 16.1 | 11.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | COS | D | C | F | C | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.4 | 5.9 | 1.7 | 20.6 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.2 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 46 |
| Intersection LOS | E |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | 4 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 16 | 273 | 91 | 54 | 123 | 103 | 81 | 139 | 111 | 232 | 208 | 18 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 16 | 273 | 91 | 54 | 123 | 103 | 81 | 139 | 111 | 232 | 208 | 18 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 18 | 307 | 102 | 61 | 138 | 116 | 91 | 156 | 125 | 261 | 234 | 20 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 85.8 |  |  | 38.2 |  |  | 32.5 |  |  | 27.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 | SBLn3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Tru, \% | $0 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 81 | 250 | 380 | 280 | 232 | 208 | 18 |
| LT Vol | 81 | 0 | 16 | 54 | 232 | 0 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 139 | 273 | 123 | 0 | 208 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 111 | 91 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 91 | 281 | 427 | 315 | 261 | 234 | 20 |
| Geometry Grp | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.263 | 0.752 | 1.042 | 0.784 | 0.69 | 0.584 | 0.046 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 10.877 | 9.96 | 8.785 | 9.219 | 9.816 | 9.273 | 8.485 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 332 | 365 | 418 | 396 | 370 | 393 | 425 |
| Service Time | 8.577 | 7.66 | 6.482 | 6.919 | 7.516 | 6.973 | 6.185 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.274 | 0.77 | 1.022 | 0.795 | 0.705 | 0.595 | 0.047 |
| HCM Control Delay | 17.4 | 37.4 | 85.8 | 38.2 | 31.7 | 24.2 | 11.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | E | F | E | D | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1 | 5.9 | 13.8 | 6.7 | 5 | 3.6 | 0.1 |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | \$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 7 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 110 | 50 | 82 | 267 | 199 | 189 | 265 | 63 | 146 | 153 | 35 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 110 | 50 | 82 | 267 | 199 | 189 | 265 | 63 | 146 | 153 | 35 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 121 | 55 | 90 | 293 | 219 | 208 | 291 | 69 | 160 | 168 | 38 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 18.7 |  |  | 181.9 |  |  | 36.6 |  |  | 17.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 | SBLn3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, $\%$ | $0 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 189 | 328 | 161 | 548 | 146 | 153 | 35 |
| LT Vol | 189 | 0 | 1 | 82 | 146 | 0 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 265 | 110 | 267 | 0 | 153 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 63 | 50 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 208 | 360 | 177 | 602 | 160 | 168 | 38 |
| Geometry Grp | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.52 | 0.832 | 0.422 | 1.319 | 0.397 | 0.39 | 0.082 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 10.059 | 9.315 | 9.364 | 7.888 | 9.897 | 9.299 | 8.563 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 361 | 393 | 387 | 458 | 366 | 390 | 421 |
| Service Time | 7.759 | 7.015 | 7.064 | 5.674 | 7.597 | 6.999 | 6.263 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.576 | 0.916 | 0.457 | 1.314 | 0.437 | 0.431 | 0.09 |
| HCM Control Delay | 23.2 | 44.3 | 18.7 | 181.9 | 19 | 17.8 | 12 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | E | C | F | C | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.9 | 7.6 | 2 | 26.4 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 0.3 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 64.9 |
| Intersection LOS | F |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | ¢ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 17 | 296 | 100 | 58 | 134 | 112 | 88 | 152 | 120 | 252 | 227 | 20 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 17 | 296 | 100 | 58 | 134 | 112 | 88 | 152 | 120 | 252 | 227 | 20 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 19 | 333 | 112 | 65 | 151 | 126 | 99 | 171 | 135 | 283 | 255 | 22 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 133.8 |  |  | 50.2 |  |  | 41.6 |  |  | 33.6 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 | SBLn3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $0 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 88 | 272 | 413 | 304 | 252 | 227 | 20 |
| LT Vol | 88 | 0 | 17 | 58 | 252 | 0 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 152 | 296 | 134 | 0 | 227 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 120 | 100 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 99 | 306 | 464 | 342 | 283 | 255 | 22 |
| Geometry Grp | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.292 | 0.831 | 1.182 | 0.862 | 0.76 | 0.648 | 0.052 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 11.553 | 10.632 | 9.167 | 9.729 | 10.398 | 9.853 | 9.061 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 313 | 342 | 399 | 376 | 351 | 370 | 398 |
| Service Time | 9.253 | 8.332 | 6.867 | 7.429 | 8.098 | 7.553 | 6.761 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.316 | 0.895 | 1.163 | 0.91 | 0.806 | 0.689 | 0.055 |
| HCM Control Delay | 18.9 | 48.9 | 133.8 | 50.2 | 39.5 | 29 | 12.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | E | F | F | E | D | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.2 | 7.3 | 18.4 | 8.2 | 6 | 4.3 | 0.2 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | -1 | 1 |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 5 | 202 | 245 | 5 | 12 | 10 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 5 | 202 | 245 | 5 | 12 | 10 |
