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## 1 Introduction

This study was initiated by the City of Vestavia Hills through the Advanced Planning, Programming, and Logical Engineering (APPLE) program developed by the Regional Planning Commission of Greater Birmingham (RPCGB). The City requested professional planning assistance in evaluating traffic operations at several intersections within the City. The study involves the following nine (9) intersections:

1. Rocky Ridge Road at Dolly Ridge Road
2. Sicard Hollow Road at Blue Lake Drive/Cahaba Heights Road
3. Rocky Ridge Road at US-280
4. US-31 at Shades Crest Road
5. US-31 at Columbiana Road/I-65 Northbound Ramps
6. Columbiana Road at Shades Crest Road/Vestaview Lane
7. US-31 at Vestavia Plaza/City Hall
8. US-31 at Pizitz Drive/Vestavia Forest Place
9. Dolly Ridge Road at Gresham Drive

### 1.1 Purpose and Need of the Study

This study was undertaken to assess traffic operational improvements at several intersections in and around the City, specifically stemming from user complaints and the redistricting of several schools within the district. This document summarizes the following topics:

- Existing transportation system operational conditions and deficiencies,
- The process used to identify potential alternatives for improvement,
- The resulting alternatives that were developed from that process, and
- An evaluation of potential positive and negative impacts to the area and adjacent properties that may be associated with each improvement.

The purpose of this study is to identify feasible improvements and their potential impacts. If the City chooses to move forward with an improvement project, a more detailed Environmental Planning Study would be required for federally funded projects; however, the City may also fund any improvements in order to achieve a quicker timeline.

Some of the intersections included in this study need improvements to accommodate adjusted traffic demands and pedestrian access as a result of the redistricting of schools within the City. For these intersections, this study is specifically geared towards identifying improvements that can be implemented with an accelerated timeline before the school redistricting takes effect for the 2019-2020 school year. Long term

[^0]improvements were identified at various locations to provide additional context for daily traffic operations at the intersections.

### 1.2 Study Approach

This study involves an evaluation of the existing conditions and constraints of several intersections selected by the City to be a part of the study. Existing traffic data was collected and a capacity analysis of the existing conditions was prepared. All information was compiled and evaluated to define the needs of each intersection and identify constraints and opportunities for improvement. Field reviews were performed that consisted of observing peak hour traffic patterns and investigating the impacts of various improvement options.

Recommendations were developed and evaluated relative to their ability to address the purpose and need for the project. Recommendations for each intersection are included within its respective subsection of this report.

### 1.3 Background Information

The most influential driver of the purpose and need for this project is the redistricting of several city schools. Table 1 outlines the changes in school facility enrollment and capacity as estimated by Vestavia Hills City School District.

Table 1: Vestavia Hills City School District Facility Enrollment Before and After Redistricting

| School | Current Grades | Enrollment | Capacity | New Grades | New Enrollment | New Capacity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| East | K-3rd | 770 | 779 | K-5 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | 774 | 836 |
| West | K - 3rd | 752 | 798 | K-5 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | 769 | 874 |
| Central | $4^{\text {th }}-5^{\text {th }}$ | 769 | 646 | None | None | None |
| Gresham/ <br> Dolly Ridge | None | None | None | K $-5^{\text {th }}$ | 735 | 836 |
| Cahaba Heights | K - $5^{\text {th }}$ | 429 | 437 | K $-5^{\text {th }}$ | 491 | 570 |
| Liberty Park Elementary | K - $5^{\text {th }}$ | 589 | 779 | K - $5^{\text {th }}$ | 613 | 779 |
| Liberty Park Middle | $6^{\text {th }}-8^{\text {th }}$ | 482 | 798 | $6^{\text {th }}-8^{\text {th }}$ | 479 | 798 |
| Pizitz | $6^{\text {th }}-8^{\text {th }}$ | 1149 | 1026 | $9^{\text {th }}$ | 510* | 1026** |
| Berry | None | None | None | $6^{\text {th }}-8^{\text {th }}$ | 1199 | 1300 |

Source: Vestavia Hills City Schools Annual Reports 2013-2018 (www.vestavia.k12.al.us)
*Estimated based on 2017-2018 Vestavia Hills High School total enrollment
**Assumed previous Pizitz campus capacity would remain the same as 2017-2018

## 2 Traffic Analysis and Recommendations

Stakeholder input resulted in the following intersections and any specified focus areas associated with each location. Each subsection contains an operations analysis of the existing conditions for the year 2019 and recommendations for mitigating operational deficiencies. Traffic counts are included in Appendix A, and capacity analysis reports from Trafficware's Synchro 10 software are included in Appendix B.

In the Highway Capacity Manual (2016), published by the Transportation Research Board, traffic capacities are expressed as levels of service (LOS) ranging from "A" to "F". A detailed description of each level of service designation is included in Appendix C. Generally, LOS " C " is considered desirable, while LOS " D " is considered acceptable during peak hours of traffic flow.

### 2.1 Rocky Ridge Road at Dolly Ridge Road

Rocky Ridge Road is classified as a two-lane minor arterial with a speed limit of 35 MPH , and Dolly Ridge Road is classified as a two-lane major collector. The intersection is signalized and operates currently as a two-phase cycle running free at all times. Figure 1 displays aerial imagery of the intersection. Traffic counts were collected by Jefferson County on Tuesday, January 15, 2019, from 6:00 AM to 8:00 AM, 2:00 PM to 3:00 PM, and 4:30 PM to 6:00 PM. Analysis completed by Jefferson County and Sain Associates included a Synchro capacity analysis, trip generation estimates for added school traffic, and crash data analysis. According to the City, plans are in place to install sidewalks in the vicinity of the intersection. These plans were considered when making recommendations.


Figure 1: Aerial Imagery of the Rocky Ridge Road at Dolly Ridge Road Intersection

## Analysis

Rocky Ridge Road is a heavily utilized roadway for commuters accessing US-280 and schools. Dolly Ridge Road connects Rocky Ridge Road on the western end to Cahaba River Road on the eastern end. Both Rocky Ridge Road approaches have left turn lanes. The trip generating land parcels that feed the eastbound approach to this intersection are fully built-out. The west leg of Dolly Ridge Road provides access to a CVS, a veterinarian office, an assisted-living facility, and a moderately-sized residential neighborhood. With its close proximity to Vestavia Hills High School and the new Dolly Ridge Elementary, the intersection is expected to be noticeably affected by the redistricting of schools. Table 2 displays the current level of service for each lane group. The numbers shown in parentheses indicate each lane group's delay per vehicle in seconds.

Table 2: Existing Lane Group LOS at Rocky Ridge Road and Dolly Ridge Road (2019)

| Approach | AM LOS |  | School PM LOS |  | PM LOS |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through/ <br> Right | Left | Through/ <br> Right | Left | Through/ <br> Right |
| Rocky Ridge Road - Northbound | $\mathrm{A}(5.7)$ | $\mathrm{C}(22.2)$ | $\mathrm{A}(5.6)$ | $\mathrm{A}(7.0)$ | $\mathrm{A}(7.3)$ | $\mathrm{A}(9.4)$ |
| Rocky Ridge Road - Southbound | $\mathrm{D}(41.5)$ | $\mathrm{A}(7.9)$ | $\mathrm{A}(6.8)$ | $\mathrm{B}(10.2)$ | $\mathrm{A}(9.1)$ | $\mathrm{B}(15.5)$ |
| Dolly Ridge Road - Eastbound | $\mathrm{B}(19.9)$ |  | $\mathrm{B}(14.5)$ | $\mathrm{B}(18.3)$ |  |  |
| Dolly Ridge Road - Westbound | $\mathrm{D}(35.7)$ |  | $\mathrm{B}(19.3)$ |  | $\mathrm{C}(25.6)$ |  |

Table 3 shows the estimated additional trips induced by the opening of Dolly Ridge Elementary. Trip generation was completed based on turning movement counts from an existing Vestavia Hills elementary school and distributed by a shortest-path analysis using GIS software. Since Vestavia Hills does not employ a typical bus system, the ITE Trip Generation Manual trip rates for elementary schools (LUC 520) is not appropriate for this scenario. Further details of the trip generation methodology used in this study can be found in Section 2.9 and Appendix D. Table 4 contains the peak hour capacity analysis with the estimated added volume from the trip generation.

Table 3: Net Added Volume from Trip Generation

| Approach | Net Added AM Trips |  | Net Added School PM Trips |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| Rocky Ridge Road - Northbound | 0 | 0 | 302 | 0 | 0 | 82 |
| Rocky Ridge Road - Southbound | 154 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 0 | 0 |
| Dolly Ridge Road - Eastbound | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| Dolly Ridge Road - Westbound | 119 | 2 | 196 | 139 | 19 | 146 |

Table 4: Lane Group LOS with Trip Generation Volumes Added (2019)

| Approach | AM LOS |  | School PM LOS |  | PM** LOS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through/ Right | Left | Through/ Right | Left | Through/ Right |
| Rocky Ridge Road - Northbound | A (6.2) | F (122.7) | A (7.6) | B (11.2) | A (7.3) | A (9.4) |
| Rocky Ridge Road - Southbound | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } \\ (>300)^{*} \end{gathered}$ | A (8.6) | D (38.8) | B (16.9) | A (9.1) | B (15.5) |
| Dolly Ridge Road - Eastbound | C (21.2) |  | B (17.4) |  | B (18.3) |  |
| Dolly Ridge Road - Westbound | F (>300)* |  | F (89.5) |  | C (25.6) |  |

*Computed delay in seconds exceeds a meaningful value
**School trip generation estimates do not affect PM LOS, only AM and School PM LOS.
The crash data analysis included ten (10) crashes from 2016 through 2018. $40 \%$ of crashes involved angle collisions, and an additional $40 \%$ of the crashes were sideswipe crashes. There were two safety issues observed at this intersection that could be contributing to angle or sideswipe crashes. First, the diagonal span-wire arrangement leads to poor signal head visibility for drivers as they enter the intersection. This is especially true for drivers attempting to make a permissive left turn from either Rocky Ridge Road approach. Second, the access point density in the segment just north of the intersection on Rocky Ridge Road is unnecessarily high. The potential for drivers to use the access points as cut-throughs during peak hours is high, which presents a safety issue for gas station customers walking to and from the gas pumps. One access is striped as a right-in, right-out configuration, which is generally less effective at preventing incorrect movements than raised channelizing islands. Figure 2 shows a view of the intersection, its span-wire arrangement, and the right-in, right-out access point to the gas station.


Figure 2: View from the northeast corner of the Rocky Ridge Road at Dolly Ridge Road intersection

## Recommendations

Considering the added volumes and the existing operational performance of the intersection, the following short-term and long-term recommendations should be implemented.

Short Term Recommendations:

1. Add a left turn phase for the Rocky Ridge Road northbound and southbound approaches. A flashing yellow arrow (FYA) signal head arrangement is recommended for both protected-permissive left turn conditions. Base signal timings with the added phase are included in Appendix E. The timings should be monitored after school begins, and any necessary adjustments should be made.
2. In conjunction with adding left turn phases, the existing span-wire arrangement should be converted to a box arrangement. Long term recommendations below should be considered in the placement of any new signal poles.
3. Include pedestrian timings, signal heads, and crosswalks in accordance with the plans for sidewalks in the area.
4. Install a raised channelizing island at the right-in, right-out gas station driveway along Rocky Ridge Road just north of the intersection.

## Long Term Recommendations:

5. Install right turn lanes on the Rocky Ridge Road northbound and Dolly Ridge Road westbound approaches. Both turn lanes should be as long as feasible to ensure effectiveness in improving traffic operations at the intersection.

Table 5 shows the capacity analysis results when accounting for short term recommendations (no turn lane additions) and added volumes from trip generation. Table 6 shows the capacity analysis results when accounting for both short term and long term recommendations and added volumes from trip generation. Inclusion of pedestrian phases will impact levels of service for other movements.

Table 5: Lane Group LOS with Short Term Recommendations Implemented (2019)

| Approach | AM LOS |  | School PM LOS |  | PM LOS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through/ Right | Left | Through/ Right | Left | Through/ Right |
| Rocky Ridge Road Northbound | A (9.7) | F (258.9) | B (10.5) | D (43.5) | A (3.6) | B (16.3) |
| Rocky Ridge Road Southbound | F (211.9) | B (15.1) | D (29.6) | C (25.9) | A (4.6) | B (15.1) |
| Dolly Ridge Road Eastbound | C (30.0) |  | B (16.6) |  | B (19.8) |  |
| Dolly Ridge Road Westbound | F (297.8) |  | D (52.3) |  | C (33.7) |  |

Table 6: Lane Group LOS with Short Term and Long Term Recommendations Implemented (2019)

| Approach | AM LOS |  |  | School PM LOS |  |  | PM LOS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Rocky Ridge Road Northbound | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ (5.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { D } \\ (37.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ (4.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ (5.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} C \\ (20.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A} \\ (4.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A} \\ (4.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} B \\ (13.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ (3.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| Rocky Ridge Road Southbound | $\begin{gathered} F \\ (81.0) \end{gathered}$ | A (9.5) |  | $\begin{gathered} A \\ (8.4) \end{gathered}$ | B (16.6) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ (4.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | B (13.4) |  |
| Dolly Ridge Road Eastbound | C (26.5) |  |  | B (16.0) |  |  | B (18.9) |  |  |
| Dolly Ridge Road Westbound | E (71.3) |  | $\begin{gathered} C \\ (26.6) \end{gathered}$ | D (39.0) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ (5.6) \end{gathered}$ | C (27.8) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ (7.2) \end{gathered}$ |

### 2.2 Sicard Hollow Road at Blue Lake Drive/Cahaba Heights Road

Blue Lake Road and Sicard Hollow Road are both classified as two-lane major collectors with speed limits of 35 MPH . The intersection is unsignalized and has four legs. The intersection serves as a hub for access between three areas: Cahaba Heights, the Colonnade and Patchwork Farms, and Liberty Park. 24-hour turning movement counts were collected at this intersection on February 6, 2019. Analysis completed for this intersection includes a capacity analysis, a signal warrant, sight distance measurements, Curve Analysis Reporting Services (CARS) runs, and crash data analysis. No measurable impact to operations is expected due to school redistricting. The Cahaba Pump Station on the northeast quadrant of the intersection is a historic property, and several utility poles and markers exist in close proximity to the intersection. Figure 3 displays the view from the western leg of the intersection.


Figure 3: Intersection of Sicard Hollow Road and Blue Lake Drive/Cahaba Heights Road

## Analysis

While the eight-hour volume warrant was not satisfied, the four-hour volume warrant was satisfied. The signal warrant analysis can be found in Appendix F. Intersections that do not meet the eight-hour volume warrant are typically not considered signal candidates by ALDOT. Though this is not an ALDOT-owned or maintained roadway, there are also stopping sight distance concerns associated with the installation of a signal at this location that increase the likelihood of more severe crashes. Additionally, the installation of a signal generally increases the number of rear end crashes at an intersection. There is no discernible growth trend in nearby historical traffic count data, but Sicard Hollow Road approach volumes would have to grow by at least $5 \%$ annually for the eight-hour warrant to be satisfied in five years.

Much of the queuing observed at this intersection was a result of several vehicles platooning behind a slower driver along Sicard Hollow Road. This type of arrival occurred several times during peak hour observations, but the queue processed fairly quickly each time. Considering the safety implications as well as the delay tradeoffs associated with signalization, it is not recommended that a signal be installed at this time. However, this intersection is an excellent candidate for a roundabout based on the need for acceptable levels of service, traffic calming measures, and the mitigation of insufficient intersection sight distance from Sicard Hollow Road. Table 7 shows the existing levels of service for each lane group at the intersection. Table 8 shows levels of service after signalization and the addition of a southbound left turn lane. The numbers shown in parentheses indicate the lane group delay per vehicle in seconds. Table 9 contains the levels of service for a roundabout at the intersection.

Table 7: Existing Lane Group LOS at Sicard Hollow Road and Blue Lake Drive/Cahaba Heights Road (2019)

| Approach (Existing Conditions) | AM LOS | PM LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left/Through/Right | Left/Through/Right |
| Blue Lake Drive - Northbound | $\mathrm{A}(0)$ | $\mathrm{A}(0)$ |
| Cahaba Heights Road - Southbound | $\mathrm{A}(2.8)$ | $\mathrm{A}(3.9)$ |
| Driveway - Eastbound | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Sicard Hollow Road - Westbound | $\mathrm{F}(>300)^{*}$ | $\mathrm{~F}(265.6)$ |

*Computed delay in seconds exceeds a meaningful value
Table 8: Lane Group LOS with Signalization (2019)

|  | AM LOS |  | PM LOS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach (Signalized) | Left | Through/ Right | Left | Through/ Right |
| Blue Lake Drive - Northbound | D (53.7) |  | B (18.6) |  |
| Cahaba Heights Road - Southbound | B (16.9) | B (10.7) | A (8.9) | A (4.5) |
| Driveway - Eastbound | N/A |  | N/A |  |
| Sicard Hollow Road - Westbound | F (117.8) |  | C (31.6) |  |

Table 9: Proposed Roundabout LOS at Sicard Hollow Road and Blue Lake Drive/Cahaba Heights Road

| Type of Roundabout | Blue Lake <br> Drive - NB |  | Cahaba Heights Road - SB |  | Driveway EB |  | Sicard Hollow Road - WB |  | Roundabout LOS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| 1-Lane by 1-Lane | B | B | A | A | B | B | E | A | C | B |
| 1-Lane by 2-Lanes | A | B | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | A |
| 2-Lanes by 1-Lane | A | A | A | A | A | A | C | A | B | A |
| 2-Lanes by 2-Lanes | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | A |

Sight distance measurements are documented in Table 10 below. Figures 4 and 5 show the view from the stop line at the Sicard Hollow Road approach.

Table 10: Intersection Sight Distance Summary-Sicard Hollow Road \& Blue Lake Drive/Cahaba Heights Road

| Approach - View Direction | Measured Intersection <br> Sight Distance (ft) | Required Intersection <br> Sight Distance* (ft) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Sicard Hollow Road - looking <br> northbound | 350 | 390 |
| Sicard Hollow Road - looking <br> southbound | 305 | 390 |

*According to A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (AASHTO 2011) for a 35 MPH facility.
There is limited curve warning signage along Blue Lake Drive and Cahaba Heights Road to encourage lower speeds and caution near the intersection of Sicard Hollow Road. Existing signage is in poor condition. To determine what advisory speeds should be in place for the curves near the intersection, CARS analysis was run on this stretch of roadway. All recommended curve advisory speeds were at or above the speed limit except for the Blue Lake Drive curve immediately south of the Sicard Hollow Road intersection. CARS analysis documentation can be found in Appendix G, and the appropriate signage is noted in the short term recommendations.

Crash data queries returned just two (2) crashes at the intersection itself. Three (3) additional crashes were analyzed, but their actual locations were north of the intersection of Sicard Hollow Road and Blue Lake Drive. Speed was a factor in at least $60 \%$ of the crashes, but no other conclusive trends can be established with this sample size.


Figure 4: View from Sicard Hollow Road Looking Northbound along Cahaba Heights Road


Figure 5: View from Sicard Hollow Road Looking Southbound along Blue Lake Drive

## Recommendations

Considering existing safety and operational performance of the intersection, the following short-term and long-term recommendations should be implemented.

Short Term Recommendations:

1. A Winding Road (W1-5) sign should be installed 100 feet prior to the group of curves along Blue Lake Drive northbound and southbound between Lakeside Drive and the l-459 overpass.
2. Install a combination horizontal alignment/intersection (W1-10e) sign with a Speed Advisory Plaque (W13-1P) at the beginning of the first curve in each direction along Blue Lake Drive/Cahaba Heights Road (northbound and southbound) before the Sicard Hollow Road intersection. In the northbound direction along Blue Lake Drive, the Speed Advisory Plaque (W13-1P) should be 25 MPH . In the southbound direction along Cahaba Heights Road, the Speed

Advisory Plaque (W13-1P) should be 20 MPH . Ideally, solar-powered flashing beacons should be installed on these sign arrangements to improve visibility to drivers.
3. Install two (2) double-sided Chevron (W1-8) signs along the Blue Lake Drive curve immediately south of the intersection.
4. Trim vegetation on the southwestern quadrant of the intersection to improve intersection sight distance for Sicard Hollow Road drivers looking southbound.
5. Install gate-posted Stop Ahead (W3-1) signs approximately 100 feet from the stop line of the Sicard Hollow Road westbound approach.
6. Install lighting at the intersection to improve intersection visibility during nighttime conditions.

Long Term Recommendations:
7. Install a one-lane by one-lane roundabout at the intersection to calm traffic speeds, mitigate sight distance deficiencies, lessen the likelihood of high severity crashes, and improve average delays at the intersection for Sicard Hollow Road approaches. If a roundabout is installed, reevaluate the warning signage in the area prior to installation. Figure 6 shows a concept of the proposed roundabout.

Short term recommendations would not necessarily change the capacity analysis results from existing conditions, but in practice it would ease the execution of movements from the Sicard Hollow Road approach and improve visibility at the intersection and approaching the intersection. The installation of a roundabout is estimated to bring about the levels of service found in Table 9, based on the ALDOT Capacity Analysis for Planning of Roundabouts tool. This analysis tool uses methodology from the Highway Capacity Manual ( $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition). After evaluating the different types of roundabouts and potential design constraints at this location, a one-lane by one-lane roundabout is the recommended configuration. The LOS E at Sicard Hollow Road westbound is a significant improvement over the LOS F registered by the existing intersection (Table 7) and a signalized intersection (Table 8).


Figure 6: Sicard Hollow Road at Blue Lake Drive Roundabout Concept

Vestavia Hills, Alabama
This report is prepared solely for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, and planning safety improvements on public roads; and is therefore exempt from open records, discovery or admission under Alabama law and 23 U.S.C. §§ 148(h)(4), and 409.

### 2.3 Rocky Ridge Road at Shades Crest Road and US-280

This junction serves to connect many Vestavia Hills neighborhoods to the US-280 corridor. Rocky Ridge Road and Shades Crest Road are both classified as two-lane minor arterials. US-280 is classified as a six-lane principal arterial with a speed limit of 55 MPH. The two signalized intersections are separated by approximately 300 feet. 24hour turning movement counts were collected on February 6, 2019 at the intersection of Rocky Ridge Road and Shades Crest Road. Peak hour volumes from the US-280 at Rocky Ridge Road intersection were obtained through Skipper Consulting from November 2018.

Analysis performed at these intersections included a capacity analysis and crash data analysis. Figure 7 shows aerial imagery of the two intersections. Several utilities lie in close proximity to the roadway on the east side of Rocky Ridge Road, presenting challenges for any short-term widening of the Rocky Ridge Road northbound approach to US-280.


Figure 7: Aerial View of US-280 at Rocky Ridge Road and Shades Crest Road

## Analysis

At the height of the AM peak hour, the queue for the Rocky Ridge Road northbound approach to US-280 extended over half of a mile back to Rocky Brook Drive. The Shades Crest Road eastbound phase was served twice per US-280 cycle, which led to drivers receiving a green light when there was no available space to occupy on Rocky Ridge Road northbound. The majority of Shades Crest Road eastbound drivers continue onto Rocky Ridge Road northbound to turn right onto US-280 eastbound.

