To: Jason Guillot
Westhampton, LLC
350 Pembrooke Lane
Richmond, VA 23238
From: Diane Linderman
Ahmed Amer
VHB

Date: May 23, 2016
Project \#: 34149.00
Re: Traffic Impact Analysis for the Westhampton on Grove Redevelopment Project

## Introduction

This memo is to summarize the analysis made of the intersections in the vicinity of the proposed new development at the Westhampton on Grove redevelopment project in Richmond, VA. The objective is to study the impacts of the proposed new development on the traffic operations at the following three adjacent intersections.

1) Grove Avenue and Libbie Avenue (Signalized).
2) Grove Avenue and Granite Avenue (two-way stop control (TWSC) on Granite Avenue).
3) Libbie Avenue and York Road (TWSC on York Road).

As shown in Figure 1, the development is located on the north side of Grove Avenue at the corner of Grove and Granite Avenues in the City of Richmond. The current uses on the property include a two screen movie theater, a real estate office, and parking. The redevelopment site plan indicates the following proposed land uses.


Figure 1: Aerial Image of the Study Area and the Subject Intersections (Source: Google Earth ${ }^{\circledR}$ )

- Restaurant.
- Salon.
- Food store/sandwich shop.
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- Office.
- Residential.

Due to the location of the project within the City of Richmond, it has been assumed that VDOT Traffic Impact Analysis Regulations (Chapter 527) will not apply in this case.

## Existing Conditions

## Traffic and Pedestrian/Bicycle Counts

Based on our scoping meeting with City staff, the operational analysis was conducted for PM peak hour conditions. Vehicular turning movement counts (TMCs) as well as pedestrian/bicycle crossings during midday and PM peak periods were recently collected from the three subject intersections in March 2016. Figure 2, Figure 3 and Figure 4 summarize the existing conditions traffic counts during the evening peak hour (5:00-6:00 PM).


Vehicles


Pedestrians/Bicycles

Figure 2: Existing Conditions - Evening Peak Vehicular, Pedestrian and Bicycle Counts at Grove Ave and Libbie Ave


Figure 3: Existing Conditions - Evening Peak Vehicular, Pedestrian and Bicycle Counts at Grove Ave and Granite Ave
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Figure 4: Existing Conditions - Evening Peak Vehicular, Pedestrian and Bicycle Counts at Libbie Ave and York Rd
This neighborhood is influenced by vehicle and pedestrian traffic due to the proximity of the three schools. Vehicular turning movement counts (TMCs) as well as pedestrian/bicycle crossings for the midday peak are shown in Figure 5, Figure 6 and Figure 7.


Figure 5: Existing Conditions - Midday Peak Vehicular, Pedestrian and Bicycle Counts at Grove Ave and Libbie Ave
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Vehicles


Figure 6: Existing Conditions - Midday Peak Vehicular, Pedestrian and Bicycle Counts at Grove Ave and Granite Ave


Figure 7: Existing Conditions - Midday Peak Vehicular, Pedestrian and Bicycle Counts at Libbie Ave and York Rd

## Signal Phasing and Timings

Existing phasing and timings at the signalized intersection of Grove Ave and Libbie Ave were obtained from City of Richmond, as shown in Figure 8. It is worth mentioning that the split phasing operation on Grove Ave has phase numbers 1 and 2. Nevertheless, in order for Synchro to be able to run HCM 2010 analyses, the phase number for WB approach is changed from phase 1 to phase 6 . Signal timing splits are based on a PM cycle length of 110 seconds.


Figure 8: Existing Signal Phasing at Grove Ave and Libbie Ave (Weekday PM)
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## Proposed Developments

The redevelopment of this site includes land uses that are allowed under the current zoning. The site plan prepared by Stewart/HG and dated May 2016 is included as Figure 9. This plan proposed a reconfiguration of the parking lot behind the buildings with an entrance only at Granite Avenue and exit only on York Road. The parking lot will have controlled access and be available for use by the retail and residential uses in this development. The site plan improves the access management on York Road by consolidating the current access in and out of the existing parking lot to one driveway. The improvements along Grove Avenue will greatly enhance the pedestrian environment by the elimination of two existing driveways. A new sidewalk will be constructed along the west side Granite Avenue to the driveway entrance and along the property boundary on York Road.