| 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 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 6 | 224 | 272 | 6 | 13 | 11 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 278 | 0 | - | 0 | 511 | 275 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 275 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 236 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1285 | - | - | - | 523 | 764 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 771 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 803 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1285 | - | - - | - | 520 | 764 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - - | - | 520 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 767 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 803 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.2 |  | 0 |  | 11.2 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1285 | - | - | - | 608 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.004 | - | - | - | 0.04 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.8 | - | - | - | 11.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | , | - | - | 0.1 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | -1 | 个 |  | 1 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 15 | 328 | 250 | 19 | 12 | 9 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 15 | 328 | 250 | 19 | 12 | 9 |
| 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 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 17 | 377 | 287 | 22 | 14 | 10 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 309 | 0 | - | 0 | 709 | 298 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 298 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 411 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1252 | - | - | - | 401 | 741 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 753 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 669 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1252 | - | - - | - | 394 | 741 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - - | - | 394 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 740 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 669 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.3 |  | 0 |  | 12.7 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1252 | 2 | - | - | 493 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.014 | - | - | - | 0.049 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.9 | 0 | - | - | 12.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | , | - | - | 0.2 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | -1 | 1 |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 5 | 221 | 267 | 5 | 12 | 10 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 5 | 221 | 267 | 5 | 12 | 10 |
| 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 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 6 | 246 | 297 | 6 | 13 | 11 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 303 | 0 | - | 0 | 558 | 300 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 300 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 258 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | -3.518 | 3.318 |  |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1258 | - | - | - | 491 | 740 |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 752 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 785 | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1258 | - | - | - | 488 | 740 |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 488 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 747 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 785 | - |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.2 | 0 | 11.5 |
| HCM LOS |  | $B$ |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1258 | - | - | - | 577 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.004 | - | - | -0.042 |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.9 | 0 | - | - | 11.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - | 0.1 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 335 | 0 | - | 0 | 768 | 324 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 324 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 444 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1224 | - | - | - | 370 | 717 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 733 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 646 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1224 | - | - | - | 363 | 717 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 363 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 720 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 646 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.3 |  | 0 |  | 13.3 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1224 | - | - | - | 460 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.014 | - | - | - | 0.052 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | A | 0 | - | - | 13.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | - | - | - | 0.2 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{- 1}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 9 | 202 | 253 | 2 | 5 | 21 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 9 | 202 | 253 | 2 | 5 | 21 |
| 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 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 10 | 224 | 281 | 2 | 6 | 23 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{i}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 34 | 338 | 251 | 8 | 5 | 20 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 34 | 338 | 251 | 8 | 5 | 20 |
| 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 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 39 | 389 | 289 | 9 | 6 | 23 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 298 | 0 | - | 0 | 761 | 294 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 294 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 467 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1263 | - | - | - | 373 | 745 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 756 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 631 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1263 | - | - - | - | 358 | 745 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - - | - | 358 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 727 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 631 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.7 |  | 0 |  | 11.2 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1263 | - | - | - | 613 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.031 | - | - | - | 0.047 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.9 | 0 | - | - | 11.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.1 | A | - | - | 0.1 |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | b |  | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 34 |  | 273 | 8 | 5 | 20 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 34 | 367 | 273 | 8 | 5 | 20 |
| 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 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 39 | 422 | 314 | 9 | 6 | 23 |