In the southbound direction during the AM peak hour, Rocky Ridge Road never queued back to US-280. However, the offset between the two intersections caused issues in the PM peak with Rocky Ridge Road southbound queuing back onto US-280. As soon as the westbound left turn phase is serviced on US-280, the southbound phase for Rocky

Ridge Road at Shades Crest Road turned red. Unfortunately, establishing an offset to employ at the Rocky Ridge Road and Shades Crest Road signal is not practical due to cycle lengths on the US-280 adaptive signal system varying throughout the day.

Another issue associated with the short distance between these intersections is that some drivers are unaware that one lane on Rocky Ridge Road southbound continues on Rocky Ridge Road and the other feeds onto Shades Crest Road westbound. This leads to drivers stopping between the two intersections to change lanes and increases the risk of traffic queuing back onto US-280. Existing directional signage along US-280 westbound prior to the left turn lane that illustrates the upcoming scenario is small and outside of the natural eyeline of the average driver. Figure 8 shows the view of the eastbound left turn phase signal heads.


Figure 8: View of US-280 Westbound Left Turn Signal Heads
There is a short concrete path connecting Rocky Ridge Road with the adjacent cul-desac on the south side of Rocky Ridge Road. There is a Bike Route sign on Rocky Ridge Road northbound a few feet prior to the path, however it is unclear what purpose the path is currently serving. There are safety concerns regarding the lack of guidance associated with this path, and there are no nearby destinations or existing infrastructure to support bicycles or pedestrians. If vehicles are queued on Rocky Ridge Road northbound, a cyclist or pedestrian exiting the path has no view of oncoming traffic.

Table 11 shows existing levels of service at the US-280 and Rocky Ridge Road intersection for each lane group. The numbers shown in parentheses indicate the lane group delay per vehicle in seconds. Though modeled contiguously in Synchro, the capacity analysis results (see Appendix B) for Shades Crest Road at Rocky Ridge Road were not indicative of the conditions observed in the field due to queue spillback from the US-280 and Rocky Ridge Road intersection.

[^1]Table 11: Existing Lane Group LOS at US-280 and Rocky Ridge Road (2019)

| Approach | AM LOS |  |  | PM LOS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Rocky Ridge Road - Northbound | F (111.1) |  | E (58.7) | F (104.0) |  | E (67.3) |
| US-280 - Eastbound |  | C (34.8) | A (8.2) |  | F (212.0) | B (9.0) |
| US-280 - Westbound | F (116.8) | C (31.0) |  | F (116.4) | A (9.0) |  |

Despite the satisfactory levels of service registered in the capacity analysis at the intersection of Shades Crest Road and Rocky Ridge Road, queue spillback from the US280 at Rocky Ridge Road signal prevents the intersection from achieving these levels of service in the field. In other words, the signal at Rocky Ridge Road and Shades Crest Road would operate well if it wasn't in such close proximity to US-280. As a result, our recommendations promote the strategy of maximizing the use of limited space between the intersections to improve the overall efficiency of the system. Currently, the Shades Crest Road phase is set to Max Recall, which takes valuable green time away from Rocky Ridge Road traffic in the PM peak hour and increases the chances of traffic queuing back to US-280 along Rocky Ridge Road southbound.

Thirty nine (39) crashes were reported at the intersection of US-280 and Rocky Ridge Road from 2016 through 2018. The vast majority of crashes from this dataset were lowseverity, rear end collisions on the US-280 mainline. Approximately $90 \%$ of all crashes involved property damage only. Crash data queries returned zero (0) reported crashes at the intersection of Rocky Ridge Road at Shades Crest Road; however, City staff mentioned two recent crashes involving garbage trucks running straight through the intersection from the steep downgrade of Shades Crest Road's approach to Rocky Ridge Road. Advance warning signage on Shades Crest Road has since been installed to notify heavy vehicle drivers of the steep grade.

## Recommendations

Considering existing safety and operational performance of the intersection, the following short-term and long-term recommendations should be implemented.

Short Term Recommendations:

1. Place signage on the south signal span wire facing US-280 westbound traffic that delineates the appropriate lane to occupy for each subsequent route once the left turn movement is made onto Rocky Ridge Road southbound. The inside left turn lane feeds Rocky Ridge Road southbound, while the outside left turn lane feeds Shades Crest Road.
2. At the intersection of Shades Crest Road and Rocky Ridge Road, turn off the Max Recall setting for the Shades Crest Road phase.
3. Extend the Rocky Ridge Road northbound right turn lane onto US-280 eastbound back to the Shades Crest Road intersection to give the right turn lane 275 feet of
storage length from the stop line at US-280 with an additional 100 feet of taper length. This would also require the extension of the outermost left turn lane by the same distance as the right turn lane.
4. Remove the path between Rocky Ridge Road and the adjacent cul-de-sac. There are no pedestrian or bicycle facilities nearby, and it is not within driver expectation to encounter either mode at this location.

Long Term Recommendations:
5. Upon turn lane extension, observe the signal performance at the Rocky Ridge Road and Shades Crest Road intersection and make adjustments to signal timings based on the altered traffic conditions.

Table 12 shows the levels of service for the lane groups at the intersection of US-280 and Rocky Ridge Road after taking into account the recommendations found above. Long cycle lengths on US-280 during peak hours lead to poor delay-related metrics, so the goal of the recommendations is to make the most of each phase. Queue spillback will remain an issue for the Rocky Ridge Road at Shades Crest Road intersection as long as it is a full access intersection, but allowing Shades Crest Road drivers to go directly to the right turn lane on Rocky Ridge Road northbound at US-280 will aid the efficiency of both intersections.

Table 12: Lane Group LOS at US-280 and Rocky Ridge Road with All Improvements (2019)

| Approach | AM LOS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Rocky Ridge Road - <br> Northbound | F (111.1) |  | B (15.1) | F (104.3) |  | E (65.8) |
| US-280 - Eastbound |  | C (34.8) | A (8.2) |  | F (211.2) | B (16.8) |
| US-280 - Westbound | F (116.8) | C (31.0) |  | F (116.4) | A (8.9) |  |

Though there is no major difference in the levels of service registered by Synchro due to turn lane lengthening, our peak hour observations at the intersections indicate that increasing turn lane lengths per the recommendations will increase capacity at the intersection by maximizing the number of vehicles that can be stored between US-280 and Shades Crest Road. Several other methods for signal coordination between the two intersections were evaluated, but we do not believe that they guarantee enough of an operational benefit to traffic conditions. Converting the two intersections to run on one signal controller may result in unacceptable inefficiency at the Shades Crest Road and Rocky Ridge Road intersection at all hours of the day. Attempting to hardwire the controller or detection of the US-280 and Rocky Ridge Road signal to the Rocky Ridge Road and Shades Crest Road signal would most likely be effective during peak hours, but also presents a likelihood of unacceptable inefficiency during nonpeak hours.

[^2]
### 2.4 US-31 at Shades Crest Road

US-31 is classified as a four-lane principal arterial with a speed limit of 40 MPH , and Shades Crest Road is classified as a two-lane minor arterial. Shades Crest Road is one of the major east-west roads in the City of Vestavia Hills, and it intersects US-31 in close proximity to the Vestavia City Center, which is a popular commercial destination. 24hour turning movement counts from May 2012 were grown using a conservative $0.5 \%$ annual growth rate to reach the 2019 existing conditions year. Figure 9 shows a view of the full intersection, and Figure 10 shows the view of the intersection from the Shades Crest Road eastbound approach to US-31. School redistricting will affect this intersection, but no schools are close enough to quantify volume differences with any degree of accuracy. Analysis performed at the intersection included capacity analysis and crash data analysis.

## Analysis

Table 13 shows the levels of service for existing conditions. The numbers shown in parentheses indicate the lane group delay per vehicle in seconds. The most pressing issue at this intersection is the interaction between the Shades Crest Road approaches during the side street phase. There is not a sufficient lane configuration for a protected left turn phase on the side streets, and it is difficult to gauge the intentions of opposing drivers due to the skew of the approaches. Figure 11 shows aerial imagery of the intersection.


Figure 9: Looking north at the intersection of US-31 at Shades Crest Road


Figure 10: Looking Eastbound from the Shades Crest Road approach to US-31


Figure 11: Aerial View of US-31 at Shades Crest Road
During the AM peak hour, the heaviest side street movements are the Shades Crest Road eastbound left turn and the Shades Crest Road westbound right turn. However, there is enough through volume on each Shades Crest Road approach to make it difficult to execute a permissive left turn, which hurts the efficiency of the side street phase. Similar issues are seen during the PM peak hour, but the Shades Crest Road movements are more balanced.

Table 13: Existing Lane Group LOS at US-31 and Shades Crest Road (2019)

| Approach | AM LOS |  |  | PM LOS |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | ThrU | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| US-31 - Northbound | B (10.7) | D (48.6) | B (11.7) | C (27.3) | B (18.6) | A (4.7) |
| US-31 - Southbound | D (42.4) | B (18.8) | A (3.5) | C (21.8) | C (32.4) | A (5.9) |
| Shades Crest Road - Eastbound | F (>300)* |  |  | F (198.2) |  |  |
| Shades Crest Road - Westbound | E (72.1) | E (65.3) |  | F (165.5) | E (64.9) |  |

*Computed delay in seconds exceeds a meaningful value
Crash data analysis from 2016 through 2018 reveals a high percentage of low-severity crashes. Over half of reported crashes at the intersection were rear end collisions, nearly $20 \%$ were angle crashes, and approximately $13 \%$ were sideswipe crashes. This data supports the notion that it is difficult to ascertain the intentions of opposing drivers on the Shades Crest Road approaches. The other potential safety concern observed during field observation was the lack of functional sight distance from the US-31 northbound left turn lane. Due to the vertical crest along US-31 just north of the intersection, it is difficult to achieve adequate sight distance to execute a permissive left turn on the US-31 northbound approach, especially when a vehicle is waiting to make the opposing left turn from the US-31 southbound left turn lane.

## Recommendations

Considering existing safety and operational performance of the intersection, the following short-term and long-term recommendations should be implemented.

Short Term Recommendations:

1. Convert the US-31 northbound left turn phase to protected-only.

Long Term Recommendations:
2. Widen both Shades Crest Road approaches to US-31. Each approach should have a left turn lane and a shared through/right lane. The left turn lanes should have at least 225 feet of storage length to separate the approach's movements early enough for the opposing side street drivers to discern each other's intentions prior to their actual decision point.
3. In conjunction with the widening of the Shades Crest Road approaches to US-31, install flashing yellow arrow (FYA) signal operation on the Shades Crest Road approaches to employ protected-permissive left turn phases. Remove pedestrian push-buttons and pedestrian timings, unless pedestrian facilities are constructed on the west side of the intersection. At that time, perform a signal timing study to determine the appropriate modified timings for the flashing yellow arrow operation.

For the analysis, a parameter was set to utilize the existing amount of the cycle length dedicated to the Shades Crest Road phase during the AM and PM peak hours in order
to fit the recently-retimed US-31 signal system throughout Vestavia Hills. Levels of service along US-31 at the intersection indicate that there is flexibility within the cycle to allocate more time to Shades Crest Road; however, a marginal benefit to the side street may not be an economical use of time when considering how that might affect the US-31 mainline. Given that US-31 within Vestavia Hills was retimed as recently as 2017 with several timing plans in place throughout each day of the week, the practical solution was to accommodate the existing signal coordination on US-31.

Table 14 shows the levels of service for the movements at each intersection after taking into account the recommendations found above. The benefits of the improvements found above come in the form of increased safety and a more functional configuration from the driver's perspective. The high cycle length on US-31 worsens the northbound left turning movement to LOS F, but the sight distance issue is mitigated for a lowvolume movement.

Table 14: Lane Group LOS at US-31 and Shades Crest Road with All Improvements (2019)

| Approach | AM LOS |  |  | PM LOS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| US-31-Northbound | F (107.6) | D (48.6) | A (9.0) | F (103.5) | $\begin{gathered} B \\ (17.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} A \\ (4.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| US-31-Southbound | D (44.7) | C (20.2) | A (2.0) | C (20.9) | $\begin{gathered} D \\ (33.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ \text { (6.4) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Shades Crest Road - Eastbound | F (>300)* | F (80.1) |  | F (88.4) | F (109.6) |  |
| Shades Crest Road - Westbound | E (70.5) | F (272.8) |  | F (213.9) | E (97.4) |  |

*Computed delay in seconds exceeds a meaningful value

### 2.5 US-31 at Columbiana Road/I-65 Northbound Ramps

US-31 is classified as a four-lane principal arterial with a speed limit of 40 MPH , and Columbiana Road is classified as a four-lane minor arterial with a speed limit of 40 MPH . Both routes utilize auxiliary turn lanes. The fourth leg (westbound) of the intersection is the $1-65$ northbound on and off ramps. This signalized intersection is running free with split-phased side streets. 24-hour turning movement counts from May 2012 were grown using a conservative $0.5 \%$ annual growth rate to reach the 2019 existing conditions year. Analysis completed at the intersection included a capacity analysis and crash data analysis. It should be noted that extensive capacity issues exist at this intersection and will be documented in any LOS tables, but the focus of the analysis was to provide the City with practical, economical short-term recommendations. Figure 12 shows the view of the US-31 southbound signal heads at the intersection along with the Columbiana Road eastbound right turn approach.

This intersection was included in two past studies performed by Sain Associates. The Statewide Wrong Way Interchange Assessment (2015) identified safety improvements with the focus of preventing wrong way movements at this interchange, which has a

[^3]higher potential for wrong way movements due to its partial cloverleaf configuration. The East Central Region Birmingham Area Horizontal Curve Study (2017) evaluated safety improvements for the segment of US-31 (SR-3) between approximate mile points 265.9 and 266.3. US-31's intersection with Columbiana Road and the I-65 Northbound Ramps occurs at approximate mile point 266.3. Documentation of recommendations from both studies can be found in Appendix $H$.

## Analysis

Table 15 shows the existing conditions levels of service for each lane group at the intersection. The numbers shown in parentheses indicate the lane group delay per vehicle in seconds.

Table 15: Existing Lane Group LOS at US-31 and Columbiana Road/I-65 Northbound Ramps (2019)

| Approach | AM LOS |  |  | PM LOS |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| US-31 - Northbound | $\mathrm{C}(32.0)$ | $\mathrm{C}(31.2)$ | $\mathrm{B}(17.5)$ | $\mathrm{D}(49.7)$ | $\mathrm{C}(27.7)$ | $\mathrm{A}(9.8)$ |
| US-31 - Southbound | $\mathrm{C}(20.3)$ | $\mathrm{D}(41.2)$ | $\mathrm{A}(4.6)$ | $\mathrm{B}(17.4)$ | $\mathrm{F}(86.2)$ | $\mathrm{A}(2.2)$ |
| Columbiana Road - Eastbound | $\mathrm{F}(92.9)$ | $\mathrm{F}(84.9)$ | $\mathrm{B}(11.2)$ | $\mathrm{F}(97.8)$ | $\mathrm{F}(87.9)$ | $\mathrm{E}(55.9)$ |
| I-65 Northbound Ramps - <br> Westbound | $\mathrm{E}(56.9)$ | $\mathrm{F}(135.9)$ | $\mathrm{F}(208.6)$ | $\mathrm{E}(68.8)$ | $\mathrm{F}(134.6)$ | F |
| $(>300)^{*}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Computed delay in seconds exceeds a meaningful value
The Columbiana Road right turn movement onto US-31 southbound is a dual-right turn lane. The outside right turn lane feeds into a US-31 southbound right turn lane onto the I-65 southbound on ramp. The inside right turn lane feeds into a US-31 southbound through lane. The dual-right turn lanes are currently regulated by the signal. However, observations revealed that familiar drivers tend to treat this as a yield condition when the signal heads are red. Unfamiliar drivers appear to be unsure of what to do when navigating this movement, which frustrates familiar drivers. In addition to that, the inside right turn lane vehicles impair the sight distance of the outside right turn lane drivers and prevents them from safely turning right on red. Some drivers ignore all signage, striping, and signals, and continue through the outside right turn lane without observing US-31 southbound traffic. In summary, the current layout for this dual-right turn lane is not clear enough and functional enough for familiar and unfamiliar drivers.


Figure 12: View of Columbiana Road Right Turn Condition onto US-31 Southbound
Out of 95 reported crashes at this intersection from 2016 through 2018, approximately $79 \%$ of all reported crashes involved rear end collisions and approximately $94 \%$ of all reported crashes involved property damage only. These numbers are typical of a highvolume, high-capacity signalized intersection such as this. The skewed approach of Columbiana Road presents a higher potential for angle, sideswipe, and head-on collisions, so a focus on lane continuity, signage, and striping was adopted for the recommended safety and operational improvements. The data revealed that these three collision types comprised approximately $21 \%$ of all reported crashes in the dataset. At the I-65 northbound off ramp, the horizontal and vertical alignment of the approach causes limited sight distance and a higher potential for rear end collisions on this approach, but the cost of modifying the off ramp would be extremely high given the topography.

## Recommendations

Considering existing safety and operational performance of the intersection, the following short-term and long-term recommendations should be implemented.

## Short Term Recommendations:

1. Restripe the dual-right turn lane from Columbiana Road to US-31 southbound as shown on Figure 13. Convert the inside lane of Columbiana Road southbound to an option lane, enabling drivers to queve in that lane for either the movement to l-65 northbound or the movement to US-31 southbound. Provide pavement markings in advance to communicate to drivers the appropriate lanes to occupy.
2. Perform access management at the gas station on the northern corner of the intersection. It currently has five (5) driveways, several of which are unnecessarily wide.
3. Convert one (1) access on Columbiana Road to a right-in, right-out configuration.

## Long Term Recommendations:

- None

Synchro is not able to adequately process the recommendations listed above in a manner that provides accurate changes to the existing conditions levels of service. However, it is estimated that restriping the right turn lane from Columbiana Road to US31 southbound may slightly worsen the level of service for that movement, but substantially reduce the issues caused by driver confusion on the movement. Converting the inside lane of Columbiana Road to an option lane should function as an overflow lane for the right turning vehicles onto US-31 southbound. When there isn' $\dagger$ a queue in the outside right turn lane, drivers will use the outside right turn lane to the yield condition at US-31. When a queue develops in the outside right turn lane, drivers can opt for the inside right turn lane, which is signalized in accordance with the Columbiana Road signal phase and overlaps with the US-31 northbound left turn phase. The volume distribution between the Columbiana Road left, through, and right turn lanes is so disproportionate towards the right turning movement that any left or through volume caught up in a queue for the right turn lanes would still translate to a more effective overall experience for the most amount of drivers.


Concept: US-31 at Columbiana Rd
Vestavia Hills Traffic Operations Study Phase 1 APPLE Program
Vestavia Hills, Alabama
Figure 13: US-31 at Columbiana Road Concept

### 2.6 Columbiana Road at Shades Crest Road/Vestaview Lane

Columbiana Road is classified as a four-lane minor arterial with a speed limit of 45 MPH . Shades Crest Road and Vestaview Lane are both classified as two-lane major collectors. Columbiana Road and Shades Crest Road intersect twice, with Shades Crest Road running concurrently with Columbiana Road for approximately 450 feet. Figure 14 shows aerial imagery of the area. The southern, four-leg intersection of Columbiana Road and Shades Crest Road/Vestaview Lane is signalized and running free; the northern, three-leg intersection of Columbiana Road and Shades Crest Road is unsignalized. To fully capture the interaction between the two intersections, both were included in 24 -hour turning movement counts collected on February 6, 2019. Shades Mountain Baptist Church is on the southeast corner of the southern intersection of Columbiana Road and Shades Crest Road/Vestaview Lane and has two satellite parking lots. One parking lot is on the southwest quadrant of the intersection, and the other parking lot is on the northeast quadrant of the intersection. School redistricting will place the new Pizitz Middle School along Columbiana Road approximately 1.25 miles south of these intersections. Theoretically, this will increase left turn volumes from Shades Crest Road westbound and Vestaview Lane westbound in the AM peak. Analysis performed at these intersections included a capacity analysis, crash data analysis, signal warrant, and pedestrian access evaluation.


Figure 14: Aerial View of Columbiana Road at Shades Crest Road/Vestaview Lane

## Analysis

Existing conditions levels of service for each lane group of these intersections are shown in Tables 16 and 17. The numbers shown in parentheses indicate the lane group delay per vehicle in seconds.

Table 16: Existing Lane Group LOS at Columbiana Road and Shades Crest Road/Vestaview Lane (2019)

| Approach | AM LOS |  |  | PM LOS |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Columbiana Road - Northbound | E (55.8) | D (37.7) | A (0) | D (50.4) | C (25.7) | A (0) |
| Columbiana Road - Southbound | C (31.8) | B (15.4) | A (0) | B (16.9) | C (23.3) | A (0) |
| Shades Crest Road - Eastbound | E (59.6) |  |  | B (27.3) |  |  |
| Vestaview Lane - Westbound | C (24.8) |  |  | C (39.7) |  |  |

Table 17: Existing Lane Group LOS at Columbiana Road and Shades Crest Road (2019)

| Approach | AM LOS |  |  | PM LOS |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | ThrU | Right | Left | ThrU | Right |
| Columbiana Road - Northbound |  | $\mathrm{A}(0)$ | $\mathrm{A}(0)$ |  | $\mathrm{A}(0)$ | A (0) |
| Columbiana Road - Southbound | B (13.2) | $\mathrm{A}(0)$ |  | $\mathrm{A}(9.3)$ | $\mathrm{A}(0)$ |  |
| Shades Crest Road - Westbound | F (123.5) |  |  | F (>300)* |  |  |

*Computed delay in seconds exceeds a meaningful value
A signal warrant analysis was performed at the northern intersection of Columbiana Road and Shades Crest Road, and the eight-hour volume warrant was satisfied. Despite the satisfaction of the warrant, it is important to recognize the tradeoffs associated with signalizing an intersection in close proximity to an existing signalized intersection. Should the City opt for signalization of the intersection, it is imperative that the two signals be synchronized. This can be done in several ways, including but not limited to time-based coordination via GPS-clock devices, wireless communications equipment, and wired communication by installing a physical cable between the cabinets. The GPS-clock devices would be the most cost-effective measure, but regular maintenance will be required to ensure that the clocks remain consistent with one another. Over time, the GPS-clocks tend to drift out of sync.