Figure 9: Proposed Plan View (Source: Stewart/HG, May 2016)
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## Proposed Land Uses and Trip Generation

In addition to the existing land uses, the new proposed land uses are listed hereinafter along with the assumed ITE land use codes (LUCs) for each land use type. Using the assumed LUCs, Table 1 includes the total daily and PM peak hour trip generation for the proposed land uses and Table 2 summarizes the trip generation results for the PM peak hour.

## Existing Land Uses

- Movie Theater with Matinee (LUC 444): 2 screens.
- General Office (LUC 710): 5,800 sf.


## Proposed Land Uses

- Residential (LUC 230): 12 units.
- General Office (LUC 710): 20,182 sf.
- Hair Salon (LUC 918): 3,053 sf.
- High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant (LUC 932): 4,736 sf.
- Quality Restaurant (LUC 931): 4,576 sf.

Table 1: Future PM Peak Trip Generation

| ITE Land Use Code | Use | Units | ITE MANUAL RATES* |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | ADT | PM Enter | PM Exit | PM Total |
| 230 | Condominiums | 12 units | 70 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| 710 | General Office | 20,182 sf | 389 | 17 | 84 | 101 |
| 918 | Hair Salon | 3,053 sf | 60 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| 932 | High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant | $4,736 \mathrm{sf}$ | 602 | 48 | 40 | 88 |
| 931 | Quality Restaurant | 4,576 sf | 412 | 23 | 11 | 34 |
|  |  | Total Trips | 1,533 | 94 | 141 | 235 |

Table 2: Summary of PM Peak Trip Generation Results

| Scenario | Daily | PM Peak |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In | Out | Total |
| Existing Total | 591 | 42 | 43 | 85 |
| Future Total | 1,533 | 94 | 141 | 235 |
| Existing Internal Capture | 30 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Future Internal Capture | 127 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Existing Pass-By | - | - | - | - |
| Future Pass-By | - | 19 | 19 | 38 |
| Existing Non-Pass-By | 561 | 40 | 41 | 81 |
| Future Non-Pass-By | $\mathbf{1 , 4 0 6}$ | 70 | $\mathbf{1 1 7}$ | 187 |
| Net New Non-Pass-By | $\mathbf{8 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6}$ |
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## Background Traffic

Using the VDOT traffic count data, the average daily traffic volumes were reviewed over the last five years. The volumes on Grove Avenue (counts both east and west of Libbie Avenue) and on Libbie Avenue north of Grove Avenue show no growth. Grove Avenue, between Libbie Avenue and Thompson Street, has a volume of approximately 9,400 daily trips and between Three Chopt Road and Libbie Avenue, approximately 10,000 trips per day. Libbie Avenue, north of Grove Avenue carries approximately 10,000 daily trips. Accordingly, a zero percent annual background traffic growth rate is assumed for the study area.

## Trip Distribution and Assignment

The trip distribution uses percentages based on the current volume counts at the three subject intersections are shown on Figure 10 ( $22 \%$ north, $11 \%$ south, $45 \%$ east, and $22 \%$ west).


Figure 10: Proposed Trip Distribution Percentages
Based on these assumptions, entering and exiting final generated trips are assigned at the subject intersection as shown in Figure 11 and Figure 12, respectively. The PM Peak generated trips as assigned to the road network are shown on Figure 13.
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Figure 11: Percentage Assignment of Entering Final Generated Trips


Figure 12: Percentage Assignment of Exiting Final Generated Trips
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Figure 13: PM Peak Trip Assignment

## Proposed Traffic Volumes

Based on the above trip generation, distribution and assignment, the final future vehicular volumes, based on the proposed land use developments, during evening peak hour are summarized Figure 14.


Figure 14: Proposed Conditions - Evening Peak Vehicular, Pedestrian and Bicycle Volumes

## Results and Conclusions

## Analysis Results

A Synchro model was used to code the study area, and HCM 2010 used to run the analyses at the three subject intersections, using fixed PM cycle lengths (110 seconds), phasing and splits. The model is used to obtain the measures of effectiveness (MOEs) and level of service (LOS) at the subject intersection. The model is run for the evening peak and evaluates the delay/LOS as well as $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths for the three intersections, based on two different scenarios listed hereinafter.