## Appendix E

Signal Warrant Analysis

## Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Intersection:
Location:
Prepared By:
Date:
Job \# :

| Time | Weekday Volumes |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Major Road |  | Minor Road |  |
|  | $N B$ | $S B$ | $E B$ | WB |
| 12:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 217 | 248 | 127 | 471 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 216 | 113 | 316 |
| 10:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:00 PM | 166 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:00 PM | 363 | 143 | 145 | 260 |
| 4:00 PM | 318 | 338 | 228 | 272 |
| 5:00 PM | 259 | 331 | 341 | 277 |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 243 | 367 | 298 |
| 7:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lanes | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Speed | 30 | 35 | 30 | 30 |

Lawson Road \& Lasater Road
City of Dallas, Dallas County, Texas
N. Dahl

1/10/2020
2450-99-015T

|  | Warrant Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Warrant | 1A | 1B | 1A \& 1B | 2 | 3 |
| \% Criteria | 100 | 100 | 80 | 100 | 100 |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | YES | NO | NO | YES | YES |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO |
|  | YES | NO | NO | YES | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | YES | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
|  | NO | NO | NO | NO | NO |
| Hours Met | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Satisfied? | NO | NO | NO | YES | YES |

[^0]Warrant 2 - Four-Hour Vehicular Volume
(100\% Thresholds)

| Time | Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |  | WARRANT SATISFIED? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Major <br> (Total) | Minor EB | Threshold | Satisfied? | Minor WB | Threshold | Satisfied? |  |
| 12:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 1:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 2:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 3:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 4:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 5:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 6:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 7:00 AM | 665 | 127 | 258 | No | 471 | 258 | Yes | YES |
| 8:00 AM | 433 | 113 | 370 | No | 316 | 370 | No | NO |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 10:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 11:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 12:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 1:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 2:00 PM | 309 | 145 | - | No | 260 | - | No | NO |
| 3:00 PM | 701 | 228 | 243 | No | 272 | 243 | Yes | YES |
| 4:00 PM | 649 | 341 | 265 | Yes | 277 | 265 | Yes | YES |
| 5:00 PM | 502 | 367 | 334 | Yes | 298 | 334 | No | YES |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 7:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 8:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 9:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 10:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 11:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| Lanes | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 4 |
| Speed | 35 | 30 |  |  | 30 |  | Satisfied? | Yes |

Figure 4C-1. Warrant 2, Four-Hour Vehicular Volume


Warrant 3 - Peak Hour Vehicular Volume
(100\% Thresholds)

| Time | Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |  | WARRANT SATISFIED ? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Major <br> (Total) | Minor EB | Threshold | Satisfied? | Minor WB | Threshold | Satisfied? |  |
| 12:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 1:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 2:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 3:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 4:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 5:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 6:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 7:00 AM | 665 | 127 | 428 | No | 471 | 428 | Yes | YES |
| 8:00 AM | 433 | 113 | - | No | 316 | - | No | NO |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 10:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 11:00 AM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 12:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 1:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 2:00 PM | 309 | 145 | - | No | 260 | - | No | NO |
| 3:00 PM | 701 | 228 | 410 | No | 272 | 410 | No | NO |
| 4:00 PM | 649 | 341 | 435 | No | 277 | 435 | No | NO |
| 5:00 PM | 502 | 367 | - | No | 298 | - | No | NO |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 7:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 8:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 9:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 10:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| 11:00 PM | 0 | 0 | - | No | 0 | - | No | NO |
| Lanes | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Speed | 35 | 30 |  |  | 30 |  | Satisfied? | Yes |



## Appendix F <br> Turn Lane Analysis

## LEFT TURN LANE WARRANT - TWO LANE HIGHWAYS

Project Name: East Lasater Manufactured Home Park Intersection: Lasater Road and W Site Driveway Location: City of Dallas, Dallas County, TX
Analysis Period: 2027 Build - AM PSH