Benefits of signalizing the northern intersection of Columbiana Road and Shades Crest Road include the following:

- Decreases delays on Shades Crest Road westbound approach to Columbiana Road
- Eliminates sight distance concerns for the Shades Crest Road westbound approach to Columbiana Road.
- Provides better route connectivity for Shades Crest Road

Challenges associated with signalizing the northern intersection of Columbiana Road and Shades Crest Road include the following:

- High initial cost to construct a signal
- Regular maintenance associated with ensuring that the two signals remain in sync
- Potential to induce more volume to the Shades Crest Road westbound approach to Columbiana Road
- Cost to upgrade the existing signal to communicate with the new signal

Crash data analysis revealed mostly low-severity crashes with approximately $84 \%$ registering as property damage only crashes. The most prevalent types of collisions among reported crashes at these intersections are angle crashes and rear end crashes. Though sight distance from the Shades Crest Road westbound approach is technically adequate, it is still challenging to complete the two-stage left turn from Shades Crest Road onto Columbiana Road southbound. The intersection sight distance requirements found in A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (2011) are closely met for both directions (looking northbound and southbound) from the Shades Crest Road westbound approach, but it is difficult to ascertain which lane that Columbiana Road southbound vehicles occupy while simultaneously being aware of any vehicles traveling northbound on Columbiana Road. At 45 MPH, 500 feet of intersection sight distance is required. Looking northbound from the Shades Crest Road westbound approach to Columbiana Road, approximately 525 feet of sight distance is available. Looking southbound, approximately 625 feet of sight distance is available.

Another focus of the study of this particular intersection is pedestrian access. Currently, there are pedestrian signal heads on the two southern signal poles with push-button activation as well as a pedestrian phase for the side streets. There is no crosswalk or nearby sidewalk in the vicinity of the intersection. There is a mid-block pedestrian crossing on Vestaview Lane approximately 210 feet from the stop line used to travel between the church and the north satellite lot.

## Recommendations

Considering existing safety and operational performance of the intersection, the following short-term and long-term recommendations should be implemented.

Short Term Recommendations:

1. Install a crosswalk on the southern side of the Columbiana Road intersection with Shades Crest Road and Vestaview Lane. Install additional sidewalk to connect to the church sidewalk. Install a pedestrian refuge island between Columbiana Road and the frontage road. Figure 15 displays a concept showing each of these improvements.
2. If the City opts for signalization of the northern intersection of Columbiana Road and Shades Crest Road, design and install the signal. Conduct a study to
determine appropriate signal timings, splits, offsets, signage, and striping for the new signal arrangement.
3. Convert the Columbiana Road southbound right turn lane to a smart channel configuration as shown on Figure 15.
4. Install one (1) Stop (R1-1) sign on the frontage road approach to Vestaview Lane just east of Columbiana Road.

## Long Term Recommendations:

- None

Tables 18 and 19 show the levels of service for each lane group at the intersections after taking into account the short term recommendations listed above. This table includes the signalization of the northern intersection and the optimization of any cycle lengths, splits, and offsets.

Slightly worsened levels of service on the side streets of the south intersection are a result of the additional green time required for Columbiana Road traffic to achieve good progression in both directions between the two signalized intersections.

Table 18: Lane Group LOS at Columbiana Road and Shades Crest Road/Vestaview Lane with All Improvements (2019)

| Approach (Signalized) | AM LOS |  |  | PM LOS |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Columbiana Road - <br> Northbound | E (55.1) | C (28.5) | A (4.7) | D (47.5) | C (23.5) | A (5.2) |
| Columbiana Road - <br> Southbound | C (31.5) | B (10.5) | A (0.5) | B (10.5) | B (14.0) | A (1.5) |
| Shades Crest Road - <br> Eastbound | F (97.1) |  |  |  | C (27.3) |  |
| Vestaview Lane - <br> Westbound | C (27.7) |  | D (44.6) |  |  |  |

Table 19: Lane Group LOS at Columbiana Road and Shades Crest Road with All Improvements (2019)

| Approach (Signalized) | AM LOS |  |  | PM LOS |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Columbiana Road - <br> Northbound |  | A (4.2) | A (0.7) |  | B (10.9) | A (0.9) |
| Columbiana Road - <br> Southbound | A (5.0) | A (3.0) |  | B (11.7) | B (14.8) |  |
| Shades Crest Road - Westbound | D (37.1) |  |  | C (35.0) |  |  |



Figure 15: Columbiana Road at Shades Crest Road/Vestaview Lane Concept

### 2.7 US-31 at Vestavia Plaza/City Hall

US-31 is classified as a four-lane principal arterial with a speed limit of 40 MPH , and both accesses to US-31 are classified as local roads. This intersection is signalized and coordinated with a number of other signals along US-31 through Vestavia Hills. The primary focus of analysis on this particular intersection is to increase pedestrian access in the area. Nearby pedestrian trip generators and destinations include residential neighborhoods on both sides of US-31, shopping centers on the both sides of US-31, the Vestavia Hills City Hall on the west side of US-31, and the new community center schedule to open in 2020. Existing sidepaths are located along the west side of US-31 from Massey Road to Vestavia Court and the east side of US-31 from Pizitz Drive to Vesthaven Way. Vesthaven Way is approximately 400 feet south of this intersection. There is also existing sidewalk within the shopping centers on both sides of US-31 at this location. Figure 16 shows the view of the intersection from the west side of US-31 at Vestavia Plaza.


Figure 16: US-31 at Vestavia Plaza/City Hall

## Analysis

Table 20 shows the current timings in place at the intersection. The phases most critical to pedestrian access would be the side street phases, which are Phases 4 and 8 . During several time-of-day plans currently in service, the side street phase has a maximum split of 20 or 25 seconds. If pedestrian timings were implemented, these would need to be increased due to the intersection width of approximately 105 feet from back-of-curb to back-of-curb on the southern leg of the intersection. The minimum amount of time needed would be 4 seconds of 'Walk' time with an additional 28.5 seconds of 'Flashing - Don't Walk' time according to the ALDOT Traffic Signal Design Guide and Timing Manual (2015). For phases 2 and 6, the US-31 mainline cycle lengths allow plenty of
time for pedestrian pedestrians to safely cross the side streets via crosswalk. The first column in Table 20 denotes each timing plan in place along the US-31 corridor throughout Vestavia. Each plan is identified within the controller by a combination of numbers, which represent the dial identifier, split identifier, and offset identifier, respectively. The time of day that each plan is active is included in parentheses beside the Dial/Split/Offset identifiers.

Table 20: Existing Signal Timing Plans and Splits at US-31 and Vestavia Plaza

| Dial / Split / Offiset | Cycle | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | Offset |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{0} / \mathbf{0} / \mathbf{4}$ (Free) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1 / 1 / 1}$ (Off-peak) | 110 | 20 | 70 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 70 | 0 | 20 | 11 |
| $\mathbf{2 / 1 / 1}$ (Mid-day) | 160 | 20 | 115 | 0 | 25 | 20 | 115 | 0 | 25 | 88 |
| $\mathbf{2 / 3 / 1}$ (School Peak) | 140 | 20 | 100 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 100 | 0 | 20 | 13 |
| $\mathbf{3 / 1 / 1}$ (AM Peak) | 200 | 20 | 160 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 160 | 0 | 20 | 112 |
| $\mathbf{4 / 1 / 1}$ (PM Peak) | 200 | 20 | 145 | 0 | 35 | 20 | 145 | 0 | 35 | 85 |

## Recommendations

Considering existing safety and operational performance of the intersection, the following short-term and long-term recommendations should be implemented.

Short Term Recommendations:

1. Install a high-visibility crosswalk on the southern leg of the US-31 intersection at Vestavia Plaza and City Hall. Restripe the stop line and lane lines of US-31 northbound accordingly. Install pedestrian signal heads with countdown display. Figure 17 displays a concept showing each of these improvements.
2. Install additional sidewalk to connect to the existing sidewalks on both sides of US-31.

## Long Term Recommendations:

- None


Figure 17: US-31 at Vestavia Plaza/City Hall Concept

### 2.8 US-31 at Pizitz Drive/Vestavia Forest Place

US-31 is classified as a four-lane principal arterial with a speed limit of 40 MPH , and both Pizitz Drive and Vestavia Forest Place are classified as local roads. This intersection is signalized and coordinated with a number of other signals along US-31 through Vestavia Hills. The primary focus of analysis on this particular intersection is to increase pedestrian access in the area. Nearby pedestrian trip generators and destinations include residential neighborhoods, high-density residential apartments, commercial establishments, and the existing Pizitz Middle School, which will house the $9^{\text {th }}$ grade beginning in the 2020-2021 school year. It should be noted that the enrollment at Pizitz with $9^{\text {th }}$ grade only is estimated to be less than half of the current middle school enrollment at the same facility (see Table 1). Existing sidepaths are located along the west side of US-31 from Massey Road to Vestavia Court and the east side of US-31 from Pizitz Drive to Vesthaven Way. Figure 18 shows the view of the intersection from the east side of US-31.


Figure 18: US-31 and Pizitz Drive/Vestavia Forest Place

## Analysis

Table 21 shows the current timings in place at the intersection. The phases most critical to pedestrian access would be the side street phases, which are Phases 4 and 8 . During one timing plan currently in service, the side street phase has a maximum split of 20 seconds. If pedestrian timings were implemented, the maximum split for that phase would need to be increased due to the intersection width of approximately 90 feet from the west edgeline to the east channelizing island on the northern leg of the intersection. The minimum amount of time needed would be 4 seconds of 'Walk' time with an additional 24 seconds of 'Flashing - Don't Walk' time according to the ALDOT Traffic Signal Design Guide and Timing Manual (2015). The first column in Table 21
denotes each timing plan in place along the US-31 corridor throughout Vestavia. Each plan is identified within the controller by a combination of numbers, which represent the dial identifier, split identifier, and offset identifier, respectively. The time of day that each plan is active is included in parentheses beside the Dial/Split/Offset identifiers.

Table 21: Existing Signal Timing Plans and Splits at US-31 and Pizitz Drive/Vestavia Forest Place

| Dial / Split / Offiset | Cycle | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | Offset |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{0} / \mathbf{0} / \mathbf{4}$ (Free) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1 / 1 / 1}$ (Off-peak) | 110 | 20 | 70 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 70 | 0 | 20 | 13 |
| $\mathbf{2 / 1 / 1}$ (Mid-day) | 160 | 20 | 110 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 110 | 0 | 30 | 11 |
| $\mathbf{2 / 3 / 1}$ (School Peak) | 140 | 20 | 80 | 0 | 40 | 35 | 65 | 0 | 40 | 84 |
| $\mathbf{3 / 1 / 1}$ (AM Peak) | 200 | 20 | 135 | 0 | 45 | 35 | 120 | 0 | 45 | 34 |
| $\mathbf{4 / 1 / 1}$ (PM Peak) | 200 | 20 | 145 | 0 | 35 | 20 | 145 | 0 | 35 | 190 |

Additionally, the existing striping of the Pizitz Drive approach to US-31 is confusing given the skew of the approach. The current striping causes the US-31 southbound left turning vehicles to traverse the outbound left turn lane of Pizitz Drive. The skew also causes conflicts between drivers crossing US-31 from Pizitz Drive and Vestavia Forest Place. The striping of the Pizitz Drive approach does not offer adequate lane continuity, making it difficult to discern where other drivers will go from either approach. Figure 19 displays aerial imagery of the intersection.


Figure 19: Aerial View of US-31 and Pizitz Drive/Vestavia Forest Place

## Recommendations

Considering existing safety and operational performance of the intersection, the following short-term and long-term recommendations should be implemented.

Short Term Recommendations:

1. Install a crosswalk on the northern leg of the US-31 intersection at Pizitz Drive and Vestavia Forest Place. Restripe the stop line and lane lines of US-31 southbound accordingly. Additionally, install additional sidewalk to connect to the existing sidewalks on both sides of US-31. Install pedestrian signal heads with countdown display. Figure 20 displays a concept showing each of these improvements.
2. Restripe the Pizitz Drive approach as shown in Figure 20. Install a raised concrete island to channelize the right turn lane from Pizitz Drive to US-31 northbound and give pedestrians a refuge island.
3. Install a Yield Here to Pedestrians (R1-5) sign at the crosswalk located in the channelized right turn lane from Pizitz Drive westbound to US-31 northbound.

Long Term Recommendations:

- None


Figure 20: US-31 at Pizitz Drive/Vestavia Forest Place Concept

### 2.9 Dolly Ridge Road at Gresham Drive

Dolly Ridge Road is classified as a two-lane major collector with a speed limit of 35 MPH , while Gresham Drive is classified as a local road with a speed limit of 25 MPH. The intersection is currently signalized and running free at all times. Dolly Ridge Road is a low-volume roadway connecting Rocky Ridge Road and Cahaba River Road. Analysis performed at this intersection included a capacity analysis, crash data analysis, and trip generation for the estimated enrollment for the 2019-2020 school year.

The intersection of Dolly Ridge Road and Gresham Drive will be heavily affected by school redistricting. For the 2018-2019 school year, Jefferson County still occupies the school while Vestavia Hills renovates the school in preparation for its use in the 20192020 school year and beyond. Table 1 denotes that the estimated enrollment at the new elementary school will be 735 students. With a sizeable shift in trip mode choice from bus to personal vehicle that will be associated with changing the school from a Jefferson County school to Vestavia Hills city school, the demands on nearby signalized intersections and roadways will change significantly.

Trip generation was performed for the new Dolly Ridge Elementary School based on traffic volumes from Cahaba Heights Elementary School performed during the 20132014 school year. Cahaba Heights Elementary is also a Vestavia Hills city school and serves as a baseline for calculating potential trips per student enrolled at the new elementary school. Additional information regarding the methodology used in this trip generation can be found in Appendix D.

The intersection currently has a left turn lane along Dolly Ridge Road eastbound and a channelized right turn lane from Gresham Drive to Dolly Ridge Road westbound. Figure 21 shows aerial imagery of the intersection.


Figure 21: Aerial View of Dolly Ridge Road at Gresham Drive
The existing operational conditions for the AM and School PM peak hours were rendered mostly irrelevant due to the major changes brought about by school redistricting. Therefore, the existing volumes collected on February 6, 2019 were modified with trip generation volumes and analyzed after optimizing the signal timings to accommodate the new scenario. Largely unaffected by everyday school traffic, the afternoon commuter peak hour existing volumes were used in analysis for the PM peak hour. Table 22 displays the level of service for each lane group at the intersection after taking into account trip generation volumes. The numbers in parentheses indicate the average delay per vehicle in seconds.

Table 22: Existing Lane Group LOS with Trip Generation at Dolly Ridge Road and Gresham Drive (2019)

| Approach | AM LOS |  | School PM LOS |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Through/ <br> Right | PM*Through/ <br> Right |  | Left | Through/ <br> Right |  |
| Gresham Drive - <br> Southbound | D (46.4) | A (8.7) | C (21.3) | A (8.2) | B (13.3) | A (8.3) |
| Dolly Ridge Road - <br> Eastbound | F(170.3) | A (6.0) | A (7.0) | A (5.8) | A (0) | A (2.6) |
| Dolly Ridge Road - <br> Westbound |  | C (27.4) |  | C (22.1) |  | A (2.7) |

*School trip generation estimates do not affect PM LOS, only AM and School PM LOS.
Table 23 shows the net added trips brought about by the trip generation. At its core, trip generation is a data-based approximation of future conditions for the surrounding area. The numbers shown below should be treated accordingly, especially for a scenario as unique as this one.

Table 23: Net Added Volume by Trip Generation

| Approach | Net AM Trips |  |  | Net School PM Trips |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Gresham Drive - Southbound | 166 | N/A | 318 | 55 | N/A | 306 |
| Dolly Ridge Road - Eastbound | 576 | 0 | N/A | 237 | 0 | N/A |
| Dolly Ridge Road - Westbound | N/A | 0 | 16 | N/A | 0 | 115 |

Though the peak hour factors used in the capacity analysis account for the fact that most school-related traffic will attempt to access the school in a small window of time, the levels of service shown in Tables 22 and 24 do not entirely capture the nature of a school peak hour. The arrival rate in the carpool queue will be higher than the departure rate, and queues will increase quickly at that time. However, the levels of service from the capacity analysis do reflect the fact that traffic on Dolly Ridge Road is light enough that a protected-permissive left turn phase on Dolly Ridge Road should be able to handle much of the stress put on the intersection during these short peaks. For this reason, the school should develop a detailed circulation plan for pickup and dropoff to ensure that process is as safe and efficient as it can be. If carpool queues reach Dolly Ridge Road, it will not matter how efficiently the signal performs.

The crash data analysis at this intersection included three (3) crashes from 2016 through 2018. The sample size is too small to derive any major conclusions, but speed or distracted driving was a factor in each of the reported crashes. The combination of the horizontal curves and the significant grade changes in the vicinity of this intersection cause sight distance issues, but this type of topography is typical of Dolly Ridge Road and well within driver expectation for drivers who are familiar with the road.

## Recommendations

Considering existing safety and operational performance of the intersection, the following short-term and long-term recommendations should be implemented.

## Short Term Recommendations:

1. Extend the left turn lane at the Dolly Ridge Road eastbound approach as far back as feasible. Due to existing pavement width and time constraints, this leg of the intersection could be restriped with lane widths of 10 feet to extend the left turn lane to allow a storage length of approximately 325 feet, a taper length of 100 feet, and a transition taper length of 205 feet (see Figure 22).
2. Widen Gresham Drive southbound to two lanes (one left turn lane, one right turn lane) to the school exit driveway or as far back as feasible.
3. Implement the base signal timings included in Appendix E. Periodically check that all detection continues to function. Monitor the intersection once school begins and make any necessary tweaks.
4. Upon any widening of Gresham Drive, resurface the roadway from Dolly Ridge Road to the northernmost school access point.
5. Develop a circulation plan for school pickup and dropoff to minimize impact to the signal performance of Dolly Ridge Road at Gresham Drive.
6. Install one (1) Signal Ahead Warning (W3-3) sign approximately 325 feet from the stop line along Dolly Ridge Road eastbound.
7. Install one (1) 20 MPH School Zone Speed Limit Assembly in each direction along Dolly Ridge Road approximately 1000 feet prior to the intersection with Gresham Drive. The assembly consists of one (1) 20 MPH Speed Limit (R2-1) sign, one (1) School (S4-3P) plaque, and one time of day plaque (S4-1P). See Figure 7B-1 in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2009) for other options on the assembly. Install one (1) End School Zone (S5-2) sign in each direction along Dolly Ridge Road approximately 1000 feet after the intersection with Gresham Drive.
8. Trim any vegetation blocking Dolly Ridge Road eastbound drivers' view of the signal heads at the intersection of Gresham Drive. Trim vegetation blocking the Gresham Drive southbound signal heads.

Long Term Recommendations:

- None

Table 24 shows the levels of service for the movements at the intersection after taking into account the recommendations. This table includes the optimization of any cycle lengths and splits. Synchro does not register a level of service improvement after lengthening existing turn lanes; however, it is clear that the existing turn lanes are insufficient for the volume expected at the intersection during school peak hours. Lengthening the Dolly Ridge Road eastbound left turn lane will lessen the impact on Dolly Ridge Road through traffic, while widening to two lanes on Gresham Drive southbound for any amount of length will allow school traffic to exit more efficiently.

Table 24: Lane Group LOS at Dolly Ridge Road and Gresham Drive with Improvements (2019)

| Approach | AM LOS |  | School PM LOS |  | PM* LOS |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through/ <br> Right | Left | Through/ <br> Right | Left | Through/ <br> Right |
| Gresham Drive - <br> Southbound | F (88.6) | B (10.8) | B (16.9) | A (6.1) | B (11.0) | A (6.7) |
| Dolly Ridge Road - <br> Eastbound | F(91.8) | A (4.9) | A (9.3) | A (7.9) | A (0) | A (3.5) |
| Dolly Ridge Road - <br> Westbound |  | D (43.9) |  | C (20.5) |  | A (3.6) |

*School trip generation estimates do not affect PM LOS, only AM and School PM LOS.

[^4]

Figure 22: Concept for Restriping Dolly Ridge Road just south of Gresham Drive

## 3 Cost Estimates

Planning level cost estimates were prepared for the improvement recommendations for each studied intersection. These detailed opinions of cost are included in Appendix I. Each estimate is based on the engineer's experiences and qualifications and represents the engineer's best judgment within the industry. The engineer does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual costs will not vary from the engineer's opinion of probable cost. Table 25 provides a summary of costs estimated in 2019 dollars for the improvement recommendations. For budgeting future year projects, the City will need to escalate the costs to future year dollars.

A contingency of $25 \%$ was included in each estimate. This contingency cost includes miscellaneous and/or unknown items that cannot be quantified at the time the study was conducted. The improvements identified at some of the intersections will require utility relocation and/or right-of-way acquisition; the $25 \%$ contingency does not cover utility or right-of-way costs which should be considered when programming any future projects.

Some of the improvement recommendations can be implemented solely with City funds. In instances where the proposed improvements are more extensive or costly, it is likely that federal or state funding would be required. For these cases, ALDOT indirect costs were included in the cost estimate and were estimated at $13.63 \%$ of the total project costs.

Table 25: Summary of Opinion of Probable Costs in Year 2019 Dollars

| Intersection | Opinion of Cost (Yr. 2019) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Short Term | Long Term |
| Rocky Ridge Road @ Dolly Ridge Road | $\$ 100,000$ | $\$ 1.21 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Sicard Hollow Road @ Blue Lake Drive | $\$ 320,000$ | $\$ 2.02 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Rocky Ridge Road @ Shades Crest Road and US-280 | $\$ 1 \mathrm{M}$ |  |
| US-31 @ Shades Crest Road | $\$ 50,000$ | $\$ 1.13 \mathrm{M}$ |
| US-31 @ Columbiana Road/I-65 Northbound Ramps | $\$ 370,000$ |  |
| Columbiana Road @ Shades Crest Road/Vestaview Lane | $\$ 770,000$ |  |
| US-31 @ Vestavia Plaza/City Hall | $\$ 260,000$ |  |
| US-31 @ Pizitz Drive | $\$ 230,000$ |  |
| Dolly Ridge Road @ Gresham Drive | $\$ 750,000$ |  |

## 4 Funding Sources

The City has the option to fund the design and construction of their preferred improvements using only local funds. Choosing this route allows the project design and construction to have shorter timelines and the potential for reduced project costs since fewer plan reviews would be required and City guidelines will govern the project design. Improvements that only affect city or county roadways will be able to operate on a quicker timeline, but any improvements located on state routes must go through additional approvals, permitting, and use ALDOT standards.

Costs associated with the design and construction of the proposed alternatives could exceed the City's current available resources. This section discusses funding sources that are available to aid in design and construction. Federal programs are administered by the Alabama Department of Transportation. Table 26 details funding sources, the category of the source and type of project for which the funding can be used.