- No-build (existing) conditions
- Build (proposed) conditions
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Figure 15 and Figure 16 summarize the delay and level of service (LOS) of the intersection approaches of each of the two scenarios, respectively. In addition, Figure 17 and Figure 18 summarize the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths of the intersection approaches of each of the two scenarios, respectively. The detailed HCM 2010 Synchro outputs can be found in Appendix A.


Figure 15: Delay (s) and Level of Service - No Build PM Peak
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Figure 16: Delay (s) and Level of Service - Build PM Peak


Figure 17: 95th \% Queue Length (ft) - No Build PM Peak
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Figure 18: $95^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue Length ( ft ) - Build PM Peak

## Conclusions

It can be seen from both the delay/LOS figures as well as the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length figures that the added trips generated from the proposed development plan have minimal impact on the operations at the three intersections. For the signalized intersection of Grove Ave and Libbie Ave, none of the approaches experienced a deterioration in the level of service in the build case compared by the no-build. With the respect to the TWSC intersection of Libbie Ave and York Rd, the operations on the mainline as well as the EB approach was not impacted by the proposed developments. However, the WB approach of York Rd shows a change in the LOS from "B" to "C", as well as increase in the $95^{\text {th }} \%$ queue length from 15 ft to 43 ft , due to the proposed development. Such change in the approach MOE is still considered acceptable.

Similarly, for the TWSC intersection of Grove Ave and Granite Ave, the proposed development does not have any observed impacts on the mainline (Grove Ave) nor the NB approach of Granite Ave. Nevertheless, the SB approach of the intersection currently has an existing LOS " F " with 55 seconds of delay and $77 \mathrm{ft} 95^{\text {th }} \%$ queue length. These deteriorated MOEs already exist without the proposed development. Such deteriorated performance on that approach can be attributed to the extended queues from the adjacent signalized intersection ( 450 ft on WB approach at Grove Ave and Libbie Ave). That long queue extends further than the spacing between the two intersections ( $\sim 410 \mathrm{ft}$ ), spills back and impedes approaching SB traffic from proceeding through the STOP sign.

Looking at the build scenario, it can be found that the SB approach experienced increased delay and queue length, those can still be attributed to the currently deteriorated condition discussed earlier. It is anticipated that over time,
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drivers will choose other options than sitting in a long queue - more may exit at York Road and Libbie Avenue or go north on Granite Avenue to Patterson Avenue.

With the installation of a signal at Maple and Grove Avenues, it is anticipated that some volume may divert to Maple Avenue from Libbie Avenue, reducing the volume on Libbie Avenue and improving the LOS at Libbie and Grove Avenues. This diversion has not been considered in this analysis and is therefore considered a conservative analysis.

In conclusion, it can be clearly seen from the results and the above discussions that the proposed new land use development at the Westhampton on Grove does not show any considerable impact on the traffic operations at the three adjacent intersections.

## Recommendations

Due to the character of the neighborhood and the focus on pedestrians, the following recommendations are made:

- Install crosswalk across York Road, westbound approach
- Install crosswalk across Granite Avenue, southbound approach
- Provide the City with the signal retiming to maximize the efficiency of the signal at Libbie and Grove Avenues
- Evaluate advance signage on Grove Avenue, east of Granite Avenue to warn drivers of the change of road character, for example "Do not block intersection", enhanced speed limit reduction signage