Project \#: 2450-99-015T
Prepared By: NED
Date: 1/10/2020

Posted Speed Limit:
Advancing Volume:
Advancing Left Turns:
Opposing Volume:
\% Left Turns:

| 40 | mph |
| :---: | :--- |
| 230 | vehicles per hour |
| 9 | vehicles per hour |
| 277 | vehicles per hour |


| Opposing | Advancing Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume <br> (veh/h) | $5 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| left turns |  |  |  |  |  | left turns | left turns |
| :--- | left turns | left turns |
| :--- |


| $40-\mathrm{mph}$ operating speed |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 800 | 330 | 240 | 180 | 160 | 150 |
| 600 | 410 | 305 | 225 | 200 | 190 |
| 400 | 510 | 380 | 275 | 245 | 230 |
| 200 | 640 | 470 | 350 | 305 | 285 |
| 100 | 720 | 515 | 390 | 340 | 320 |

Table based on AASHTO Table 9-23

| Opposing <br> Volume | Left Turn \% Interpolation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $0 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 . 9 1 \%}$ | $5 \%$ |
| 800 | NA | 350 | 330 |
| 600 | NA | $\mathbf{4 3 3}$ | 410 |
| 400 | NA | 538 | 510 |
| 200 | NA | 677 | 640 |
| 100 | NA | 765 | 720 |



## LEFT TURN LANE WARRANT - TWO LANE HIGHWAYS

Project Name: East Lasater Manufactured Home Park Intersection: Lasater Road and W Site Driveway Location: City of Dallas, Dallas County, TX
Analysis Period: 2027 Build - PM PSH

Project \#: 2450-99-015T
Prepared By: NED
Date: 1/10/2020

Posted Speed Limit:
Advancing Volume:
Advancing Left Turns:
Opposing Volume:
\% Left Turns:

| 40 | mph |
| :---: | :--- |
| 401 | vehicles per hour |
| 34 | vehicles per hour |
| 281 | vehicles per hour |


| Opposing | Advancing Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume <br> (veh/h) | $5 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| left turns |  |  |  |  |  | left turns | left turns |
| :--- | left turns | left turns |
| :--- |


| $40-\mathrm{mph}$ operating speed |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 800 | 330 | 240 | 180 | 160 | 150 |
| 600 | 410 | 305 | 225 | 200 | 190 |
| 400 | 510 | 380 | 275 | 245 | 230 |
| 200 | 640 | 470 | 350 | 305 | 285 |
| 100 | 720 | 515 | 390 | 340 | 320 |

Table based on AASHTO Table 9-23

| Opposing <br> Volume | Left Turn \% Interpolation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $5 \%$ | $\mathbf{8 . 4 8 \%}$ | $10 \%$ |
| 800 | 330 | $\mathbf{2 6 7}$ | 240 |
| 600 | 410 | $\mathbf{3 3 7}$ | 305 |
| 400 | 510 | $\mathbf{4 2 0}$ | 380 |
| 200 | 640 | $\mathbf{5 2 2}$ | 470 |
| 100 | 720 | $\mathbf{5 7 7}$ | 515 |



Warrant Met? No

## LEFT TURN LANE WARRANT - TWO LANE HIGHWAYS

Project Name: East Lasater Manufactured Home Park Intersection: Lasater Road and E Site Driveway Location: City of Dallas, Dallas County, TX
Analysis Period: 2027 Build - AM PSH

Project \#: 2450-99-015T
Prepared By: NED
Date: 1/10/2020

Posted Speed Limit:
Advancing Volume:
Advancing Left Turns:
Opposing Volume:
\% Left Turns:

| Opposing | Advancing Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume <br> (veh/h) | $5 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| left turns |  |  |  |  |  | left turns | left turns |
| :--- | left turns | left turns |
| :--- |


| $40-\mathrm{mph}$ operating speed |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 800 | 330 | 240 | 180 | 160 | 150 |
| 600 | 410 | 305 | 225 | 200 | 190 |
| 400 | 510 | 380 | 275 | 245 | 230 |
| 200 | 640 | 470 | 350 | 305 | 285 |
| 100 | 720 | 515 | 390 | 340 | 320 |