Table 26: Funding Options

| Funding Source | Category | Match Type |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Surface Transportation Plan (STP) | Federal | $80 \%$ Federal / 20\% City |
| Highway Safety Improvement Plan (HSIP) | Federal | $90 \%$ Federal / 10\% City |
| Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) | Federal | $80 \%$ Federal / 20\% City |
| Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality <br> Improvement Program (CMAQ) | Federal | $80 \%$ Federal / 20\% City |

The Surface Transportation Program (STP), administered by ALDOT, requires an 80 Federal/20\% Local match. The STP program provides flexible funding to states and localities for their use in preserving and improving the conditions and performance of a roadway. STP eligible activities applicable to the alternatives studied include: operational improvements for highways and intersections with high levels of congestion. The downside to STP funding is the time it adds to the overall project. Additional time is required in order to account for ALDOT and FHWA involvement including additional plan reviews and more stringent design and construction standards. For these reasons, a timeframe for completing a STP funded project is estimated at five to eight years. https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/160307.cfm

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a $90 \%$ Federal/10\% Local match program and has been continued through the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act). HSIP exists to provide funding to perform projects that seek to reduce the number of fatalities and serious injuries resulting from traffic crashes. HSIP funds are administered by ALDOT's Safety Operations Office. The application for HSIP funds
requests, among other general project details, that the project sponsor show how the proposed project will improve safety using Crash Reduction Factors (CRF). A benefit/cost ratio is also a requirement of the application. The application must be signed by a Professional Engineer. Like STP funding, HSIP funded projects require additional time in order to account for ALDOT and FHWA involvement including additional plan reviews and more stringent design and construction standards. For these reasons, a timeframe for completing a HSIP funded project is estimated at five to eight years.

```
https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/hsip/
```

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is an $80 \%$ Federal/20\% Local match program continued through the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. TAP funding is available for projects defined as transportation alternatives. Example of transportation alternatives include the following scenarios: on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation and enhance mobility, community improvement activities such as historic preservation and vegetation management, environmental mitigation related to stormwater and habitat connectivity, recreational trail projects, safe routes to school projects, and projects for planning, designing, or constructing boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former divided highways. https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/transportation_alternatives/

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) is a $80 \%$ Federal/20\% Local match program and has been continued through the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act). CMAQ funding is available to reduce congestion and improve air quality for areas that do not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for various pollutants. Any project must be included in the metropolitan planning organization's (MPO) current transportation plan and transportation improvement plan (TIP). https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/factsheets/cmaqfs.cfm

## 5 Next Steps

The purpose of this study was to determine the feasibility of potential improvements to several intersections throughout the City of Vestavia Hills. The City may elect to pursue projects described in this study without federal funding. However, an Alabama Department of Transportation (ALDOT) permit for the improvements would have to be obtained for any work that would occur inside ALDOT right-of-way. If the City chooses to move forward with implementing any of the proposed improvements and would like to pursue Federal funding, the next step would be to request inclusion of a project in the Birmingham Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). Once funds are in

[^5]place for the project, an environmental document will need to be prepared. The environmental document must include technical studies and public involvement outreach necessary to comply with procedures of NEPA. Once the environmental study has been completed, design would be finalized followed by construction. If it is determined that additional right-of-way is required, acquisition would be conducted prior to construction.

## Appendix A - Raw Traffic Counts



Peak Rolling Hour Flow Rates



Peak Rolling Hour Flow Rates




Peak Rolling Hour Flow Rates



Peak Rolling Hour Flow Rates

| TIME |
| :---: |
| $1700-1715$ |
| $1715-1730$ |
| $1730-1745$ |
| $1745-1800$ |



| Approach (\%) |
| :---: |
| Total (\%) |
| PHF |
| P/Cycle |
| Cars |
| Single Unit Trucks |
| Combination Trucks |


| P/Cycle (\%) |
| :---: |
| Cars (\%) |
| Single Unit Trucks (\%) |
| Combination Trucks (\%) |




Peak Rolling Hour Flow Rates



File Name: 280hwy17
205-824-0125

Site Code : 00000000
Start Date: 11/28/2018
Page No : 2

|  |  | US 280 Westbound |  |  | ROCKY RIDGE RD <br> Northbound |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { US } 280 \\ & \text { Eastbound } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | App. Total | Left | Thru | App. Total | Left | Right | App. Total | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| By Approach | 07:00 AM | 07:00 AM |  |  | 07:30 AM |  |  | 07:30 AM |  |  |  |
| Volume | 0 | 272 | 4023 | 4295 | 489 | 182 | 671 | 3016 936 | 206 6.4 | 3222 |  |
| Percent |  | 6.3 | 93.7 |  | 72.9 | 27.1 |  | $\begin{gathered} 93.6 \\ 07: 45 \mathrm{AM} \end{gathered}$ | 6.4 |  |  |
| High Int. | - | 07:15 AM |  |  | 07:30 AM 131 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 07: 45 \mathrm{AM} \\ 915 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| Volume | . | 64 | 1092 | 1156 | 131 | 41 | $\begin{array}{r} 172 \\ 0.975 \end{array}$ |  | 51 | $\begin{array}{r} 966 \\ 0.834 \end{array}$ |  |
| Peak Factor | - |  |  | 0.929 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour From 11:00 AM to 12:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1Intersection 11:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 0 | 276 | 2595 | 2871 | 269 | 226 | 495 | 3305 | 290 | 3595 | 6961 |
| Percent |  | 9.6 | 90.4 |  | 54.3 | 45.7 |  | 91.9 | 8.1 |  |  |
| 11:45 Volume | 0 | 59 | 715 | 774 | 77 | 56 | 133 | 913 | 77 | 990 | 1897 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.917 |
| High Int. |  | 11:45 AM |  |  | 11:30 AM |  |  | 11:45 AM |  |  |  |
| Volume | 0 | 59 | 715 | 774 | 82 | 59 | 141 | 913 | 77 | 990 |  |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  | 0.927 |  |  | 0.878 |  |  | 0.908 |  |
| Peak Hour From 11:00 AM to 12:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1By Approach 11:00 AM 12:00 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 11:00 AM |  |  | 11:30 AM |  |  |  |
| Volume | 0 | 274 | 2657 | 2931 | 272 | 255 | 527 | 3305 | 290 | 3595 |  |
| Percent |  | 9.3 | 80.7 |  | 51.6 | 48.4 |  | 91.9 | 8.1 |  |  |
| High Int. | - | 12:45 PM |  |  | 11:30 AM |  |  | 11:45 AM |  |  |  |
| Volume | - | 74 | 730 | 804 | 82 | 59 | 141 | 913 | 77 | 990 |  |
| Peak Factor | - |  |  | 0.911 |  |  | 0.934 |  |  | 0.908 |  |
| Peak Hour From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1Intersection 04:45 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 0 | 361 | 2834 | 3195 | 312 | 256 | 568 | 4637 | 781 | 5418 | 9181 |
| Percent |  | 11.3 | 88.7 |  | 54.9 | 45.1 |  | 85.6 | 14.4 |  |  |
| 05:15 Volume | 0 | 94 | 692 | 786 | 94 | 83 | 177 | 1187 | 262 | 1449 | 2412 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.952 |
| High Int. |  | 05:00 PM |  |  | 05:15 PM |  |  | 05:15 PM |  |  |  |
| Volume | 0 | 96 | 723 | 819 | 94 | 83 | 177 | 1187 | 262 | 1449 |  |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  | 0.975 |  |  | 0.802 |  |  | 0.935 |  |

Peak Hour From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1

| By Approach | 04:00 PM | 04:15 PM |  |  |  |  |  | 05:00 PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 0 | 344 | 2861 | 3205 | $\begin{array}{r} 356 \\ 53.9 \end{array}$ | $304$ | 660 | $\begin{array}{r} 4736 \\ 85.2 \end{array}$ | 825 14.8 | 5561 |
| Percent |  | 10.7 | 89.3 |  | $53.9$ | $46.1$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 85.2 \\ 05: 45 \text { PM } \end{gathered}$ | 14.8 |  |
| High Int. | - | 05:00 PM | 723 | 819 | $\begin{gathered} 04: 15 \mathrm{PM} \\ 105 \end{gathered}$ | 100 | 205 | $\begin{gathered} 05: 45 \text { PM } \\ 1316 \end{gathered}$ | 193 | 1509 |
| Veak Factor | - | 96 | 723 | 0.978 |  |  | 0.805 |  |  | 0.921 |


|  |  |  |  |  | F | D | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - |  |  |  |  | 409 | urnh | an |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vestavia Hill |  |  |  |  | min | am, | 35 |  |  |  | Nam | $: \text { ve }$ | tavia14 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | -824 |  |  |  |  | Cod | : 00 | 00000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | t Da | : 05 | 4/2012 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | $: 1$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Group | rinted-1 | shifted |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | WY 31 thbound |  |  | B RAM stbound |  |  | NY 31 hbound |  |  | BIANA |  |  |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 23 | 94 | 3 | 19 | 49 | 208 | 36 | 196 | 217 | 9 | 23 | 90 | 967 |
| 07:15 AM | 19 | 134 | 5 | 9 | 84 | 203 | 68 | 243 | 239 | 8 | 18 | 111 | 1141 |
| 07:30 AM | 23 | 212 | 9 | 11 | 92 | 158 | 119 | 195 | 229 | 29 | 19 | 166 | 1262 |
| 07:45 AM | 22 | 259 | 9 | 19 | 97 | 201 | 124 | 212 | 224 | 32 | 24 | 148 | 1371 |
| Total | 87 | 699 | 26 | 58 | 322 | 770 | 347 | 846 | 909 | 78 | 84 | 515 | 4741 |
| 08:00 AM | 25 | 185 | 12 | 30 | 98 | 218 | 123 | 188 | 197 | 18 | 6 | 113 | 1213 |
| 08:15 AM | 19 | 191 | 5 | 30 | 67 | 163 | 98 | 225 | 175 | 13 | 14 | 115 | 1115 |
| 08:30 AM | 21 | 170 | 8 | 24 | 84 | 191 | 64 | 177 | 210 | 12 | 21 | 95 | 1077 |
| 08:45 AM | 21 | 184 | 6 | 29 | 63 | 204 | 63 | 152 | 145 | 9 | 21 | 108 | 1005 |
| Total | 86 | 730 | 31 | 113 | 312 | 776 | 348 | 742 | 727 | 52 | 62 | 431 | 4410 |
| 11:00 AM | 27 | 274 | 4 | 35 | 47 | 108 | 52 | 191 | 136 | 21 | 18 | 109 | 1022 |
| 11:15 AM | 32 | 321 | 7 | 42 | 48 | 128 | 40 | 170 | 147 | 12 | 13 | 122 | 1082 |
| 11:30 AM | 22 | 289 | 14 | 53 | 46 | 121 | 38 | 172 | 124 | 17 | 12 | 121 | 1029 |
| 11:45 AM | 23 | 371 | 13 | 36 | 44 | 132 | 47 | 183 | 124 | 16 | 9 | 129 | 1127 |
| Total | 104 | 1255 | 38 | 166 | 185 | 489 | 177 | 716 | 531 | 66 | 52 | 481 | 4260 |
| 12:00 PM | 29 | 324 | 11 | 41 | 46 | 110 | 48 | 221 | 155 | 34 | 15 | 153 | 1187 |
| 12:15 PM | 41 | 348 | 8 | 38 | 52 | 114 | 92 | 212 | 146 | 16 | 7 | 135 | 1209 |
| 12:30 PM | 26 | 439 | 3 | 40 | 47 | 194 | 67 | 241 | 172 | 20 | 13 | 122 | 1384 |
| 12:45 PM | 28 | 380 | 11 | 39 | 45 | 166 | 55 | 181 | 172 | 12 | 16 | 121 | 1226 |
| Total | 124 | 1491 | 33 | 158 | 190 | 584 | 262 | 855 | 645 | 82 | 51 | 531 | 5006 |


| 04:00 PM | 19 | 374 | 12 | 38 | 73 | 120 | 53 | 136 | 155 | 16 | 12 | 175 | 1183 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 22 | 398 | 2 | 35 | 61 | 126 | 64 | 153 | 139 | 22 | 21 | 196 | 1239 |
| 04:30 PM | 24 | 396 | 6 | 44 | 62 | 135 | 33 | 140 | 158 | 22 | 12 | 180 | 1212 |
| 04:45 PM | 28 | 448 | 2 | 45 | 75 | 153 | 69 | 170 | 156 | 26 | 11 | 213 | 1396 |
| Total | 93 | 1616 | 22 | 162 | 271 | 534 | 219 | 599 | 608 | 86 | 56 | 764 | 5030 |
| 05:00 PM | 27 | 455 | 3 | 35 | 73 | 184 | 30 | 175 | 224 | 24 | 27 | 202 | 1459 |
| 05:15 PM | 20 | 435 | 10 | 32 | 69 | 173 | 46 | 146 | 203 | 25 | 21 | 208 | 1388 |
| 05:30 PM | 21 | 444 | 7 | 27 | 78 | 262 | 75 | 230 | 143 | 24 | 12 | 185 | 1508 |
| 05:45 PM | 18 | 449 | 16 | 30 | 76 | 239 | 62 | 169 | 198 | 38 | 16 | 173 | 1484 |
| Total | 86 | 1783 | 36 | 124 | 296 | 858 | 213 | 720 | 768 | 111 | 76 | 768 | 5839 |
| Grand Total | 580 | 7574 | 186 | 781 | 1576 | 4011 | 1566 | 4478 | 4188 | 475 | 381 | 3490 | 29286 |
| Apprch \% | 7.0 | 90.8 | 2.2 | 12.3 | 24.7 | 63.0 | 15.3 | 43.8 | 40.9 | 10.9 | 8.8 | 80.3 |  |
| Total \% | 2.0 | 25.9 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 5.4 | 13.7 | 5.3 | 15.3 | 14.3 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 11.9 |  |


|  | HWY 31 Southbound |  |  |  | I-65 NB RAMPS Westbound |  |  |  | HWY 31 Northbound |  |  |  | COLUMBIANA RD Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. <br> Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. <br> Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ |
| Peak Hour From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 07:15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 89 | 790 | 35 | 914 | 69 | 371 | 780 | 1220 | 434 | 838 | 889 | 2161 | 87 | 67 | 538 | 692 | 4987 |
| Percent | 9.7 | 86.4 | 3.8 |  | 5.7 | 30.4 | 63.9 |  | 20.1 | 38.8 | 41.1 |  | 12.6 | 9.7 | 77.7 |  |  |
|  | 22 | 259 | 9 | 290 | 19 | 97 | 201 | 317 | 124 | 212 | 224 | 560 | 32 | 24 | 148 | 204 | 1371 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.909 |
| High Int. | 07:45 |  |  |  | 08:00 |  |  |  | 07:45 |  |  |  | 07:30 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 22 | 259 | 9 | 290 | 30 | 98 | 218 | 346 | 124 | 212 | 224 | 560 | 29 | 19 | 166 | 214 |  |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  | 0.788 |  |  |  | 0.882 |  |  |  | 0.965 |  |  |  | 0.808 |  |
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|  | HWY 31 Southbound |  |  |  | 1-65 NB RAMPS Westbound |  |  |  | HWY 31Northbound |  |  |  | COLUMBIANA RD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Int. } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ |



| Peak Hour Fro Intersection | 11:00 | PM |  | Peak |  |  |  | 932 |  |  |  | 1762 | 82 | 51 | 531 | 664 | 5006 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 124 | 1491 | 33 | 1648 | 158 | 190 | 584 |  | 262 | 855 | 645 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 7.5 | 90.5 | 2.0 |  | 17.0 | 20.4 | 62.7 |  | 14.9 | 48.5 | 36.6 |  | 12.3 | 7.7 | 80.0 |  |  |
| 12:30 | 26 | 439 | 3 | 468 | 40 | 47 | 194 | 281 | 67 | 241 | 172 | 480 | 20 | 13 | 122 | 155 | 1384 |
| Volume <br> Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.904 |
| High Int. | 12:30 |  |  |  | 12:30 |  |  |  | 12:30 |  |  |  | 12:00 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 26 | 439 | 3 | 468 | 40 | 47 | 194 | 281 | 67 | 241 | 172 | 480 | 34 | 15 | 153 | 202 |  |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  | 0.880 |  |  |  | 0.829 |  |  |  | 0.918 |  |  |  | 0.822 |  |



| Peak Hour From | 04:00 | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | 05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 86 | 1783 | 36 | 1905 | 124 | 296 | 858 | 1278 | 213 | 720 | 768 | 1701 | 111 | 76 | 768 | 955 | 5839 |
| Percent | 4.5 | 93.6 | 1.9 |  | 9.7 | 23.2 | 67.1 |  | 12.5 | 42.3 | 45.1 |  | 11.6 | 8.0 | 80.4 |  |  |
| 05:30 | 21 | 444 | 7 | 472 | 27 | 78 | 262 | 367 | 75 | 230 | 143 | 448 | 24 | 12 | 185 | 221 | 1508 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.968 |
| High Int. | 05:00 | PM |  |  | 05:30 |  |  |  | 05:30 |  |  |  | 05:15 P |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 27 | 455 | 3 | 485 | 27 | 78 | 262 | 367 | 75 | 230 | 143 | 448 | 25 | 21 | 208 | 254 |  |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  | 0.982 |  |  |  | 0.871 |  |  |  | 0.949 |  |  |  | 0.940 |  |

Peak Hour From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1

| By | 05:00 PM |  |  |  | 05:00 PM |  |  |  | 05:00 PM |  |  |  | 04:45 PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 86 | 1783 | 36 | 1905 | 124 | 296 | 858 | 1278 | 213 | 720 | 768 | 1701 | 99 | 71 | 808 | 978 |
| Percent | 4.5 | 93.6 | 1.9 |  | 9.7 | 23.2 | 67.1 |  | 12.5 | 42.3 | 45.1 |  | 10.1 | 7.3 | 82.6 |  |
| High Int. | 05:00 PM |  |  |  | 05:30 PM |  |  |  | 05:30 PM |  |  |  | 05:15 PM |  |  |  |
| Volume | 27 | 455 | 3 | 485 | 27 | 78 | 262 | 367 | 75 | 230 | 143 | 448 | 25 | 21 | 208 | 254 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  | 0.982 |  |  |  | 0.871 |  |  |  | 0.949 |  |  |  | 0.963 |


| TRAFFIC DATA, LLC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1409 Turnham Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vestavia Hills, AL |  |  |  |  |  |  | Birmingham, AL 35216 205-824-0125 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | File Name : vestavia01 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Site | Cod | ode | : 000 | 000000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Star | rt D | Date | 05/2 | 23/2012 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $: 1$ |  |
| Groups Printed-Unshifted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | HWY 31 Southbound |  |  |  | SHADES CREST RD Westbound |  |  |  | HWY 31 Northbound |  |  |  |  | SHADES CRESTRD Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| Start Time |  | Left | Thru | Right | uturn |  | Left | Thru | Right |  | eft | Thru | Right | uturn | Left |  | Thru | Right | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM |  | 7 | 111 | 6 | 0 |  | 21 | 6 | 62 |  | 4 | 369 | 19 | 0 | 36 |  | 4 | 3 | 648 |
| 07:15 AM |  | 6 | 158 | 8 | 0 |  | 33 | 21 | 54 |  | 10 | 495 | 16 | 0 | 55 |  | 5 | 2 | 863 |
| 07:30 AM |  | 9 | 157 | 6 | 0 |  | 32 | 13 | 65 |  | 8 | 477 | 34 | 0 | 78 |  | 12 | 4 | 895 |
| 07:45 AM |  | 17 | 172 | 8 | 0 |  | 46 | 14 | 84 |  | 7 | 478 | 28 | 0 | 90 |  | 16 | 4 | 964 |
| Total |  | 39 | 598 | 28 | 0 |  | 132 | 54 | 265 |  | 291 | 1819 | 97 | 0 | 259 |  | 37 | 13 | 3370 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 08:00 AM } \\ & \text { 08:15 AM } \\ & \text { 08:30 AM } \\ & \text { 08:45 AM } \end{aligned}$ |  | 12 | 214 | 12 | 0 |  | 39 | 11 | 58 |  | 4 | 512 | 32 | 0 | 79 |  | 13 | 4 | 990 |
|  |  | 17 | 167 | 9 | 0 |  | 28 | 12 | 69 |  | 5 | 466 | 22 | 0 | 55 |  | 4 | 4 | 858 |
|  |  | 16 | 219 | 10 | 0 |  | 20 | 9 | 51 |  | 7 | 388 | 16 | 0 | 40 |  | 16 | 5 | 797 |
|  |  | 18 | 192 | 11 | 0 |  | 27 | 10 | 26 |  | 6 | 297 | 29 | 1 | 43 |  | 17 | 5 | 682 |
| Total |  | 63 | 792 | 42 | 0 |  | 114 | 42 | 204 |  | 221 | 1663 | 99 | 1 | 217 |  | 50 | 18 | 3327 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:00 AM } \\ & \text { 11:15 AM } \\ & 11: 30 \mathrm{AM} \\ & 11: 45 \mathrm{AM} \end{aligned}$ |  | 18 | 296 | 17 | 0 |  | 20 | 5 | 7 |  | 5 | 232 | 26 | 0 | 10 |  | 9 | 5 | 650 |
|  |  | 25 | 331 | 14 | 0 |  | 39 | 11 | 8 |  | 10 | 305 | 29 | 0 | 16 |  | 3 | 8 | 799 |
|  |  | 17 | 399 | 14 | 0 |  | 33 | 6 | 12 |  | 7 | 270 | 34 | 0 | 12 |  | 6 | 7 | 817 |
|  |  | 20 | 339 | 25 | 0 |  | 33 | 13 | 10 |  | 3 | 336 | 25 | 0 | 6 |  | 11 | 15 | 836 |
| Total |  | 80 | 1365 | 70 | 0 |  | 125 | 35 | 37 |  | 251 | 1143 | 114 | 0 | 44 |  | 29 | 35 | 3102 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:00 PM } \\ & \text { 12:15 PM } \\ & \text { 12:30 PM } \\ & \text { 12:45 PM } \end{aligned}$ |  | 23 | 355 | 19 | 1 |  | 32 | 4 | 13 |  | 7 | 262 | 47 | 0 | 12 |  | 11 | 14 | 800 |
|  |  | 18 | 332 | 19 | 3 |  | 29 | 13 | 20 |  | 3 | 276 | 34 | 0 | 18 |  | 15 | 11 | 791 |
|  |  | 19 | 295 | 23 | 1 |  | 29 | 16 | 28 |  | 6 | 333 | 36 | 1 | 13 |  | 9 | 10 | 819 |
|  |  | 29 | 273 | 17 | 2 |  | 43 | 19 | 25 |  | 12 | 321 | 42 | 1 | 25 |  | 4 | 12 | 825 |
| Total |  | 89 | 1255 | 78 | 7 |  | 133 | 52 | 86 |  | 281 | 1192 | 159 | 2 | 68 |  | 39 | 47 | 3235 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 04:00 PM } \\ & \text { 04:15 PM } \\ & \text { 04:30 PM } \\ & \text { 04:45 PM } \end{aligned}$ |  | 29 | 419 | 60 | 1 |  | 21 | 8 | 9 |  | 13 | 215 | 44 | 0 | 13 |  | 12 | 3 | 847 |
|  |  | 32 | 458 | 61 | 1 |  | 37 | 10 | 3 |  | 10 | 299 | 31 | 0 | 9 |  | 12 | 3 | 966 |
|  |  | 42 | 479 | 72 | 0 |  | 32 | 11 | 7 |  | 10 | 220 | 29 | 0 | 18 |  | 16 | 9 | 945 |
|  |  | 57 | 490 | 83 | 1 |  | 37 | 8 | 11 |  | 5 | 242 | 43 | 0 | 8 |  | 22 | 7 | 1014 |
| Total |  | 160 | 1846 | 276 | 3 |  | 127 | 37 | 30 |  | 38 | 976 | 147 | 0 | 48 |  | 62 | 22 | 3772 |
|  |  | 62 | 484 | 80 | 0 |  | 42 | 22 | 14 |  | 12 | 269 | 54 | 1 | 19 |  | 18 | 11 | 1088 |
| 05:00 PM05:15 PM |  | 70 | 531 | 95 | 1 |  | 29 | 22 | 25 |  | 6 | 257 | 37 | 1 | 26 |  | 25 | 14 | 1139 |
| 05:30 PM |  | 55 | 497 | 61 | 0 |  | 45 | 19 | 20 |  | 11 | 189 | 46 | 1 | 12 |  | 16 | 7 | 979 |
| 05:45 PM |  | 46 | 453 | 79 | 1 |  | 50 | 22 | 16 |  | 11 | 233 | 33 | 1 | 14 |  | 18 | 17 | 994 |
| Total |  | 233 | 1965 | 315 | 2 |  | 166 | 85 | 75 |  | 40 | 948 | 170 | 4 | 71 |  | 77 | 49 | 4200 |
| Grand Total |  | 664 | 7821 | 809 | 12 |  | 797 | 305 | 697 |  | 827 | 7741 | 786 | 7 | 707 |  | 294 | 184 | 21006 |
| Apprch \% 7 |  | 7.1 | 84.0 | 8.7 | 0.1 |  | 44.3 | 17.0 | 38.7 |  | 2.1 | 88.8 | 9.0 | 0.1 | 59.7 |  | 24.8 | 15.5 |  |
| Total \% |  | 3.2 | 37.2 | 3.9 | 0.1 |  | 3.8 | 1.5 | 3.3 |  | 0.9 | 36.9 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 3.4 |  | 1.4 | 0.9 |  |
|  | HWY 31 <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  | SHADES CREST RD Westbound |  |  |  | HWY 31 Northbound |  |  |  |  | SHADES CREST RD Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Righ } \\ \mathrm{t} \end{array}$ | utur n | App. Total | Left | Thru | $\begin{array}{r\|} \text { Righ } \\ t \end{array}$ | App. Total | Left | Thru | $\begin{array}{c\|r} \mathrm{u} & \mathrm{Righ} \\ \mathrm{t} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { utur } \\ \mathrm{n} \end{array}$ | App. <br> Total | Left | Thru | $\begin{array}{r\|r} \hline \mathrm{u} & \begin{array}{r} \text { Righ } \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|c} \hline \text { App. } & \text { Ap. } \\ \text { t } & \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r\|r\|} \text { Int. } \\ \text { al } & \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Peak Hour From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersectio n | 07:15 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 44 | 701 | 34 | 0 | 779 | 150 | 59 | 261 | 470 | 29 | $\begin{array}{r} 196 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | 2110 | 0 | 2101 | 302 | 46 | $6 \quad 14$ | 462 | 3712 |
| Percent | 5.6 | 90.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 |  | 31.9 | 12.6 | 55.5 |  | 1.4 | 93.4 | 45.2 | 0.0 |  | 83.4 | 12.7 | 73.9 |  |  |
| 08:00 Volume | 12 | 214 | 12 | 0 | 238 | 39 | 11 | 58 | 108 | 4 | 512 | - 32 | 0 | 548 | 79 | 13 | 34 | 96 | 990 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.937 |
| Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High Int. 0 | 08:00 | AM |  |  |  | 7:45 | 5 AM |  |  | 08:00 | 0 AM |  |  |  | 07:45 | AM |  |  |  |
| Volume | 12 | 214 | 12 | 0 | 238 | 46 | 14 | 84 | 144 | 4 | 512 | 23 | 0 | 548 | 90 | 16 | 64 | 4110 |  |

$\begin{gathered}\text { Peak } \\ \text { Factor }\end{gathered}$
Peak Hour From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1

0.816
0.958
0.823

Peak Hour From 11:00 AM to 12:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1


Peak Hour From 11:00 AM to 12:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1

| By | $11: 30$ | AM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 78 | 142 | 77 | 4 | 1584 |
| Percent | 4.9 | 90.0 | 4.9 | 0.3 |  |
| High Int. | $11: 30$ | AM |  |  |  |
| Volume | 17 | 399 | 14 | 0 | 430 |
| Peak |  |  |  |  | 0.921 |
| Factor |  |  |  |  |  |


| 12:00 PM |  |  | 12:00 PM |  |  |  | 12:00 PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13352 | 86 | 271 | $\begin{array}{r}28 \\ \hline 119\end{array}$ | 159 | 2 | 1381 | 68 | 39 | 47 | 154 |
| 49.119 .2 | 31.7 |  | 2.086 .3 | 11.5 | 0.1 |  | 44.2 | 5.3 | 0.5 |  |
| 12:45 PM |  |  | 12:30 PM |  |  |  | 12:15 |  |  |  |
| $43 \quad 19$ | 25 | 87 | 6333 | 36 | 1 | 376 | 18 | 15 | 11 | 44 |
|  |  | 0.779 |  |  |  | 0.918 |  |  |  | 0.875 |

Peak Hour From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1


Peak Hour From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1

| By <br> Approach | 04:45 PM |  |  |  |  | 05:00 PM |  |  |  | 04:15 PM |  |  |  |  | 05:00 PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 244 | $\begin{array}{r} 200 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | 319 | 2 | 2567 | 166 | 85 | 75 | 326 | 37 | $\begin{array}{r} 103 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 157 | 1 | 1225 | 71 | 77 | 49 | 197 |
| Percent | 9.5 | 78.0 | 12.4 | 0.1 |  | 50.9 | 26.1 | 23.0 |  | 3.0 04.15 | 84.1 | 12.8 | 0.1 |  | 36.0 | 9.1 | 4.9 |  |
| High Int. | 05:15 | PM |  |  |  | 05:45 |  |  |  | 04:15 |  |  |  |  | 05:15 |  |  |  |
| Volume | 70 | 531 | 95 | 1 | 697 | 50 | 22 | 16 | 88 | 10 | 299 | 31 | 0 | 340 | 26 | 25 | 14 | 65 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  |  | 0.921 |  |  |  | 0.926 |  |  |  |  | 0.901 |  |  |  | 758 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | AFFI | DA | A, | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 409 | urnha | La |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vestavia Hil | AL |  |  |  |  | mingh | am, AL | 35 | 16 |  |  | File | ame | : ves | tavia05 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 205 | -824 | 25 |  |  |  | Site | ode | : 000 | 00000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Star | Date | : 05/ | 17/2012 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page | No |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Groups | Printed- | shifted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | HW South | 31 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { OLD } \\ W \end{gathered}$ | REEK stbound |  |  | HW North | 31 und |  | $\underset{\mathrm{E}}{\mathrm{OLD}}$ | REEK tboun |  |  |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | uturn | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | uturn | Left | Thru | Right | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 1 | 100 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 388 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 6 | 526 |
| 07:15 AM | 1 | 181 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 464 | 6 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 9 | 699 |
| 07:30 AM | 3 | 262 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 492 | 11 | 0 | 22 | 3 | 20 | 848 |
| 07:45 AM | 2 | 271 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 461 | 21 | 0 | 30 | 1 | 14 | 830 |
| Total | 7 | 814 | 28 | 0 | 13 | 9 | 19 | 25 | 1805 | 43 | 0 | 86 | 5 | 49 | 2903 |
| 08:00 AM | 3 | 185 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 452 | 17 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 8 | 697 |
| 08:15 AM | 2 | 197 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 437 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 5 | 688 |
| 08:30 AM | 6 | 165 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 301 | 5 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 3 | 508 |
| 08:45 AM | 6 | 170 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 335 | 10 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 559 |
| Total | 17 | 717 | 23 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 13 | 22 | 1525 | 45 | 2 | 56 | 1 | 17 | 2452 |
| 11:00 AM | 4 | 266 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 266 | 11 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 6 | 584 |
| 11:15 AM | 8 | 319 | 9 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 252 | 11 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 636 |
| 11:30 AM | 9 | 329 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 287 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 5 | 671 |
| 11:45 AM | 14 | 345 | 11 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 287 | 12 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 697 |
| Total | 35 | 1259 | 33 | 6 | 22 | 3 | 17 | 9 | 1092 | 43 | 5 | 34 | 8 | 22 | 2588 |
| 12:00 PM | 7 | 340 | 12 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 281 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 682 |
| 12:15 PM | 8 | 311 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 242 | 13 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 5 | 618 |
| 12:30 PM | 11 | 330 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 354 | 7 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 749 |
| 12:45 PM | 12 | 303 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 290 | 12 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 652 |
| Total | 38 | 1284 | 37 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 15 | 18 | 1167 | 43 | 3 | 45 | 6 | 14 | 2701 |
| 04:00 PM | 8 | 413 | 13 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 232 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 6 | 704 |
| 04:15 PM | 13 | 448 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 281 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 791 |
| 04:30 PM | 7 | 437 | 21 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 248 | 11 | 0 | 16 | 2 | 5 | 775 |
| 04:45 PM | 11 | 461 | 20 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 269 | 17 | 1 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 822 |
| Total | 39 | 1759 | 65 | 2 | 23 | 10 | 19 | 22 | 1030 | 42 | 2 | 54 | 8 | 17 | 3092 |
| 05:00 PM | 6 | 470 | 23 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 272 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 814 |
| 05:15 PM | 5 | 489 | 20 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 270 | 11 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 10 | 840 |
| 05:30 PM | 8 | 448 | 21 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 244 | 5 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 762 |
| 05:45 PM | 7 | 454 | 24 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 268 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 789 |
| Total | 26 | 1861 | 88 | 2 | 17 | 10 | 18 | 28 | 1054 | 32 | 3 | 35 | 6 | 25 | 3205 |
| Grand Total | 162 | 7694 | 274 | 18 | 105 | 39 | 101 | 124 | 7673 | 248 | 15 | 310 | 34 | 144 | 16941 |
| Apprch \% | 2.0 | 94.4 | 3.4 | 0.2 | 42.9 | 15.9 | 41.2 | 1.5 | 95.2 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 63.5 | 7.0 | 29.5 |  |
| Total \% | 1.0 | 45.4 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 45.3 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 0.9 |  |


|  | HWY 31 Southbound |  |  |  |  | OLD CREEK TRL Westbound |  |  |  | HWY 31 Northbound |  |  |  |  | OLD CREEK TRL <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Righ | utur | App. Total | Left | Thru | Righ | App. <br> Total | Left | Thru | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Righ } \\ t \end{array}$ | utur | App. <br> Total | Left | Thru | Righ t | App. Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { Int. } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ |

Peak Hour From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1


| Peak Factor |  |  |  | 0.833 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.957 |  |  | 0.778 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ak Hour From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| By <br> Approach | 07:30 AM |  |  |  | 07:15 AM |  |  | 07:15 AM |  |  |  | 07:00 AM |  |  |
| Volume | 10915 | 25 | 0 | 950 | $16 \quad 8$ | 21 | 45 | $\begin{array}{r}29 \\ \hline 186 \\ \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 55 | 0 | 1953 | 865 | 49 | 140 |
| Percent | 1.196 .3 | 2.6 | 0.0 |  | 35.617 .8 | 46.7 |  | $\begin{array}{ll}1.5 & 95.7\end{array}$ | 2.8 | 0.0 |  | 61.43 .6 | 35.0 |  |
| High Int. | 07:45 AM |  |  |  | 07:30 AM |  |  | 07:30 AM |  |  |  | 07:30 AM |  |  |
| Volume | $2 \quad 271$ | 8 | 0 | 281 | 66 | 10 | 22 | 7492 | 11 | 0 | 510 | 223 | 20 | 45 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  | 0.845 |  |  | 511 |  |  |  | 0.957 |  |  | 0.778 |


Peak Hour From 11:00 AM to 12:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1

| By <br> Approach | 11:45 AM |  |  |  | 11:15 AM |  |  | 12:00 PM |  |  |  |  | 12:00 PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | $\begin{array}{r} \\ 40 \\ \hline 132 \\ \hline 6\end{array}$ | 44 | 11 | 1421 | 225 | 17 | 44 | 18 |  | 43 | 3 | 1231 | 45 | 6 | 14 | 65 |
| Percent | 2.893 .3 | 3.1 | 0.8 |  | 50.011 .4 | 38.6 |  | 1.5 |  | 3.5 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| High Int. | 11:45 AM |  |  |  | 11:15 AM |  |  | 12:30 |  |  |  |  | 12:15 |  |  |  |
| Volume | 14345 | 11 | 3 | 373 | 73 | 5 | 15 | 3 | 354 | 7 | 1 | 365 | 12 | 1 | 5 | 18 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  | 0.952 |  |  | 733 |  |  |  |  | 0.843 |  |  |  |  |

Peak Hour From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1

| Intersectio n | 04:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 29 185 | 84 | 1 | 1971 | 2516 | 23 | 64 | $\begin{array}{r}22 \quad 105 \\ \hline 1\end{array}$ | 47 | 1 | 1129 | 53 | 12 | 22 | 87 | 3251 |
| Percent | 1.594 .2 | 4.3 | 0.1 |  | 39.125 .0 | 35.9 |  | 1.993 .8 | 4.2 | 0.1 |  | 60.9 | 13.8 | 25.3 |  |  |
| $05: 15$ | 5489 | 20 | 0 | 514 | 46 | 3 | 13 | $6 \quad 270$ | 11 | 0 | 287 | 12 | 4 | 10 | 26 | 840 |
| Volume Peak | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High Int. | 05:15 PM |  |  |  | 04:30 PM |  |  | 04:45 PM |  |  |  | 04:45 P |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 5489 | 20 | 0 | 514 | 85 | 9 | 22 | 5269 | 17 | 1 | 292 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 27 |  |
| Peak |  |  |  | 0.959 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.967 |  |  |  |  |  |

Peak Hour From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1

| $\begin{array}{r} \text { By } \\ \text { Approach } \end{array}$ | 04:45 PM |  |  |  | 04:30 PM |  |  | 04:15 PM |  |  |  | 04:30 PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | $30 \quad 186$ | 84 | 2 | 1984 | $25 \quad 16$ | 23 | 64 | $22 \quad \begin{array}{r} 107 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 42 | 2 | 1136 | 53 | 12 | 22 | 87 |
| Percent | $1.5 \quad 94.2$ | 4.2 | 0.1 |  | 39.125 .0 | 35.9 |  | $1.9 \quad 94.2$ | 3.7 | 0.2 |  |  | . 8 | . 3 |  |
| High Int. | 05:15 PM |  |  |  | 04:30 PM |  |  | 04:15 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 5489 | 20 | 0 | 514 | 85 | 9 | 22 | $6 \quad 281$ | 6 | 1 | 294 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 27 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  | 0.965 |  |  | 27 |  |  |  | 0.966 |  |  |  |  |


| Groups Printed- Unshifted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HWY 31 Southbound |  |  |  | RUBY TUESDAY'S <br> ACCESS <br> Westbound |  |  | HWY 31 <br> Northbound |  |  |  | VESTAVIA HILLS PLAZA <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | uturn | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | uturn | Left | Thru | Right | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 2 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 422 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 531 |
| 07:15 AM | 1 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 475 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 674 |
| 07:30 AM | 1 | 284 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 487 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 777 |
| 07:45 AM | 2 | 312 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 502 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 829 |
| Total | 6 | 890 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1886 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2811 |
| 08:00 AM | 1 | 197 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 490 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 699 |
| 08:15 AM | 2 | 194 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 433 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 648 |
| 08:30 AM | 1 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 309 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 486 |
| 08:45 AM | 4 | 151 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 355 | 15 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 553 |
| Total | 8 | 703 | 7 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 1587 | 32 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 2386 |


| 11:00 AM | 8 | 252 | 4 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 276 | 12 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 598 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11:15 AM | 17 | 306 | 12 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 287 | 17 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 660 |
| 11:30 AM | 9 | 308 | 6 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 297 | 14 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 684 |
| 11:45 AM | 9 | 356 | 7 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 320 | 15 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 743 |
| Total | 43 | 1222 | 29 | 5 | 63 | 3 | 5 | 44 | 1180 | 58 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 10 | 2685 |
| 12:00 PM | 11 | 285 | 8 | 1 | 16 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 244 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 599 |
| 12:15 PM | 11 | 300 | 8 | 3 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 273 | 14 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 643 |
| 12:30 PM | 10 | 298 | 10 | 6 | 18 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 311 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 684 |
| 12:45 PM | 6 | 309 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 312 | 11 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 671 |
| Total | 38 | 1192 | 32 | 10 | 55 | 4 | 8 | 32 | 1140 | 36 | 1 | 25 | 3 | 21 | 2597 |


| 04:00 PM | 4 | 429 | 6 | 2 | 15 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 267 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 744 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 4 | 421 | 8 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 252 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 722 |
| 04:30 PM | 4 | 430 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 288 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 766 |
| 04:45 PM | 5 | 449 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 271 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 772 |
| Total | 17 | 1729 | 23 | 4 | 67 | 4 | 4 | 24 | 1078 | 22 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 8 | 3004 |
| 05:00 PM | 4 | 487 | 2 | 3 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 293 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 820 |
| 05:15 PM | 6 | 464 | 5 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 297 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 805 |
| 05:30 PM | 5 | 472 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 268 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 782 |
| 05:45 PM | 3 | 417 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 270 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 733 |
| Total | 18 | 1840 | 14 | 9 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 23 | 1128 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 16 | 3140 |
| Grand Total | 130 | 7576 | 107 | 28 | 257 | 15 | 20 | 144 | 7999 | 178 | 7 | 97 | 7 | 58 | 16623 |
| Apprch \% | 1.7 | 96.6 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 88.0 | 5.1 | 6.8 | 1.7 | 96.0 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 59.9 | 4.3 | 35.8 |  |
| Total \% | 0.8 | 45.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 48.1 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 |  |


|  | HWY 31 Southbound |  |  |  |  | RUBY TUESDAY'S <br> ACCESS <br> Westbound |  |  |  | HWY 31 Northbound |  |  |  |  | VESTAVIA HILLS PLAZA Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | $\underset{\mathrm{t}}{\mathrm{Righ}}$ | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline \text { utur } \\ \mathrm{n} \end{array}$ | App. Total | Left | Thru | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Righ } \\ t \end{array}$ | App. Total | Left | Thru | $\begin{array}{r\|} \text { Righ } \\ t \end{array}$ | utur n | App. Total | Left | Thru | $\underset{t}{R i g h}$ | App. Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Int. } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ |

Peak Hour From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1

| Intersectio | 07:15 | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 5 | 984 | 2 | 0 | 991 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 4 |  | 14 | 0 | 1972 |  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2979 |
| Percent | 0.5 | 99.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 |  | 91.7 |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  | 50.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 2 | 312 | 1 | 0 | 315 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 502 | 5 | 0 | 508 |  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 829 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.898 |


| High Int. | 07:45 AM |  |  |  | 07:15 AM |  |  | 07:45 AM |  |  |  | 07:45 AM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 2312 | 1 | 0 | 315 | 40 | 0 | 4 | 1502 | 5 | 0 | 508 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Peak |  |  |  | 0.787 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.970 |  |  |  |

Peak Hour From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1



Peak Hour From 11:00 AM to 12:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1

| By <br> Approach | 11:15 AM |  |  |  | 11:45 AM |  |  |  | 11:00 AM |  |  |  |  | 12:00 PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | $46 \quad 125$ | 33 | 5 | 1339 | 65 | 4 | 9 | 78 | 44 | 118 0 | 58 | 1 | 1283 | 25 | 3 | 21 | 49 |
| Percent | 3.493 .7 | 2.5 | 0.4 |  | 83.3 | 5.1 | 11.5 |  | 3.4 | 92.0 | 4.5 | 0.1 |  | 51.0 |  |  |  |
| High Int. | 11:45 AM |  |  |  | 12:00 |  |  |  | 11:4 |  |  |  |  | 12:15 |  |  |  |
| Volume | 9356 | 7 | 1 | 373 | 16 | 1 | 5 | 22 | 6 | 320 | 15 | 0 | 341 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 14 |
| Peak |  |  |  | 0.897 |  |  |  | 886 |  |  |  |  | 0.941 |  |  |  | 0.875 |

Peak Hour From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1


Peak Hour From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1



|  | HWY 31 Southbound |  |  |  | PIZITZ DR Westbound |  |  |  | HWY 31 Northbound |  |  |  |  | VESTAVIA FOREST PL Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | $\underset{t}{\operatorname{Righ}}$ | App. Total | Left | Thru | $\underset{t}{\text { Righ }}$ | App. <br> Total | Left | Thru | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Righ } \\ \mathbf{t} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { utur } \\ n \end{array}$ | App. Total | Left | Thru | $\mathrm{Righ}_{\mathrm{t}}$ | App. Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Int. } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ |

Peak Hour From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1

| Approach | 04:00 PM |  |  | 04:00 PM |  |  |  | 04:45 PM |  |  |  |  | 04:00 PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | $\begin{array}{rr}  & 156 \\ & 1 \end{array}$ | 14 | 1633 | 100 | 11 | 93 | 204 | 45 | $\begin{array}{r} 123 \\ 9 \end{array}$ | 98 | 5 | 1387 | 88 | 34 | 50 |
| Percent | 3.695 .6 | 0.9 |  | 49.0 | 5.4 | 5.6 |  | 3.2 | 89.3 | 7.1 | . 4 |  | $16.0 \quad 16.0$ | 8.0 |  |
| High Int. | 04:15 PM |  |  | 04:00 |  |  |  | 05:15 |  |  |  |  | 04:15 PM |  |  |
| Volume | 8430 | 7 | 445 | 45 | 3 | 36 | 84 | 16 | 349 | 24 | 0 | 389 | 32 | 10 | 15 |
| Peak Factor |  |  | 0.917 |  |  |  | 0.607 |  |  |  |  | 0.891 |  |  | 833 |


| Peak Hour Fr Intersection | $\begin{gathered} \text { m 07:0 } \\ 07: 15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \text { AM } \\ & \text { AM } \end{aligned}$ |  | $-P \epsilon$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 202 | 935 | 11 | 1148 | 162 | 20 | 271 | 453 | 45 | 150 1 | 185 | 0 | 1731 | 26 | 40 | 57 | 123 | 3455 |
| Percent | 17.6 | 81.4 | 1.0 |  | 35.8 | 4.4 | 59.8 |  | 2.6 | 86.7 | 10.7 | 0.0 |  | 21.1 | 32.5 | 46.3 |  |  |
| 07:45 | 79 | 289 | 5 | 373 | 45 | 8 | 84 | 137 | 13 | 317 | 51 | 0 | 381 | 8 | 17 | 21 | 46 | 937 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.922 |
| High Int. | 07:45 |  |  |  | 07:45 |  |  |  | 07:15 |  |  |  |  | 07:45 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 79 | 289 | 5 | 373 | 45 | 8 | 84 | 137 | 7 | 443 | 56 | 0 | 506 | 8 | 17 | 21 | 46 |  |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  | 0.769 |  |  |  | 0.827 |  |  |  |  | 0.855 |  |  |  | 0.668 |  |

Peak Hour From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1


Peak Hour From 11:00 AM to 12:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1

| Intersection | 12:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 42 | $\begin{array}{r} 126 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | 6 | 1309 | 64 | 6 | 54 | 124 | 27 | 117 7 | 46 | 3 | 1253 | 4 | 1 | 26 | 31 | 2717 |
| Percent | 3.2 | 96.3 | 0.5 |  | 51.6 | 4.8 | 43.5 |  | 2.2 | 93.9 | 3.7 | 0.2 |  | 12.9 | 3.2 | 83.9 |  |  |
| Volume | 10 | 357 | 0 | 367 | 10 | 1 | 8 | 19 | 5 | 286 | 9 | 2 | 302 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 697 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.975 |
| High Int. | 12:15 |  |  |  | 12:00 |  |  |  | 12:45 |  |  |  |  | 12:30 P |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 10 | 357 | 0 | 367 | 27 | 3 | 16 | 46 | 10 | 307 | 8 | 0 | 325 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 10 |  |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  | 0.892 |  |  |  | 0.674 |  |  |  |  | 0.964 |  |  |  |  |  |

Peak Hour From 11:00 AM to 12:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1

| By <br> Approach | 12:00 PM |  |  |  | 12:00 PM |  |  |  | 12:00 PM |  |  |  |  | 11:45 AM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 42 | $\begin{array}{r} 126 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | 6 | 1309 | 64 | 6 | 54 | 124 | 27 |  | 46 | 3 | 1253 | 4 | 3 | 27 | 34 |
| Percent | 3.2 | 96.3 | 0.5 |  | 51.6 | 4.8 | 43.5 |  | 2.2 | 93.9 | 3.7 | 0.2 |  | 11.8 | . 8 |  |  |
| High Int. | 12:15 PM |  |  |  | 12:00 PM |  |  |  | 12:45 PM |  |  |  |  | 12:30 PM |  |  |  |
| Volume | 10 | 357 | 0 | 367 | 27 | 3 | 16 | 46 | 10 | 307 | 8 | 0 | 325 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 10 |
| Peak Factor |  |  |  | 0.892 |  |  |  | 0.674 |  |  |  |  | 0.964 |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix B - Capacity Analysis Reports

ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Capacity Analysis for Planning of Roundabouts

Instructions for Use
This tool is designed to provide a quick guide in determining a suitable layout for a proposed roundabout at planning level. Four predetermined hierarchical layouts - namely, $1 \times 1$ Rndabt, 1 NS $\times 2$ EW Rndabt, 2 NS $\times 1$ EW Rndabt and $2 \times 2$ Rndabt (See Notice for details) - are evaluated for their operational performances. The evaluation follows the procedures set in the Highway Capacity Manual ( 2010 HCM), NCHRP Report 672 and the ALDOT Roundabout Planning, Design and Operational Manual. Final selection of a suitable layout should be based on a balanced cost and operational efficiency. The configurations presented here may be used for planning purposes only. Further analysis may be needed to achieve optimum design configuration

## Steps in using this tool:

Step 1: Go to the Input worksheet and fill in the required information located in the "Yellow" boxes.
Step 2: Go through the "Design Sheet" on the second page of each design worksheet and fill in the required information located in the "Yellow" boxes.
Step 3: Review the design on the "Result Sheet"located on the first page of each design worksheet and adjust the number of lanes (Right-turn Bypass lanes) for each approach where required.
Step 4: Go to the Output Worksheet and review the consolidated output of the different configurations.

## Notes

1. Best practices suggest $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ratio thresholds of between 0.85 and 0.90 for satisfactory performance of the roundabout during the design year. Higher degree of saturation (V/C $>0.85$ ) may still perform acceptably in less critical areas (such as intersection with minor streets) where the impact of adding capacity exceeds benefit. More care may be appropriate in areas where queuing is more sensitive (e.g., closely spaced intersections, and interchange off-ramps).
2. Where a Type 2 Right-Turn Bypass lane (refer to ALDOT manual) is required, the analysis assumes zero delay and large capacity on the Bypass lane.
3. Projected Traffic Volume is the volume per day at the end of $n$ years.
4. $1 \times 1$ Rndabt : refers to design geometry where one-lane entry conflicts with one-lane circulating lane.
5. 1NS $\times 2$ EW Rndabt: refers to design geometry where one entry lane conflicts with two circulating lanes.
6. NS $\times 1$ EW Rndabt: refers to design geometry where two entry lanes conflict with one circulating lanes.
7. $2 \times 2$ Rndabt : refers to design geometry where two entry lanes conflict with two circulating lanes.
8. Four SHADES OF GREEN are used to indicate different levels of acceptability of a particular performance measure; dark green indicates highly favorable and light green indicate less favorable.
9. Generally, a RED shaded cell indicate unacceptable performance measure.
10.Calibration Parameters for Capacity Equations: Refer to TABLE 2.3 in the ALDOT Roundabout Manual for values of Parameters A
and $B$. Otherwise input site-specific values.
10. To reset the parameter values in the "Design Sheet" to their default values, simply delete the content of the cells
11. Single-lane: refers to model parameters for the single entry lane when one-lane entry conflicts with one-lane circulating lane
$142 \times 2$, RT lane: refers to model parameters for the entry right lane when two entry lanes conflict with two circulating lanes
12. $2 \times 2$, LT lane: refers to model parameters for the entry left lane when two entry lanes conflict with two circulating lanes
13. $2 \times 1$, RT/LT lanes: refers to model parameters for each entry lane when two entry lanes conflict with one circulating lanes
14. 1x2, one lane: refers to model parameters for the entry lane when one entry lane conflicts with two circulating lanes.
15. Bypass Type1a: refers to a yielding Bypass lane opposed by one exiting lane
16. Bypass Type 1b: refers to a yielding Bypass lane opposed by two exiting lanes
17. Bypass Type 2: refers to a non-yielding Bypass lanes that merge with exiting traffic through a downstream merging operation, no empirical model exist yet, but higher entry capacities are expected

## Disclaimer

ALDOT assumes no liability for this product content or use thereof and shall not be liable of errors resulting from the use or misuse of this product. This software product does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. The user accepts full responsibility.
This planning tool is based on the Capacity Analysis for Planning of Junctions (CAP-X) sofware developed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The CAP-X software was modified for use by Alabama Department of Transportation. Modifications include:
i. A lane utilization function to account for lane disciplane.
ii. A function to account for pedestrian traffic .
iii. A "future year" function to allow for user defined $n$ years design period in the traffic growth model equation.
iv. A function to allow for user defined parameters in the capacity model equations.
v. A function to allow for a Right-Turn Bypass analysis.
vi. A display function of the Right-Turn Bypass lane Measures of Effectiveness (MoE's) on each "Result Sheet".
vii. A display function of each "Approach Delay" and the "Overall Intersection Delay" on each "Result Sheet".
viii. A redefined color-coded output of $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ratios, LOS and Delays .

This tool maybe updated to reflect changing practices and experience in the State. It is the responsibility of the user to check the ALDOT website periodically for updates to this tool.

## Abbreviation Definition

EB
$\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$
PCE
LT,TR
L, LTR
LTR,R
NB
RT lane
LT lane

## SB

V/C
Veh/h
WB
$\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{HV}}$
$f_{\text {ped }}$
ped/h

Eastbound
Passenger Car Per Hour
Per Car Equivalent
Left+ Through, Through Right
Left , Left +Through +Right
Left+Through+Right, Right
Northbound
Right Lane
Left Lane
Southbound
Volume/Capacity
Vehicle per hour
Westbound
Heavy Vehicle adjustment factor
Pedestrian adjustment factor
Pedestrian per hour

## Capacity Analysis for Planning of Roundabouts

## Input Worksheet

| Project Name: | Vestavia Hills Traffic Operations Study Phase 1 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Project Number: | SA\#18-0337 |
| Location | Vestavia Hills, Alabama |
| Date | March 28,2019 |


| Traffic Volume Demand |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Volume (Veh/h) |  |  |  | Proportion of Trucks | Traffic Volume Growth Rate | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} n_{\text {ped }} \\ (\mathrm{ped} / \mathrm{h}) \end{array}\right\|$ | Lane Discipline: 2-Lane Approach |
|  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.30\% | 1.00\% | 0 | Not Sure |
| Westbound | 0 | 230 | 0 | 272 | 1.30\% | 1.00\% | 0 | Not Sure |
| Southbound | 0 | 92 | 253 | 0 | 1.30\% | 1.00\% | 0 | LT,TR |
| Northbound | 0 | 0 | 597 | 80 | 1.30\% | 1.00\% | 0 | LT,TR |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 0.88 | 0.90 | 0.83 |  |  |  |  |
| Truck to PCE Factor | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design Period (years) | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Construction } \\ \text { Year } \end{gathered}$ | 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Demand Flow Rate (PCE) |  |  |  |  | Adjustment Factors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Volume (pc/h) |  |  |  | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{HV}}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{\text {ped }}$ |  |
|  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  | Single-lane entry | Multilane entry |
| Eastbound | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.987 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Westbound | 0 | 276 | 0 | 345 | 0.987 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Southbound | 0 | 110 | 296 | 0 | 0.987 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Northbound | 0 | 0 | 699 | 102 | 0.987 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Notes:

1 The Traffic Volume Demand input values are movement volumes for the year of construction completion
2 The proportion of truck traffic and growth rate values are to be entered as percentile eg. If growth rate or proportion of truck traffic is $2 \%$, enter 2 and not 0.02 Growth rate values ranges from $0 \%$ to $4 \%$. If no data available, use $0.5 \%$
4 Lane Discipline refers to existing intersection approach (2 lanes) configuration as indicated by the existing pavement markings. This may be different from the ultim roundabout entry lane configuration depending on the traffic volume redistribution (See "Design Sheet" on subsequent worksheets). If no information is available, a in the case of a new road development, select "Not Sure".
5 The design period is typically 20 years as per Section 2.2.5 of ALDOT Roundabout Manual. A user may however, select a design year per their design requiremen
6 The Peak Hour Factor input cell default value is 0.95
Truck to PCE factor has default value of 2.0 per section 2.2.1 of the ALDOT Roundabout Manual

| Project Name: | Vestavia Hills Traffic Operations Study Phase 1 | ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Number: | SA\#18-0337 |  |  |
| Location | Vestavia Hills, Alabama | Overal Roundabout Delay, s/veh | 21.1 |
| Date | March 28, 2019 | Overal Roundabout LOS | C |



Zone 3

| Predicted approach MOE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane 1 | amo | V/C |
|  | 17.1. | d, s/veh |
|  | :\#\#, | LOS |
|  | 0 | $Q_{95}$, veh |
| Rightturn <br> Bypass | n/a | V/C |
|  | n/a | d, s/veh |
|  | n/a | LOS |
|  | n/a | $Q_{95}$, veh |
| Approach delay, s/veh |  |  |

## Zone 4

Predicted approach MOE

| Lane 1 | 0.92 | V/C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 42.2 | d, s/veh |
|  | E | LOS |
|  | 13 | $Q_{95}$, veh |
|  | n/a | V/C |
|  | n/a | d, s/veh |
|  | n/a | LOS |
|  | n/a | Q $_{95}$, veh |
| Approach delay, s/veh |  | 42.2 |

Zone 2

| Predicted approach MOE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane 1 |  | V/C |
|  | ! 1 | d, s/veh |
|  | $\sqrt{3} \text { :3 }$ | LOS |
|  | 6 | $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$, veh |
| Rightturn <br> Bypass | n/a | V/C |
|  | n/a | d, s/veh |
|  | n/a | LOS |
|  | n/a | $Q_{95}$, veh |
| Approach delay, s/veh |  |  |




| Equation |  | $A \times \exp (-B \times Q)$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Entry, 2 Circ. | A | $\mathbf{1 4 2 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 8 5}$ |  |
| Bypass Type1a | A | $\mathbf{1 3 8 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1 0 2}$ |  |
| Bypass Type1b | A | $\mathbf{1 4 2 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 8 5}$ |  |
| 2 Entry, 1 Circ. | A | $\mathbf{1 4 2 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 9 1}$ |  |



Zone 1


Zone 2


| Project Name: | Vestavia Hills Traffic Operations Study Phase |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Number: | SA\#18-0337 |  | alaeamadepartment of transportation |
| Location | Vestavia Hills, Alabama | Overal Roundabout Delay, s/veh |  |
| Date | March 28, 2019 | Overal Roundabout LOS |  |



| Equation |  | A $\times \exp (-B \times$ Q) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Entry, 2 Circ. | A | $\mathbf{1 4 2 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 8 5}$ |  |
| Bypass Type1a | A | $\mathbf{1 3 8 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1 0 2}$ |  |
| Bypass Type1b | A | $\mathbf{1 4 2 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 8 5}$ |  |
| 2 Entry, 1 Circ. | A | $\mathbf{1 4 2 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 9 1}$ |  |



Zone 2




## Capacity Analysis for Planning of Roundabouts

| Project Name: | Vestavia Hills Traffic Operations Study Phase 1 |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Number: | SA\#18-0337 |  |
| Location | Vestavia Hills, Alabama |  |
| Date | March 28, 2019 |  |

Results for Roundabouts

| \# | TYPE OF ROUNDABOUT | Zone 1 (North) |  |  | Zone 3 (West) |  |  | Zone 2 (South) |  |  | Zone 4 (Eest) |  |  | Consolidated LOS | Ranking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lane 1 | Lane 2 | Bypass Lane | Lane 1 | Lane 2 | Bypass Lane | Lane 1 | Lane 2 | Bypass Lane | Lane 1 | Lane 2 | Bypass Lane |  |  |
| 1.0 | 1×1 | LIL ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | n/a | 4 ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ - |  | n/a | +as |  | n/a | LOS E |  | n/a | LOS C | \#DIV/0! |
| 1.2 | $1 \times 2$ | Lis |  | n/a | Los 4 | 1654 | n/a | 405 |  | n/a | Hos | $15 \mathrm{~S}=$ | n/a | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! |
| 1.3 | $\underline{2 \times 1}$ | 1\% | 18.5 | n/a | LoS |  | n/a | Los m | Los 5 | n/a | LOS C |  | n/a | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! |
| 1.4 | $\underline{2 \times 2}$ | Hosia | Loss | n/a | Losit | Hosin | n/a | Lossa | LoSt | n/a | - 0 2 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $15 \mathrm{D}=$ | n/a | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! |

ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Capacity Analysis for Planning of Roundabouts

Instructions for Use
This tool is designed to provide a quick guide in determining a suitable layout for a proposed roundabout at planning level. Four predetermined hierarchical layouts - namely, $1 \times 1$ Rndabt, 1 NS $\times 2$ EW Rndabt, 2 NS $\times 1$ EW Rndabt and $2 \times 2$ Rndabt (See Notice for details) - are evaluated for their operational performances. The evaluation follows the procedures set in the Highway Capacity Manual ( 2010 HCM), NCHRP Report 672 and the ALDOT Roundabout Planning, Design and Operational Manual. Final selection of a suitable layout should be based on a balanced cost and operational efficiency. The configurations presented here may be used for planning purposes only. Further analysis may be needed to achieve optimum design configuration

## Steps in using this tool:

Step 1: Go to the Input worksheet and fill in the required information located in the "Yellow" boxes.
Step 2: Go through the "Design Sheet" on the second page of each design worksheet and fill in the required information located in the "Yellow" boxes.
Step 3: Review the design on the "Result Sheet"located on the first page of each design worksheet and adjust the number of lanes (Right-turn Bypass lanes) for each approach where required.
Step 4: Go to the Output Worksheet and review the consolidated output of the different configurations.

## Notes

1. Best practices suggest $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ratio thresholds of between 0.85 and 0.90 for satisfactory performance of the roundabout during the design year. Higher degree of saturation (V/C $>0.85$ ) may still perform acceptably in less critical areas (such as intersection with minor streets) where the impact of adding capacity exceeds benefit. More care may be appropriate in areas where queuing is more sensitive (e.g., closely spaced intersections, and interchange off-ramps).
2. Where a Type 2 Right-Turn Bypass lane (refer to ALDOT manual) is required, the analysis assumes zero delay and large capacity on the Bypass lane.
3. Projected Traffic Volume is the volume per day at the end of $n$ years.
4. $1 \times 1$ Rndabt : refers to design geometry where one-lane entry conflicts with one-lane circulating lane.
5. 1NS $\times 2$ EW Rndabt: refers to design geometry where one entry lane conflicts with two circulating lanes.
6. NS $\times 1$ EW Rndabt: refers to design geometry where two entry lanes conflict with one circulating lanes.
7. $2 \times 2$ Rndabt : refers to design geometry where two entry lanes conflict with two circulating lanes.
8. Four SHADES OF GREEN are used to indicate different levels of acceptability of a particular performance measure; dark green indicates highly favorable and light green indicate less favorable.
9. Generally, a RED shaded cell indicate unacceptable performance measure.
10.Calibration Parameters for Capacity Equations: Refer to TABLE 2.3 in the ALDOT Roundabout Manual for values of Parameters A
and $B$. Otherwise input site-specific values.
10. To reset the parameter values in the "Design Sheet" to their default values, simply delete the content of the cells
11. Single-lane: refers to model parameters for the single entry lane when one-lane entry conflicts with one-lane circulating lane
$142 \times 2$, RT lane: refers to model parameters for the entry right lane when two entry lanes conflict with two circulating lanes
12. $2 \times 2$, LT lane: refers to model parameters for the entry left lane when two entry lanes conflict with two circulating lanes
13. $2 \times 1$, RT/LT lanes: refers to model parameters for each entry lane when two entry lanes conflict with one circulating lanes
14. 1x2, one lane: refers to model parameters for the entry lane when one entry lane conflicts with two circulating lanes.
15. Bypass Type1a: refers to a yielding Bypass lane opposed by one exiting lane
16. Bypass Type 1b: refers to a yielding Bypass lane opposed by two exiting lanes
17. Bypass Type 2: refers to a non-yielding Bypass lanes that merge with exiting traffic through a downstream merging operation, no empirical model exist yet, but higher entry capacities are expected

## Disclaimer

ALDOT assumes no liability for this product content or use thereof and shall not be liable of errors resulting from the use or misuse of this product. This software product does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. The user accepts full responsibility.
This planning tool is based on the Capacity Analysis for Planning of Junctions (CAP-X) sofware developed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The CAP-X software was modified for use by Alabama Department of Transportation. Modifications include:
i. A lane utilization function to account for lane disciplane.
ii. A function to account for pedestrian traffic .
iii. A "future year" function to allow for user defined $n$ years design period in the traffic growth model equation.
iv. A function to allow for user defined parameters in the capacity model equations.
v. A function to allow for a Right-Turn Bypass analysis.
vi. A display function of the Right-Turn Bypass lane Measures of Effectiveness (MoE's) on each "Result Sheet".
vii. A display function of each "Approach Delay" and the "Overall Intersection Delay" on each "Result Sheet".
viii. A redefined color-coded output of $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ratios, LOS and Delays .

This tool maybe updated to reflect changing practices and experience in the State. It is the responsibility of the user to check the ALDOT website periodically for updates to this tool.

## Abbreviation Definition

EB
$\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$
PCE
LT,TR
L, LTR
LTR,R
NB
RT lane
LT lane

## SB

V/C
Veh/h
WB
$\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{HV}}$
$f_{\text {ped }}$
ped/h

Eastbound
Passenger Car Per Hour
Per Car Equivalent
Left+ Through, Through Right
Left , Left +Through +Right
Left+Through+Right, Right
Northbound
Right Lane
Left Lane
Southbound
Volume/Capacity
Vehicle per hour
Westbound
Heavy Vehicle adjustment factor
Pedestrian adjustment factor
Pedestrian per hour

## Capacity Analysis for Planning of Roundabouts

## Input Worksheet

| Project Name: | Vestavia Hills Traffic Operations Study Phase 1 |
| ---: | :---: |
| Project Number: | SA\#18-0337 |
| Location | Vestavia Hills, Alabama |
| Date | March 28,2019 |


| Traffic Volume Demand |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Volume (Veh/h) |  |  |  | Proportion of Trucks | Traffic Volume Growth Rate | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} n_{\text {ped }} \\ (\mathrm{ped} / \mathrm{h}) \end{array}\right\|$ | Lane Discipline: 2-Lane Approach |
|  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.30\% | 1.00\% | 0 | Not Sure |
| Westbound | 0 | 90 | 0 | 79 | 1.30\% | 1.00\% | 0 | Not Sure |
| Southbound | 0 | 184 | 320 | 0 | 1.30\% | 1.00\% | 0 | LT,TR |
| Northbound | 0 | 0 | 464 | 256 | 1.30\% | 1.00\% | 0 | LT,TR |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |  |  |  |  |
| Truck to PCE Factor | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design Period (years) | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Construction } \\ \text { Year } \end{gathered}$ | 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Demand Flow Rate (PCE) |  |  |  |  | Adjustment Factors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Volume (pc/h) |  |  |  | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{HV}}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{\text {ped }}$ |  |
|  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  | Single-lane entry | Multilane entry |
| Eastbound | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.987 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Westbound | 0 | 101 | 0 | 89 | 0.987 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Southbound | 0 | 206 | 359 | 0 | 0.987 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Northbound | 0 | 0 | 520 | 287 | 0.987 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Notes:

1 The Traffic Volume Demand input values are movement volumes for the year of construction completion
2 The proportion of truck traffic and growth rate values are to be entered as percentile eg. If growth rate or proportion of truck traffic is $2 \%$, enter 2 and not 0.02 Growth rate values ranges from $0 \%$ to $4 \%$. If no data available, use $0.5 \%$
4 Lane Discipline refers to existing intersection approach (2 lanes) configuration as indicated by the existing pavement markings. This may be different from the ultim roundabout entry lane configuration depending on the traffic volume redistribution (See "Design Sheet" on subsequent worksheets). If no information is available, a in the case of a new road development, select "Not Sure".
5 The design period is typically 20 years as per Section 2.2.5 of ALDOT Roundabout Manual. A user may however, select a design year per their design requiremen
6 The Peak Hour Factor input cell default value is 0.95
Truck to PCE factor has default value of 2.0 per section 2.2.1 of the ALDOT Roundabout Manual

| Project Name： | Vestavia Hills Traffic Operations Study Phase | ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Number： | SA\＃18－0337 |  |  |
| Location | Vestavia Hills，Alabama | Overal Roundabout Delay，s／veh |  |
| Date | March 28， 2019 | Overal Roundabout LOS | $⿳ 亠 ⿻ 口 一 𧘇$ |


| Tone |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Predicted approach MOE |  |  |
| Lane 1 | ala <br> 17 <br> 4 <br> 3 | V／C <br> d，s／veh <br> LOS <br> $Q_{95}$, veh |
| Right－ turn <br> Bypass | n／a | V／C |
|  | n／a | d，s／veh |
|  | n／a | LOS |
|  | n／a | $\mathbf{Q}_{95}$, veh |
| Approach delay， s／veh |  |  |

Zone 3

| Predicted approach MOE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane 1 |  | V／C |
|  | Wex | d，s／veh |
|  |  | LOS |
|  | 0 | $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$, veh |
| Right－ turn Bypass | n／a | V／C |
|  | n／a | d，s／veh |
|  | n／a | LOS |
|  | n／a | $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$, veh |
| Approach delay， s／veh |  |  |

Zone 4



Zone 2

| Predicted approach MOE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane 1 |  | V／C |
|  | 氺沙迷 | d，s／veh |
|  | $\sqrt{3}$ | LOS |
|  | 7 | $Q_{95}$ ，veh |
| Right－ turn <br> Bypass | n／a | V／C |
|  | n／a | d，s／veh |
|  | n／a | LOS |
|  | n／a | $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ ，veh |
| Approach delay， s／veh |  |  |




| Equation |  | $A \times \exp (-B \times Q)$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Entry, 2 Circ. | A | $\mathbf{1 4 2 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 8 5}$ |  |
| Bypass Type1a | A | $\mathbf{1 3 8 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1 0 2}$ |  |
| Bypass Type1b | A | $\mathbf{1 4 2 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 8 5}$ |  |
| 2 Entry, 1 Circ. | A | $\mathbf{1 4 2 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 9 1}$ |  |



Zone 1
$\left.\begin{array}{|c|}\hline \text { Right-turn } \\ \text { Bypass Lane }\end{array}\right\}$


Zone 2


| Project Name: | Vestavia Hills Traffic Operations Study Phase |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Number: | SA\#18-0337 |  |  |
| Location | Vestavia Hills, Alabama | Overal Roundabout Delay, s/veh |  |
| Date | March 28, 2019 | Overal Roundabout LOS |  |



| Equation |  | $A \times \exp (-B \times$ Q |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Entry, 2 Circ. | A | $\mathbf{1 4 2 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 8 5}$ |  |
| Bypass Type1a | A | $\mathbf{1 3 8 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1 0 2}$ |  |
| Bypass Type1b | A | $\mathbf{1 4 2 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 8 5}$ |  |
| 2 Entry, 1 Circ. | A | $\mathbf{1 4 2 0}$ | B | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 9 1}$ |  |



Zone 2




## Capacity Analysis for Planning of Roundabouts

## Output Worksheet

| Project Name: | Vestavia Hills Traffic Operations Study Phase 1 |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Number: | SA\#18-0337 |  |
| Location | Vestavia Hills, Alabama |  |
| Date | March 28, 2019 |  |

Results for Roundabouts

| \# | TYPE OF ROUNDABOUT | Zone 1 (North) |  |  | Zone 3 (West) |  |  | Zone 2 (South) |  |  | Zone 4 (Eest) |  |  | Consolidated LOS | Ranking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lane 1 | Lane 2 | Bypass Lane | Lane 1 | Lane 2 | Bypass Lane | Lane 1 | Lane 2 | Bypass Lane | Lane 1 | Lane 2 | Bypass Lane |  |  |
| 1.0 | $1 \times 1$ | Mos ${ }^{2}$ | - | n/a | W 2 a |  | n/a | -0¢ |  | n/a | Hos 4 |  | n/a | 102 ${ }^{2}$ | \#DIV/0! |
| 1.2 | $1 \times 2$ | Los 4 |  | n/a | Host | Hos | n/a | -55 |  | n/a | Los | 105 4 | n/a | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! |
| 1.3 | $\underline{2 \times 1}$ | 1os ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | - 14 | n/a | 1\%S |  | n/a | 1052 | 105 | n/a | 1os |  | n/a | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! |
| 1.4 | $\underline{2 \times 2}$ | 1-35a | Losa | n/a | LuThe | Los | n/a | 1-35 | Hos | n/a | 1os | 1-3 | n/a | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! |


|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }_{1}$ | $\hat{\square}$ |  | ${ }_{8}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 18 | 7 | 5 | 104 | 4 | 158 | 6 | 707 | 102 | 68 | 292 | 13 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 18 | 7 | 5 | 104 | 4 | 158 | 6 | 707 | 102 | 68 | 292 | 13 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 75 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.978 |  |  | 0.920 |  |  | 0.981 |  |  | 0.994 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.971 |  |  | 0.981 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1769 | 0 | 0 | 1681 | 0 | 1770 | 1827 | 0 | 1770 | 1852 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.737 |  |  | 0.848 |  | 0.496 |  |  | 0.117 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1343 | 0 | 0 | 1453 | 0 | 924 | 1827 | 0 | 218 | 1852 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 9 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 18 |  |  | 5 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( ft ) |  | 281 |  |  | 402 |  |  | 232 |  |  | 271 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  | 5.3 |  |  | 6.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 33 | 13 | 9 | 141 | 5 | 214 | 7 | 842 | 121 | 89 | 384 | 17 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | O | 55 | 0 | 0 | 360 | 0 | 7 | 963 | 0 | 89 | 401 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 |  | 22.5 | 22.5 |  | 22.5 | 22.5 |  | 22.5 | 22.5 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 52.0 | 52.0 |  | 52.0 | 52.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 31.6\% | 31.6\% |  | 31.6\% | 31.6\% |  | 68.4\% | 68.4\% |  | 68.4\% | 68.4\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 46.9 | 46.9 |  | 46.9 | 46.9 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 1.1 | 1.1 |  | 1.1 | 1.1 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  | 5.1 | 5.1 |  | 5.1 | 5.1 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 3.2 | 3.2 |  | 3.2 | 3.2 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | Min | Min |  | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 16.6 |  |  | 16.6 |  | 39.2 | 39.2 |  | 39.2 | 39.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.25 |  |  | 0.25 |  | 0.60 | 0.60 |  | 0.60 | 0.60 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.16 |  |  | 0.82 |  | 0.01 | 0.88 |  | 0.68 | 0.36 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 19.9 |  |  | 35.7 |  | 5.7 | 22.2 |  | 41.5 | 7.9 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 19.9 |  |  | 35.7 |  | 5.7 | 22.2 |  | 41.5 | 7.9 |  |
| LOS |  | B |  |  | D |  | A | C |  | D | A |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 19.9 |  |  | 35.7 |  |  | 22.0 |  |  | 14.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |


| 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Stops (vph) | 20 |  |  | 166 |  | 3 | 584 |  | 46 | 133 |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 0 |  |  | 4 |  | 0 | 8 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 19 |  |  | 276 |  | 2 | 583 |  | 68 | 131 |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 4 |  |  | 54 |  | 0 | 113 |  | 13 | 25 |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 4 |  |  | 64 |  | 1 | 135 |  | 16 | 30 |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 |  |  | 17 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 17 |  |  | 118 |  | 1 | 320 |  | 24 | 81 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 24 |  |  | 158 |  | 5 | 439 |  | \#82 | 102 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 201 |  |  | 322 |  |  | 152 |  |  | 191 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 441 |  |  | 534 |  | 675 | 1340 |  | 159 | 1355 |  |
| 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 | 0.12 |  |  | 0.67 |  | 0.01 | 0.72 |  | 0.56 | 0.30 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 65.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 22.5 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 80.9\% ICU Level of Service DAnalysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Dolly Ridge Rd


| Lane Group | SEL | SER | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | * | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 190 | 371 | 635 | 258 | 143 | 56 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 190 | 371 | 635 | 258 | 143 | 56 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 50 | 0 | 100 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  | 25 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.951 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1787 | 1599 | 1787 | 1881 | 1789 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  | 0.447 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1787 | 1599 | 841 | 1881 | 1789 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 640 |  |  | 32 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  |  | 35 | 35 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 737 |  |  | 474 | 400 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 20.1 |  |  | 9.2 | 7.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.57 | 0.83 | 0.82 | 0.57 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 328 | 640 | 1114 | 311 | 174 | 98 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 328 | 640 | 1114 | 311 | 272 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | pm+pt | NA | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 6 | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 16.0 | 16.0 | 14.0 | 24.5 | 24.5 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 34.0 | 34.0 | 24.0 | 39.5 | 39.5 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 34.9\% | 34.9\% | 24.6\% | 40.5\% | 40.5\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | Max | Max |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 | 59.7 | 59.2 | 35.1 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.65 | 0.64 | 0.38 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.70 | 0.72 | 1.48 | 0.26 | 0.39 |  |
| Control Delay | 39.1 | 7.4 | 240.2 | 8.4 | 21.0 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 39.1 | 7.4 | 240.2 | 8.4 | 21.0 |  |
| LOS | D | A | F | A | C |  |
| Approach Delay | 18.2 |  |  | 189.6 | 21.0 |  |


| Lane Group | SEL | SER | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | F | C |  |
| Stops (vph) | 163 | 37 | 305 | 105 | 124 |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 3 | 3 | 36 | 2 | 2 |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 233 | 212 | 2483 | 148 | 165 |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 45 | 41 | 483 | 29 | 32 |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 54 | 49 | 575 | 34 | 38 |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 11 |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 172 | 0 | $\sim 915$ | 72 | 100 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 151 | 0 | $\# 466$ | 116 | 158 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 657 |  |  | 394 | 320 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 50 |  | 100 |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 586 | 954 | 754 | 1213 | 704 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.56 | 0.67 | 1.48 | 0.26 | 0.39 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

```
Area Type: Other
```

Cycle Length: 97.5
Actuated Cycle Length: 91.8
Natural Cycle: 120
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.48
Intersection Signal Delay: $110.1 \quad$ Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 72.8\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 1: Dolly Ridge Rd \& Gresham Dr


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 18 | 12 | 5 | 224 | 6 | 354 | 6 | 707 | 405 | 222 | 292 | 13 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 18 | 12 | 5 | 224 | 6 | 354 | 6 | 707 | 405 | 222 | 292 | 13 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 75 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.981 |  |  | 0.918 |  |  | 0.945 |  |  | 0.994 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.975 |  |  | 0.981 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1782 | 0 | 0 | 1678 | 0 | 1770 | 1760 | 0 | 1770 | 1852 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.671 |  |  | 0.846 |  | 0.485 |  |  | 0.087 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1226 | 0 | 0 | 1447 | 0 | 903 | 1760 | 0 | 162 | 1852 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 9 |  |  | 99 |  |  | 69 |  |  | 5 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 281 |  |  | 402 |  |  | 232 |  |  | 271 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  | 5.3 |  |  | 6.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 33 | 22 | , | 303 | 8 | 478 | 7 | 842 | 482 | 292 | 384 | 17 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 789 | 0 | 7 | 1324 | 0 | 292 | 401 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 6 | 6 |  | , | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 51.0 | 51.0 |  | 51.0 | 51.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 32.9\% | 32.9\% |  | 32.9\% | 32.9\% |  | 67.1\% | 67.1\% |  | 67.1\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 3.2 | 3.2 |  | 3.2 | 3.2 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | Min | Min |  | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 20.0 |  |  | 20.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.26 |  |  | 0.26 |  | 0.61 | 0.61 |  | 0.61 | 0.61 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.19 |  |  | 1.74 |  | 0.01 | 1.21 |  | 2.98 | 0.36 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 21.2 |  |  | 364.7 |  | 6.2 | 122.7 |  | 932.7 | 8.6 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 21.2 |  |  | 364.7 |  | 6.2 | 122.7 |  | 932.7 | 8.6 |  |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | F |  | A | F |  | F | A |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 21.2 |  |  | 364.7 |  |  | 122.1 |  |  | 398.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Dolly Ridge Rd


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 327.4 | 327.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }_{*}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 0 | 272 | 0 | 597 | 80 | 92 | 253 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 0 | 272 | 0 | 597 | 80 | 92 | 253 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | Yield | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 87 | 87 | 87 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Mumt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 267 | 0 | 316 | 0 | 796 | 107 | 106 | 291 | 0 |  |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  |  | Minor1 |  |  | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1353 | 1406 | 291 | 1353 | 1353 | 850 | 291 | 0 | 0 | O 903 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 503 | 503 | - | 850 | 850 | - | - | - |  | - - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 850 | 903 | - | 503 | 503 | - | - | - |  | - - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.11 | 6.51 | 6.21 | 7.11 | 6.51 | 6.21 | 4.11 | - |  | 4.11 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.11 | 5.51 | - | 6.11 | 5.51 | - | - | - |  | - - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.11 | 5.51 | - | 6.11 | 5.51 | - | - | - |  | - - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.509 | 4.009 | 3.309 | 3.509 | 4.009 | 3.309 | 2.209 | - |  | - 2.209 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 128 | 140 | 751 | ~128 | 151 | 362 | 1276 | - |  | 757 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 553 | 543 | - | 357 | 378 | - | - | - |  | - - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 357 | 357 | - | 553 | 543 | - | - | - |  | - - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 14 | 117 | 751 | ~112 | 126 | 362 | 1276 | - |  | 757 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 14 | 117 |  | $\sim 112$ | 126 | - | - | - |  | - - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 553 | 452 | - | 357 | 378 | - | - | - |  | - - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 45 | 357 | - | 461 | 452 | - | - | - |  | - - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  |  | 1054.2 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 2.8 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvm |  | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1276 | - |  | - | 181 | 757 | - |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - |  |  | 3.225 | 0.14 | - |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 0 | - | - |  | 1054.2 | 10.5 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | - | - | A | F | B | A |  | - |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | - | - | - | 54.4 | 0.5 | - |  | - |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sim$ Volume exceeds capacity |  | \$: Delay exceeds 300s |  |  |  | +: Computation Not Defined |  |  |  | *: All major volume in platoon |  |  |


| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | WBR2 | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | SEL2 | SEL | SER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 「 | 「 | ${ }^{7} 1$ | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 中4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | ${ }^{1}$ | 「7 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 71 | 384 | 808 | 449 | 838 | 889 | 92 | 818 | 36 | 90 | 69 | 557 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 71 | 384 | 808 | 449 | 838 | 889 | 92 | 818 | 36 | 90 | 69 | 557 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length（ft） | 175 | 0 |  | 400 |  | 0 | 360 |  | 230 |  | 0 | 230 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 1 |
| Taper Length（ft） | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.88 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 | 0.950 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1770 | 1583 | 1583 | 3433 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 1770 | 2787 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.126 |  |  | 0.250 |  |  | 0.950 | 0.950 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1770 | 1583 | 1583 | 455 | 3539 | 1583 | 466 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 1770 | 2787 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 362 |  |  | 666 |  |  | 56 |  |  | 688 |
| Link Speed（mph） | 25 |  |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance（ft） | 478 |  |  |  | 683 |  |  | 562 |  |  | 543 |  |
| Travel Time（s） | 13.0 |  |  |  | 11.6 |  |  | 9.6 |  |  | 9.3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 81 | 436 | 918 | 468 | 873 | 926 | 116 | 1035 | 46 | 111 | 85 | 688 |

Shared Lane Traffic（\％）

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 81 | 436 | 918 | 468 | 873 | 926 | 116 | 1035 | 46 | 111 | 85 | 688 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | Perm | pm＋pt | NA | Perm | pm＋pt | NA | Perm | Prot | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 8 |  |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Permitted Phases |  | 8 | 8 | 2 |  | 2 | 6 |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase | 8 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 |

Switch Phase

| Minimum Initial（s） | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 7.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Split（s） | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 11.5 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 12.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Total Split（s） | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 45.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Total Split（\％） | 20．9\％ | 20．9\％ | 20．9\％ | 20．9\％ | 46．5\％ | 46．5\％ | 20．9\％ | 46．5\％ | 46．5\％ | 11．6\％ | 11．6\％ | 11．6\％ |
| Maximum Green（s） | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 41.0 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 40.5 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 20.5 | 20.5 | 20.5 |
| Yellow Time（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All－Red Time（s） | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lead／Lag |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |  |  |  |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | Min | Min | None | Min | Min | None | None | None |
| Act Effct Green（s） | 40.9 | 40.9 | 40.9 | 94.7 | 78.6 | 78.6 | 81.2 | 70.1 | 70.1 | 16.2 | 16.2 | 16.2 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.57 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.19 | 1.12 | 1.38 | 0.77 | 0.52 | 0.84 | 0.37 | 0.69 | 0.07 | 0.65 | 0.49 | 0.77 |
| Control Delay | 56.9 | 135.9 | 208.6 | 32.0 | 31.2 | 17.5 | 20.3 | 41.2 | 4.6 | 92.9 | 84.9 | 11.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 56.9 | 135.9 | 208.6 | 32.0 | 31.2 | 17.5 | 20.3 | 41.2 | 4.6 | 92.9 | 84.9 | 11.2 |
| LOS | E | F | F | C | C | B | C | D | A | F | F | B |
| Approach Delay | 178.0 |  |  |  | 25.8 |  |  | 37.8 |  |  | 28.6 |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |


|  | $\square$ |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | 4 | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | W |  | $\rightarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | WBR2 | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | SEL2 | SEL | SER |
| Stops (vph) | 56 | 293 | 356 | 230 | 555 | 296 | 44 | 637 | 3 | 84 | 63 | 38 |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 1 | 13 | 39 | 7 | 15 | 10 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 93 | 931 | 2725 | 508 | 1024 | 713 | 81 | 1136 | 14 | 200 | 144 | 259 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 18 | 181 | 530 | 99 | 199 | 139 | 16 | 221 | 3 | 39 | 28 | 50 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 21 | 216 | 631 | 118 | 237 | 165 | 19 | 263 | 3 | 46 | 33 | 60 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 77 | $\sim 613$ | ~1097 | 130 | 344 | 288 | 57 | 476 | 0 | 126 | 95 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 136 | \#889 | \#1400 | 204 | 428 | 554 | 80 | 503 | 13 | 185 | 147 | 14 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 398 |  |  |  | 603 |  |  | 482 |  |  | 463 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 175 |  |  | 400 |  |  | 360 |  | 230 |  |  | 230 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 436 | 390 | 663 | 1014 | 2075 | 1203 | 591 | 2075 | 951 | 224 | 224 | 953 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.19 | 1.12 | 1.38 | 0.46 | 0.42 | 0.77 | 0.20 | 0.50 | 0.05 | 0.50 | 0.38 | 0.72 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 215 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 165.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 66.5 |  |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 81.5\% ICU Level of Service D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 3: US-31 \& I-65 NB Ramps \& Columbiana Rd


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| LOS |  | F |  | E | E |  | B | D | B | D | B | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 2451.6 |  |  | 67.5 |  |  | 46.1 |  |  | 19.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |
| Stops (vph) |  | 254 |  | 132 | 237 |  | 10 | 1757 | 32 | 21 | 336 | 3 |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  | 190 |  | 4 | 7 |  | 0 | 47 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  | 13315 |  | 253 | 489 |  | 19 | 3295 | 67 | 56 | 652 | 12 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  | 2591 |  | 49 | 95 |  | 4 | 641 | 13 | 11 | 127 | 2 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  | 3086 |  | 59 | 113 |  | 4 | 764 | 16 | 13 | 151 | 3 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (t) |  | $\sim 1120$ |  | 226 | 403 |  | 13 | 1391 | 44 | 25 | 306 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#1227 |  | 288 | 474 |  | 26 | \#1681 | 81 | 69 | 315 | 15 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 402 |  |  | 424 |  |  | 313 |  |  | 422 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  | 35 |  |  | 300 |  | 175 |  |  | 375 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 72 |  | 361 | 508 |  | 447 | 2207 | 1000 | 165 | 2276 | 1033 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 6.36 |  | 0.52 | 0.79 |  | 0.07 | 0.96 | 0.12 | 0.34 | 0.39 | 0.04 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 210 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 210 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 51 (24\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 6.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 299.1 |  |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 108.4\% |  |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: US-31 \& Shades Crest Rd


|  | $\cdots$ |  |  | $\pm$ | 4 | \# |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | NEL | NER |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 个44 | 444 | F | *** | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 274 | 3867 | 3020 | 191 | 448 | 159 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 274 | 3867 | 3020 | 191 | 448 | 159 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 350 |  |  | 0 | 100 | 100 |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 75 |  |  |  | 75 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.97 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 3433 | 5085 | 5085 | 1583 | 4990 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 3433 | 5085 | 5085 | 1583 | 4990 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | 79 |  | 88 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 | 55 |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 616 | 491 |  | 414 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.6 | 6.1 |  | 7.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 298 | 4203 | 3283 | 208 | 487 | 173 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 298 | 4203 | 3283 | 208 | 487 | 173 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | NA | Perm | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 | 6 |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 6 |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 8.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 12.5 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Total Split (s) | 40.0 | 200.0 | 160.0 | 160.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 16.7\% | 83.3\% | 66.7\% | 66.7\% | 16.7\% | 16.7\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 35.5 | 193.5 | 153.5 | 153.5 | 35.5 | 35.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | Max | Max | Max | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 25.4 | 193.5 | 163.6 | 163.6 | 28.1 | 28.1 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.11 | 0.83 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.12 | 0.12 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.79 | 0.99 | 0.92 | 0.18 | 0.81 | 0.65 |
| Control Delay | 116.8 | 31.0 | 34.8 | 8.2 | 110.8 | 58.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Total Delay | 116.8 | 31.0 | 34.8 | 8.2 | 111.1 | 58.7 |


|  | $\cdots$ | 4 | $\dagger$ | ل | 4 | $\square$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | NEL | NER |
| LOS | F | C | C | A | F | E |
| Approach Delay |  | 36.7 | 33.3 |  | 97.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D | C |  | F |  |
| Stops (vph) | 263 | 3074 | 2378 | 40 | 431 | 75 |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 12 | 97 | 75 | 2 | 16 | 3 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 872 | 6753 | 5242 | 116 | 1091 | 215 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 170 | 1314 | 1020 | 23 | 212 | 42 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 202 | 1565 | 1215 | 27 | 253 | 50 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 81 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 234 | 2025 | 1478 | 61 | 263 | 128 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 295 | \#2509 | 1793 | 118 | 311 | 227 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 536 | 411 |  | 334 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 350 |  |  |  | 100 | 100 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 524 | 4231 | 3577 | 1136 | 761 | 316 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 9 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.57 | 0.99 | 0.92 | 0.18 | 0.67 | 0.56 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 240 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 232.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 39.9 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: D |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 92.4\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& US-280


|  | $\rightarrow$ | 2 | b | $\nearrow$ | 4 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | F |  | ¢4 | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 151 | 22 | 7 | 456 | 294 | 171 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 151 | 22 | 7 | 456 | 294 | 171 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 100 | 125 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 75 |  | 75 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.999 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1583 | 0 | 3536 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1583 | 0 | 3362 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 24 |  |  |  | 186 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  |  | 40 | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 484 |  |  | 376 | 414 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 13.2 |  |  | 6.4 | 7.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 164 | 24 | 8 | 496 | 320 | 186 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 164 | 24 | 0 | 504 | 320 | 186 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | Perm | NA | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  |  | 6 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 6 |  |  | 2 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 44.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 42.9\% | 42.9\% | 57.1\% | 57.1\% | 57.1\% | 57.1\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 28.7 | 28.7 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 39.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.3 | 4.3 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | Max | Max | Max | Max | Max | Max |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 28.7 | 28.7 |  | 39.0 | 39.0 | 39.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.37 | 0.37 |  | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.25 | 0.04 |  | 0.30 | 0.34 | 0.21 |
| Control Delay | 18.0 | 6.9 |  | 11.6 | 12.6 | 2.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 18.0 | 6.9 |  | 11.6 | 12.6 | 2.4 |


|  | $\rightarrow$ | 2 |  | $\nearrow$ | 4 | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| LOS | B | A |  | B | B | A |
| Approach Delay | 16.6 |  |  | 11.6 | 8.8 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | B | A |  |
| Stops (vph) | 100 | 6 |  | 253 | 165 | 16 |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 2 | 0 |  | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 109 | 10 |  | 333 | 224 | 50 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 21 | 2 |  | 65 | 44 | 10 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 25 | 2 |  | 77 | 52 | 12 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 |  | 30 | 19 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 53 | 0 |  | 69 | 86 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 96 | 14 |  | 100 | 139 | 29 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 404 |  |  | 296 | 334 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 659 | 605 |  | 1702 | 943 | 893 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.25 | 0.04 |  | 0.30 | 0.34 | 0.21 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 11.2 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: B |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 33.7\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 2: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Shades Crest Rd