## Appendix A:

Synchro Model HCM 2010 Outputs

|  | $y$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | P |  | 1 | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}{ }^{\text {d }}$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 63 | 236 | 16 | 31 | 727 | 110 | 38 | 187 | 24 | 105 | 177 | 156 |
| Number | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.82 | 1.00 |  | 0.89 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1891 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 68 | 257 | 17 | 34 | 790 | 120 | 41 | 203 | 26 | 114 | 192 | 170 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 134 | 530 | 36 | 38 | 915 | 148 | 53 | 295 | 38 | 143 | 210 | 186 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.08 | 0.23 | 0.23 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 653 | 2576 | 177 | 116 | 2795 | 451 | 1810 | 1647 | 211 | 1810 | 921 | 815 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 194 | 0 | 148 | 553 | 0 | 391 | 41 | 0 | 229 | 114 | 0 | 362 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1867 | 0 | 1539 | 1894 | 0 | 1469 | 1810 | 0 | 1858 | 1810 | 0 | 1736 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 10.1 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 30.5 | 0.0 | 26.8 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 22.4 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 10.1 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 30.5 | 0.0 | 26.8 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 22.4 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.35 |  | 0.12 | 0.06 |  | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 0.11 | 1.00 |  | 0.47 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 384 | 0 | 317 | 620 | 0 | 481 | 53 | 0 | 332 | 143 | 0 | 397 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.47 | 0.89 | 0.00 | 0.81 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.69 | 0.80 | 0.00 | 0.91 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 384 | 0 | 317 | 620 | 0 | 481 | 156 | 0 | 380 | 239 | 0 | 434 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 38.7 | 0.0 | 38.4 | 35.2 | 0.0 | 33.9 | 53.0 | 0.0 | 42.3 | 49.8 | 0.0 | 41.4 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 1.1 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 17.7 | 0.0 | 13.9 | 21.0 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 22.3 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 5.4 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 13.2 |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 39.8 | 0.0 | 39.4 | 52.9 | 0.0 | 47.8 | 74.1 | 0.0 | 46.7 | 59.6 | 0.0 | 63.7 |
| LnGrp LOS | D |  | D | D |  | D | E |  | D | E |  | E |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 342 |  |  | 944 |  |  | 270 |  |  | 476 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 39.6 |  |  | 50.8 |  |  | 50.8 |  |  | 62.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |


| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Assigned Phs | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 28.6 | 8.7 | 30.6 | 42.0 | 14.2 | 25.2 |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 14.0 | 9.5 | 27.5 | 36.0 | 14.5 | 22.5 |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c $\mathbf{l}+11)$, s | 12.1 | 4.5 | 24.4 | 32.5 | 8.8 | 14.7 |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 1.5 |  |

Intersection Summary
HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay
51.7

HCM 2010 LOS
D

## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Vol, veh/h | 19 | 354 | 16 | 25 | 838 | 93 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 34 | 17 | 34 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 45 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 21 | 385 | 17 | 27 | 911 | 101 | 4 | 8 | 15 | 37 | 18 | 37 |
| Major/Minor | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  | inor1 |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1012 | 0 | 0 | 404 | 0 | 0 | 956 | 1503 | 248 | 1256 | 1461 | 551 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 437 | 437 | - | 1016 | 1016 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 519 | 1066 | - | 240 | 445 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.1 | - | - | 4.1 | - | - | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.5 | 5.5 | - | 6.5 | 5.5 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.5 | 5.5 | - | 6.5 | 5.5 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.2 | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | 3.5 | 4 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.3 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 693 | - | - | 1166 | - | - | 216 | 123 | 758 | 130 | 130 | 483 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 574 | 583 | - | 259 | 318 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 513 | 301 | - | 748 | 578 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 667 | - | - | 1122 | - | - | 156 | 111 | 728 | 108 | 117 | 465 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | 156 | 111 | - | 108 | 117 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 550 | 558 | - | 248 | 300 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 403 | 284 | - | 667 | 553 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.7 | 0.4 | 22.6 | 55.1 |
| HCM LOS |  | $C$ | $F$ |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 232 | 667 | - | - | 1122 | - | - | 159 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.117 | 0.031 | - | -0.024 | - | -0.581 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 22.6 | 10.6 | 0.2 | - | 8.3 | 0.2 | - | 55.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | A | - | A | A | - | F |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.4 | 0.1 | - | - | 0.1 | - | - | 3 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Vol, veh/h | 3 | 8 | 37 | 3 | 8 | 63 | 23 | 366 | 5 | 29 | 406 | 46 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 25 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - |  | None | - |  | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 3 | 9 | 40 | 3 | 9 | 68 | 25 | 398 | 5 | 32 | 441 | 50 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Minor1 |  |  |  | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1068 | 1032 | 509 | 1055 | 1055 | 445 | 516 | 0 | 0 | 428 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 554 | 554 | - | 476 | 476 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 514 | 478 | - | 579 | 579 | - | - | - |  | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 | - | - | 4.1 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.1 | 5.5 | - | 6.1 | 5.5 | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.1 | 5.5 | - | 6.1 | 5.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 4 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.3 | 2.2 | - | - | 2.2 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 201 | 235 | 568 | 205 | 227 | 617 | 1060 | - | - | 1142 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 520 | 517 | - | 574 | 560 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 547 | 559 | - | 504 | 504 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 157 | 210 | 548 | 168 | 203 | 595 | 1044 | - | - | 1124 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 157 | 210 | - | 168 | 203 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 493 | 486 | - | 545 | 531 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 454 | 530 | - | 434 | 474 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 15.8 | 14.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| HCM LOS | C | B |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR EBLn1WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1044 | - | - | 385 | 454 | 1124 | - |