Table based on AASHTO Table 9-23

| Opposing <br> Volume | Left Turn \% Interpolation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $0 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 . 2 1 \%}$ | $5 \%$ |
| 800 | NA | $\mathbf{3 8 0}$ | 330 |
| 600 | NA | $\mathbf{4 6 9}$ | 410 |
| 400 | NA | $\mathbf{5 8 2}$ | 510 |
| 200 | NA | $\mathbf{7 3 5}$ | 640 |
| 100 | NA | $\mathbf{8 3 4}$ | 720 |



## LEFT TURN LANE WARRANT - TWO LANE HIGHWAYS

Project Name: East Lasater Manufactured Home Park Intersection: Lasater Road and E Site Driveway Location: City of Dallas, Dallas County, TX
Analysis Period: 2027 Build - PM PSH

Project \#: 2450-99-015T
Prepared By: NED
Date: 1/10/2020

Posted Speed Limit:
Advancing Volume:
Advancing Left Turns:
Opposing Volume:
\% Left Turns:

| Opposing | Advancing Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume <br> (veh/h) | $5 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| left turns |  |  |  |  |  | left turns | left turns |
| :--- | left turns | left turns |
| :--- |


| 40-mph operating speed |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 800 | 330 | 240 | 180 | 160 | 150 |
| 600 | 410 | 305 | 225 | 200 | 190 |
| 400 | 510 | 380 | 275 | 245 | 230 |
| 200 | 640 | 470 | 350 | 305 | 285 |
| 100 | 720 | 515 | 390 | 340 | 320 |

Table based on AASHTO Table 9-23

| Opposing <br> Volume | Left Turn \% Interpolation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $0 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 3 \%}$ | $5 \%$ |
| 800 | NA | $\mathbf{3 4 7}$ | 330 |
| 600 | NA | $\mathbf{4 3 0}$ | 410 |
| 400 | NA | 535 | 510 |
| 200 | NA | $\mathbf{6 7 3}$ | 640 |
| 100 | NA | $\mathbf{7 6 0}$ | 720 |



Warrant Met? No
where heavy left-turn movements take place, but also occur where left-turn movements enter or leave driveways serving adjacent land development. As with left-turn movements, right-turn movements pose problems at both driveways and street intersections. Right-turn movements increase conflicts, delays, and crashes, particularly where a speed differential of 10 mph or more exists between the speed of through traffic and the vehicles that are turning right.

Table 2-3 presents thresholds for auxiliary lanes. These thresholds represent examples of where left turn and right turn lanes should be considered. Refer to the TxDOT Roadway Design Manual, Chapter 3, for proper acceleration and deceleration lengths.

Table 2-3: Auxiliary Lane Thresholds

| Median Type | Left Turn to or from Property |  | Right Turn to or from Property (5) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

(1) Refer to Table 3-11, TxDOT Roadway Design Manual, for alternative left-turn-bay operational considerations.
(2) A left-turn acceleration lane may be required if it would provide a benefit to the safety and operation of the roadway. A left-turn acceleration lane would interfere with the left-turn ingress movements to any other access connection.
(3) Additional right-turn considerations:

- Conditions for providing an exclusive right-turn lane when the right-turn traffic volume projections are less than indicated in Table 2-3:
- High crash experience
- Heavier than normal peak flow movements on the main roadway
- Large volume of truck traffic
- Highways where sight distance is limited
- Conditions for NOT requiring a right-turn lane where right-turn volumes are more than indicated in Table 2-3:
- Dense or built-out corridor where space is limited
- Where queues of stopped vehicles would block the access to the right turn lane
- Where sufficient length of property width is not available for the appropriate design
(4) The acceleration lane should not interfere with any downstream access connection.
- The distance from the end of the acceleration lane taper to the next unsignalized downstream access connection should be equal to or greater than the distances found in Table 2-2.
- Additionally, if the next access connection is signalized, the distance from the end of the acceleration lane taper to the back of the 90th percentile queue should be greater than or equal to the distances found Table 2-2.
(5) Continuous right-turn lanes can provide mobility benefits both for through movements and for the turning vehicles. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Access connections within a continuous right turn lane should meet the spacing requirements found in Table 22. However, when combined with crossing left in movements, a continuous right-turn lane can introduce additional operational conflicts.


[^0]:    Based upon the Traffic Signal Warrants described in Chapter 4C of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), 2009 Edition, published by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