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 9 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * $\uparrow$ |  |  | * $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }^{*}$ | F |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 63 | 243 | 16 | 33 | 730 | 110 | 38 | 187 | 27 | 112 | 184 | 169 |
| Number | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.81 | 1.00 |  | 0.89 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1891 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 68 | 264 | 17 | 36 | 793 | 120 | 41 | 203 | 29 | 122 | 200 | 184 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 125 | 506 | 34 | 40 | 914 | 147 | 53 | 300 | 43 | 151 | 216 | 199 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.08 | 0.24 | 0.24 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 640 | 2592 | 174 | 123 | 2792 | 449 | 1810 | 1622 | 232 | 1810 | 903 | 831 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 198 | 0 | 151 | 556 | 0 | 393 | 41 | 0 | 232 | 122 | 0 | 384 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 1868 | 0 | 1537 | 1894 | 0 | 1469 | 1810 | 0 | 1854 | 1810 | 0 | 1733 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 10.5 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 30.8 | 0.0 | 27.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 12.8 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 23.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 10.5 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 30.8 | 0.0 | 27.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 12.8 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 23.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.34 |  | 0.11 | 0.06 |  | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 0.13 | 1.00 |  | 0.48 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 365 | 0 | 300 | 620 | 0 | 481 | 53 | 0 | 342 | 151 | 0 | 414 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.90 | 0.00 | 0.82 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.68 | 0.81 | 0.00 | 0.93 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 365 | 0 | 300 | 620 | 0 | 481 | 156 | 0 | 379 | 239 | 0 | 433 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 39.8 | 0.0 | 39.5 | 35.2 | 0.0 | 34.0 | 53.0 | 0.0 | 41.8 | 49.5 | 0.0 | 40.9 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 14.2 | 21.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 25.4 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 5.6 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 12.8 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 41.5 | 0.0 | 40.8 | 53.5 | 0.0 | 48.2 | 74.1 | 0.0 | 46.0 | 59.9 | 0.0 | 66.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | D |  | D | D |  | D | E |  | D | E |  | E |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 349 |  |  | 949 |  |  | 273 |  |  | 506 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 41.2 |  |  | 51.3 |  |  | 50.2 |  |  | 64.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), $s$ |  | 27.5 | 8.7 | 31.8 |  | 42.0 | 14.7 | 25.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s |  | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 |  | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 14.0 | 9.5 | 27.5 |  | 36.0 | 14.5 | 22.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time ( $\left.\mathrm{g}_{-} \mathrm{c}+11\right)$, s |  | 12.5 | 4.5 | 25.8 |  | 32.8 | 9.3 | 14.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 |  | 1.3 | 0.1 | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 52.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 10.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Vol, veh/h | 29 | 361 | 16 | 25 | 838 | 107 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 61 | 17 | 39 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 45 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 32 | 392 | 17 | 27 | 911 | 116 | 4 | 8 | 15 | 66 | 18 | 42 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |  | Minor1 |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1027 | 0 | 0 | 412 | 0 | 0 | 985 | 1548 | 252 | 1288 | 1498 | 559 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 466 | 466 | - | 1023 | 1023 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 519 | 1082 | - | 265 | 475 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.1 | - | - | 4.1 | - | - | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.5 | 5.5 | - | 6.5 | 5.5 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.5 | 5.5 | - | 6.5 | 5.5 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.2 | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | 3.5 | 4 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.3 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 684 | - | - | 1158 | - | - | 205 | 115 | 754 | 123 | 124 | 478 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 551 | 566 | - | 256 | 316 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 513 | 296 | - | 723 | 561 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 658 | - | - | 1115 | - | - | 142 | 101 | 725 | 100 | 109 | 460 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | 142 | 101 | - | 100 | 109 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 515 | 529 | - | 240 | 298 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 396 | 279 | - | 629 | 525 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 1 | 0.4 | 24.3 | 118.9 |
| HCM LOS |  | $C$ | $F$ |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 214 | 658 | - | -1115 | - | - | 138 |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.127 | 0.048 | - | -0.024 | - | -0.922 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 24.3 | 10.7 | 0.3 | - | 8.3 | 0.2 | -118.9 |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | A | - | A | A | - | F |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.4 | 0.2 | - | - | 0.1 | - | - | 6.3 |



| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| HCM Control Delay, S | 16 | 22.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 |
| HCM LOS | C | C |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR EBLn1WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1044 | - | -378 | 331 | 1124 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.024 | - | -0.138 | 0.387 | 0.033 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.5 | 0 | - | 16 | 22.6 | 8.3 | 0 |


|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 342 | 944 | 41 | 229 | 114 | 362 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.83 | 0.77 | 0.32 | 0.70 | 0.59 | 0.77 |
| Control Delay | 64.4 | 35.7 | 54.7 | 53.0 | 58.9 | 46.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 64.4 | 35.7 | 54.7 | 53.0 | 58.9 | 46.5 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 124 | 316 | 28 | 145 | 77 | 217 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | \#196 | \#450 | 63 | 227 | 134 | \#354 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 408 | 392 |  | 134 |  | 164 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 419 | 1232 | 155 | 385 | 237 | 477 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.82 | 0.77 | 0.26 | 0.59 | 0.48 | 0.76 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ $\uparrow$ |  |  | $4 \hat{}$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 19 | 354 | 16 | 25 | 838 | 93 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 34 | 17 | 34 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 21 | 385 | 17 | 27 | 911 | 101 | 4 | 8 | 15 | 37 | 18 | 37 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 15 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Lane Width (tt) |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |
| Walking Speed (t/s) |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ti) |  | 472 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  | 0.95 |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 1057 |  |  | 417 |  |  | 1006 | 1561 | 218 | 1315 | 1519 | 551 |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 1057 |  |  | 282 |  |  | 901 | 1486 | 72 | 1227 | 1442 | 551 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 97 |  |  | 98 |  |  | 97 | 93 | 98 | 66 | 84 | 92 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 642 |  |  | 1213 |  |  | 165 | 107 | 920 | 107 | 114 | 465 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 213 | 210 | 483 | 557 | 27 | 92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 21 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 4 | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 17 | 0 | 101 | 15 | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 642 | 1700 | 1213 | 1700 | 239 | 158 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.02 | 0.33 | 0.11 | 0.59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 22.0 | 55.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  | C | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.7 |  | 0.3 |  | 22.0 | 55.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | C | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 59.2\% |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | B |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 349 | 949 | 41 | 232 | 122 | 384 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.85 | 0.78 | 0.32 | 0.70 | 0.62 | 0.81 |
| Control Delay | 65.7 | 36.7 | 54.7 | 52.7 | 59.8 | 48.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 65.7 | 36.7 | 54.7 | 52.7 | 59.8 | 48.8 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 126 | 326 | 28 | 144 | 83 | 230 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | \#203 | \#453 | 63 | 230 | 142 | \#390 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 408 | 392 |  | 134 |  | 164 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 419 | 1215 | 155 | 387 | 237 | 481 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.83 | 0.78 | 0.26 | 0.60 | 0.51 | 0.80 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |