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 178.7 |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 |  | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  | \％ | ¢ $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | 个个 | F |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 65 | 88 | 13 | 113 | 166 | 108 | 28 | 460 | 115 | 199 | 894 | 295 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 65 | 88 | 13 | 113 | 166 | 108 | 28 | 460 | 115 | 199 | 894 | 295 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length（ft） | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 115 |  | 0 | 140 |  | 350 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length（ft） | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.989 |  |  | 0.962 |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.981 |  |  | 0.986 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 0 | 1807 | 0 | 0 | 1767 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.676 |  |  | 0.833 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.300 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 0 | 1245 | 0 | 0 | 1493 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 559 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 4 |  |  | 17 |  |  |  | 142 |  |  | 304 |
| Link Speed（mph） |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance（ft） |  | 493 |  |  | 298 |  |  | 271 |  |  | 469 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 11.2 |  |  | 6.8 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 74 | 100 | 15 | 123 | 180 | 117 | 35 | 568 | 142 | 205 | 922 | 304 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 189 | 0 | 0 | 420 | 0 | 35 | 568 | 142 | 205 | 922 | 304 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | pm＋pt | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | ， |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial（s） | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 5.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 5.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Minimum Split（s） | 23.0 | 23.0 |  | 22.5 | 22.5 |  | 12.0 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 12.0 | 23.5 | 23.5 |
| Total Split（s） | 46.0 | 46.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  | 23.0 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 18.0 | 52.0 | 52.0 |
| Total Split（\％） | 38．0\％ | 38．0\％ |  | 38．0\％ | 38．0\％ |  | 19．0\％ | 43．0\％ | 43．0\％ | 14．9\％ | 43．0\％ | 43．0\％ |
| Maximum Green（s） | 40.0 | 40.0 |  | 40.0 | 40.0 |  | 17.0 | 46.5 | 46.5 | 12.0 | 46.5 | 46.5 |
| Yellow Time（s） | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All－Red Time（s） | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 3.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| Lead／Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | Min | Min | None | Min | Min |
| Walk Time（s） | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk（s） | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls（\＃／hr） | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Act Effct Green（s） |  | 29.9 |  |  | 29.9 |  | 6.7 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 43.8 | 38.4 | 38.4 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.34 |  |  | 0.34 |  | 0.08 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.50 | 0.44 | 0.44 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.44 |  |  | 0.81 |  | 0.26 | 0.49 | 0.23 | 0.49 | 0.59 | 0.35 |
| Control Delay |  | 27.3 |  |  | 39.7 |  | 50.4 | 25.7 | 5.1 | 16.9 | 23.3 | 3.8 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 27.3 |  |  | 39.7 |  | 50.4 | 25.7 | 5.1 | 16.9 | 23.3 | 3.8 |



Splits and Phases: 1: Columbiana Rd \& Shades Crest Rd/Vestaview Ln


|  | $\checkmark$ | $\lambda$ | \% | $\ngtr$ | 4 | $\cdots$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | SEL | SER | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F | \% | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{1}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 12 | 9 | 0 | 167 | 229 | 7 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 12 | 9 | 0 | 167 | 229 | 7 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 50 | 0 | 100 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  | 25 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.996 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1787 | 1599 | 1881 | 1881 | 1874 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1787 | 1599 | 1881 | 1881 | 1874 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 16 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  |  | 35 | 35 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 737 |  |  | 474 | 400 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 20.1 |  |  | 9.2 | 7.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 21 | 16 | 0 | 217 | 241 | 7 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 21 | 16 | 0 | 217 | 248 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | pm+pt | NA | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 6 | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 16.0 | 16.0 | 14.0 | 24.5 | 24.5 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 34.0 | 34.0 | 24.0 | 39.5 | 39.5 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 34.9\% | 34.9\% | 24.6\% | 40.5\% | 40.5\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) | 12.2 | 12.2 |  | 35.1 | 35.1 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.29 | 0.29 |  | 0.82 | 0.82 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.04 | 0.03 |  | 0.14 | 0.16 |  |
| Control Delay | 12.3 | 7.0 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 12.3 | 7.0 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  |
| LOS | B | A |  | A | A |  |
| Approach Delay | 10.0 |  |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Splits and Phases: 1: Dolly Ridge Rd \& Gresham Dr


|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | ¢ |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 30 | 12 | 9 | 102 | 8 | 90 | 16 | 375 | 67 | 109 | 691 | 35 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 30 | 12 | 9 | 102 | 8 | 90 | 16 | 375 | 67 | 109 | 691 | 35 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 75 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.975 |  |  | 0.940 |  |  | 0.977 |  |  | 0.993 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.972 |  |  | 0.975 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1765 | 0 | 0 | 1707 | 0 | 1770 | 1820 | 0 | 1770 | 1850 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.788 |  |  | 0.808 |  | 0.197 |  |  | 0.381 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1431 | 0 | 0 | 1415 | 0 | 367 | 1820 | 0 | 710 | 1850 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 11 |  |  | 52 |  |  | 21 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 281 |  |  | 402 |  |  | 232 |  |  | 271 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  | 5.3 |  |  | 6.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 35 | 14 | 11 | 123 | 10 | 108 | 20 | 469 | 84 | 122 | 776 | 39 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | O | 60 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 0 | 20 | 553 | 0 | 122 | 815 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 51.0 | 51.0 |  | 51.0 | 51.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 32.9\% | 32.9\% |  | 32.9\% | 32.9\% |  | 67.1\% | 67.1\% |  | 67.1\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 3.2 | 3.2 |  | 3.2 | 3.2 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | Min | Min |  | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 13.0 |  |  | 13.0 |  | 31.2 | 31.2 |  | 31.2 | 31.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.24 |  |  | 0.24 |  | 0.57 | 0.57 |  | 0.57 | 0.57 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.17 |  |  | 0.64 |  | 0.10 | 0.53 |  | 0.30 | 0.78 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 18.3 |  |  | 25.6 |  | 7.3 | 9.4 |  | 9.1 | 15.5 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 18.3 |  |  | 25.6 |  | 7.3 | 9.4 |  | 9.1 | 15.5 |  |
| LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  | A | A |  | A | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 18.3 |  |  | 25.6 |  |  | 9.3 |  |  | 14.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Dolly Ridge Rd


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 34.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 464 | 256 | 184 | 320 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 464 | 256 | 184 | 320 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control S | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | Yield | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 86 | 86 | 86 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 504 | 278 | 214 | 372 | 0 |  |



| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | WBR2 | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | SEL2 | SEL | SER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 「 | F | ${ }^{7 *}$ | 个4 | F＇ | ${ }^{7}$ | 个个 | F | \％ | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 128 | 307 | 888 | 221 | 746 | 795 | 89 | 1846 | 37 | 115 | 79 | 795 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 128 | 307 | 888 | 221 | 746 | 795 | 89 | 1846 | 37 | 115 | 79 | 795 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length（ft） | 175 | 0 |  | 400 |  | 0 | 360 |  | 230 |  | 0 | 230 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 1 |
| Taper Length（ft） | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.88 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 | 0.950 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1770 | 1583 | 1583 | 3433 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 1770 | 2787 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.040 |  |  | 0.297 |  |  | 0.950 | 0.950 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1770 | 1583 | 1583 | 145 | 3539 | 1583 | 553 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 1770 | 2787 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 373 |  |  | 669 |  |  | 56 |  |  | 603 |
| Link Speed（mph） | 25 |  |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance（ft） | 478 |  |  |  | 683 |  |  | 562 |  |  | 543 |  |
| Travel Time（s） | 13.0 |  |  |  | 11.6 |  |  | 9.6 |  |  | 9.3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 147 | 353 | 1021 | 233 | 785 | 837 | 91 | 1884 | 38 | 122 | 84 | 846 |


| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Detector Phase | 8 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial（s） | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 7.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Minimum Split（s） | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 11.5 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 12.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Total Split（s） | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 45.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Total Split（\％） | 20．9\％ | 20．9\％ | 20．9\％ | 20．9\％ | 46．5\％ | 46．5\％ | 20．9\％ | 46．5\％ | 46．5\％ | 11．6\％ | 11．6\％ | 11．6\％ |
| Maximum Green（s） | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 41.0 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 40.5 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 20.5 | 20.5 | 20.5 |
| Yellow Time（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All－Red Time（s） | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lead／Lag |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |  |  |  |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | Min | Min | None | Min | Min | None | None | None |
| Act Efftt Green（s） | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 116.1 | 101.1 | 101.1 | 105.0 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 20.5 | 20.5 | 20.5 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.61 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.55 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.40 | 1.06 | 1.63 | 0.64 | 0.42 | 0.72 | 0.25 | 1.07 | 0.05 | 0.64 | 0.44 | 1.01 |
| Control Delay | 68.8 | 134.6 | 315.5 | 49.7 | 27.7 | 9.8 | 17.4 | 86.2 | 2.2 | 97.8 | 87.9 | 55.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 68.8 | 134.6 | 315.5 | 49.7 | 27.7 | 9.8 | 17.4 | 86.2 | 2.2 | 97.8 | 87.9 | 55.9 |
| LOS | E | F | F | D | C | A | B | F | A | F | F | E |
| Approach Delay | 249.7 |  |  |  | 22.4 |  |  | 81.5 |  |  | 63.3 |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |


|  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | \% | $\uparrow$ | p |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\cdots$ | $\rightarrow$ | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | WBR2 | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | SEL2 | SEL | SER |
| Stops (vph) | 110 | 265 | 338 | 137 | 436 | 156 | 39 | 1641 | 2 | 109 | 73 | 217 |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 3 | 11 | 62 | 5 | 12 | 7 | 1 | 56 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 14 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 191 | 746 | 4330 | 322 | 836 | 476 | 73 | 3883 | 12 | 265 | 169 | 986 |
| NOX Emissions (g/hr) | 37 | 145 | 842 | 63 | 163 | 93 | 14 | 756 | 2 | 51 | 33 | 192 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 44 | 173 | 1004 | 75 | 194 | 110 | 17 | 900 | 3 | 61 | 39 | 228 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 161 | $\sim 483$ | $\sim 1451$ | 94 | 305 | 147 | 46 | ~1361 | 0 | 149 | 100 | ~213 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 235 | \#683 | \#1654 | 145 | 368 | 324 | 74 | \#1530 | 12 | 232 | 168 | \#382 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 398 |  |  |  | 603 |  |  | 482 |  |  | 463 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 175 |  |  | 400 |  |  | 360 |  | 230 |  |  | 230 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 372 | 333 | 627 | 797 | 1881 | 1155 | 595 | 1768 | 819 | 190 | 190 | 838 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.40 | 1.06 | 1.63 | 0.29 | 0.42 | 0.72 | 0.15 | 1.07 | 0.05 | 0.64 | 0.44 | 1.01 |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type: Other

Cycle Length: 215
Actuated Cycle Length: 190.1
Natural Cycle: 150
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.63
Intersection Signal Delay: 101.2 Intersection LOS: F

Intersection Capacity Utilization 88.0\% ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: $\quad 3:$ US-31 \& I-65 NB Ramps \& Columbiana Rd


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 个4 | \% | ${ }^{*}$ | 个4 | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 67 | 84 | 40 | 158 | 74 | 72 | 35 | 991 | 186 | 253 | 2073 | 330 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 67 | 84 | 40 | 158 | 74 | 72 | 35 | 991 | 186 | 253 | 2073 | 330 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 35 |  | 0 | 300 |  | 175 | 0 |  | 375 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.972 |  |  | 0.926 |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.983 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1780 | 0 | 1770 | 1725 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.581 |  | 0.439 |  |  | 0.031 |  |  | 0.187 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1052 | 0 | 818 | 1725 | 0 | 58 | 3539 | 1583 | 348 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 6 |  |  | 22 |  |  |  | 147 |  |  | 194 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 482 |  |  | 504 |  |  | 393 |  |  | 502 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 11.0 |  |  | 11.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 7.6 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 94 | 118 | 56 | 180 | 84 | 82 | 40 | 1139 | 214 | 275 | 2253 | 359 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 268 | 0 | 180 | 166 | 0 | 40 | 1139 | 214 | 275 | 2253 | 359 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 | 6 |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 7.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 29.5 | 29.5 |  | 29.5 | 29.5 |  | 12.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 12.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 45.0 | 45.0 |  | 45.0 | 45.0 |  | 40.0 | 135.0 | 135.0 | 20.0 | 115.0 | 115.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 22.5\% | 22.5\% |  | 22.5\% | 22.5\% |  | 20.0\% | 67.5\% | 67.5\% | 10.0\% | 57.5\% | 57.5\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 40.5 | 40.5 |  | 40.5 | 40.5 |  | 35.5 | 130.0 | 130.0 | 15.5 | 110.0 | 110.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C-Min | C-Min | None | C-Min | C-Min |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 40.5 |  | 40.5 | 40.5 |  | 139.4 | 130.9 | 130.9 | 150.5 | 139.9 | 139.9 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.20 |  | 0.20 | 0.20 |  | 0.70 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.75 | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 1.24 |  | 1.09 | 0.45 |  | 0.37 | 0.49 | 0.20 | 0.75 | 0.91 | 0.31 |
| Control Delay |  | 198.2 |  | 165.5 | 64.9 |  | 27.3 | 18.6 | 4.7 | 21.8 | 32.4 | 5.9 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 198.2 |  | 165.5 | 64.9 |  | 27.3 | 18.6 | 4.7 | 21.8 | 32.4 | 5.9 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Splits and Phases: 1: US-31 \& Shades Crest Rd



|  | $\cdots$ |  | $\frac{1}{\dagger}$ | $\pm$ | 4 | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | NEL | NER |
| LOS | F | A | F | B | F | E |
| Approach Delay |  | 19.6 | 187.5 |  | 87.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B | F |  | F |  |
| Stops (vph) | 298 | 1047 | 3335 | 276 | 305 | 110 |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 14 | 36 | 277 | 10 | 11 | 5 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 983 | 2496 | 19331 | 664 | 753 | 379 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 191 | 486 | 3761 | 129 | 146 | 74 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 228 | 579 | 4480 | 154 | 174 | 88 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 61 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 247 | 554 | ~3718 | 421 | 215 | 214 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 311 | 703 | \#3894 | 667 | 227 | 267 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 536 | 411 |  | 334 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 350 |  |  |  | 100 | 100 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 524 | 4238 | 3559 | 1162 | 763 | 413 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.60 | 0.68 | 1.40 | 0.62 | 0.53 | 0.82 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 240 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 232.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 124.0 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: F |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 118.0\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service H |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& US-280


|  | $\rightarrow$ | 2 | b | $\nearrow$ | $\lambda$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 7 |  | $\uparrow \uparrow$ | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 264 | 19 | 17 | 325 | 693 | 284 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 264 | 19 | 17 | 325 | 693 | 284 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 100 | 125 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 75 |  | 75 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.997 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1583 | 0 | 3529 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.894 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1583 | 0 | 3164 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 21 |  |  |  | 305 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  |  | 40 | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 484 |  |  | 376 | 414 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 13.2 |  |  | 6.4 | 7.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 293 | 21 | 20 | 374 | 745 | 305 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 293 | 21 | 0 | 394 | 745 | 305 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | Perm | NA | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  |  | 6 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 6 |  |  | 2 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 32.0 | 32.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 41.6\% | 41.6\% | 58.4\% | 58.4\% | 58.4\% | 58.4\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 27.7 | 27.7 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.3 | 4.3 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | Max | Max | Max | Max | Max | Max |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 27.7 | 27.7 |  | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.36 | 0.36 |  | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.46 | 0.04 |  | 0.24 | 0.77 | 0.32 |
| Control Delay | 21.8 | 7.4 |  | 10.6 | 21.6 | 2.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 10.4 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 21.8 | 7.4 |  | 10.6 | 32.0 | 2.2 |


|  | $\rightarrow$ | 2 | b) | $\nearrow$ | $\$ & $\checkmark$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| LOS | C | A |  | B | C | A |
| Approach Delay | 20.9 |  |  | 10.6 | 23.4 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | B | C |  |
| Stops (vph) | 196 | 6 |  | 176 | 536 | 21 |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 3 | 0 |  | 3 | 10 | 1 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 211 | 9 |  | 234 | 717 | 79 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 41 | 2 |  | 46 | 140 | 15 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 49 | 2 |  | 54 | 166 | 18 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 |  | 22 | 45 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 106 | 0 |  | 51 | 267 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 175 | 14 |  | 73 | 415 | 35 |
| Internal Link Dist (t) | 404 |  |  | 296 | 334 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 636 | 582 |  | 1643 | 967 | 968 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 200 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.46 | 0.04 |  | 0.24 | 0.97 | 0.32 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 20.1 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: C |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 58.8\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service B |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 2: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Shades Crest Rd


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 26 | 11 | 15 | 82 | 11 | 86 | 14 | 314 | 55 | 92 | 500 | 35 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 26 | 11 | 15 | 82 | 11 | 86 | 14 | 314 | 55 | 92 | 500 | 35 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 75 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.960 |  |  | 0.935 |  |  | 0.977 |  |  | 0.990 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.976 |  |  | 0.978 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1745 | 0 | 0 | 1703 | 0 | 1770 | 1820 | 0 | 1770 | 1844 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.849 |  |  | 0.822 |  | 0.293 |  |  | 0.499 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1518 | 0 | 0 | 1432 | 0 | 546 | 1820 | 0 | 930 | 1844 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 20 |  |  | 59 |  |  | 22 |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 281 |  |  | 402 |  |  | 232 |  |  | 271 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  | 5.3 |  |  | 6.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 34 | 14 | 20 | 93 | 13 | 98 | 16 | 357 | 63 | 119 | 649 | 45 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 204 | 0 | 16 | 420 | 0 | 119 | 694 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 |  | 22.5 | 22.5 |  | 22.5 | 22.5 |  | 22.5 | 22.5 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 52.0 | 52.0 |  | 52.0 | 52.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 31.6\% | 31.6\% |  | 31.6\% | 31.6\% |  | 68.4\% | 68.4\% |  | 68.4\% | 68.4\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 46.9 | 46.9 |  | 46.9 | 46.9 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 1.1 | 1.1 |  | 1.1 | 1.1 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  | 5.1 | 5.1 |  | 5.1 | 5.1 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 3.2 | 3.2 |  | 3.2 | 3.2 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | Min | Min |  | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 10.8 |  |  | 10.8 |  | 27.5 | 27.5 |  | 27.5 | 27.5 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.22 |  |  | 0.22 |  | 0.57 | 0.57 |  | 0.57 | 0.57 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.19 |  |  | 0.55 |  | 0.05 | 0.40 |  | 0.22 | 0.66 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 14.5 |  |  | 19.3 |  | 5.6 | 7.0 |  | 6.8 | 10.8 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 14.5 |  |  | 19.3 |  | 5.6 | 7.0 |  | 6.8 | 10.8 |  |
| LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  | A | A |  | A | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 14.5 |  |  | 19.3 |  |  | 6.9 |  |  | 10.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |



Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Dolly Ridge Rd


| Lane Group | SEL | SER | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | F | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 75 | 298 | 205 | 154 | 149 | 107 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 75 | 298 | 205 | 154 | 149 | 107 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 50 | 0 | 100 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  | 25 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.948 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1787 | 1599 | 1787 | 1881 | 1783 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  | 0.478 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1787 | 1599 | 899 | 1881 | 1783 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 608 |  |  | 36 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  |  | 35 | 35 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 737 |  |  | 474 | 400 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 20.1 |  |  | 9.2 | 7.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.94 | 0.83 | 0.82 | 0.94 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 153 | 608 | 218 | 186 | 182 | 114 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 153 | 608 | 218 | 186 | 296 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | pm+pt | NA | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 6 | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 16.5 | 16.5 | 14.5 | 24.5 | 24.5 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 34.0 | 34.0 | 24.0 | 39.5 | 39.5 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 34.9\% | 34.9\% | 24.6\% | 40.5\% | 40.5\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | Max | Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  |  |  |  | 11.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 14.4 | 14.4 | 50.2 | 49.7 | 35.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.69 | 0.68 | 0.48 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.43 | 0.76 | 0.29 | 0.14 | 0.34 |  |
| Control Delay | 29.5 | 9.3 | 5.6 | 4.9 | 12.3 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |


|  | $\cdots$ | $\lambda$ | \% | $\nearrow$ | 4 | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | SEL | SER | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| Total Delay | 29.5 | 9.3 | 5.6 | 4.9 | 12.3 |  |
| LOS | C | A | A | A | B |  |
| Approach Delay | 13.3 |  |  | 5.3 | 12.3 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | A | B |  |
| Stops (vph) | 61 | 34 | 67 | 50 | 133 |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 81 | 179 | 101 | 74 | 166 |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 16 | 35 | 20 | 14 | 32 |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 19 | 42 | 23 | 17 | 39 |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 17 |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 60 | 0 | 24 | 21 | 61 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 58 | 0 | 73 | 57 | 133 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (t) | 657 |  |  | 394 | 320 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) | 50 |  | 100 |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 741 | 1019 | 867 | 1535 | 881 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.21 | 0.60 | 0.25 | 0.12 | 0.34 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 97.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 72.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 10.9 |  |  |  |  | rsectio | OS: B |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 48.4\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Dolly Ridge Rd \& Gresham Dr


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | P |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 26 | 27 | 15 | 221 | 30 | 231 | 14 | 314 | 137 | 229 | 500 | 35 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 26 | 27 | 15 | 221 | 30 | 231 | 14 | 314 | 137 | 229 | 500 | 35 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 75 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.970 |  |  | 0.935 |  |  | 0.954 |  |  | 0.990 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.981 |  |  | 0.978 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1773 | 0 | 0 | 1703 | 0 | 1770 | 1777 | 0 | 1770 | 1844 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.786 |  |  | 0.810 |  | 0.220 |  |  | 0.366 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1420 | 0 | 0 | 1411 | 0 | 410 | 1777 | 0 | 682 | 1844 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 18 |  |  | 59 |  |  | 52 |  |  | 8 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 281 |  |  | 402 |  |  | 232 |  |  | 271 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  | 5.3 |  |  | 6.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 34 | 36 | 20 | 251 | 34 | 263 | 16 | 357 | 156 | 297 | 649 | 45 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 548 | 0 | 16 | 513 | 0 | 297 | 694 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 51.0 | 51.0 |  | 51.0 | 51.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 32.9\% | 32.9\% |  | 32.9\% | 32.9\% |  | 67.1\% | 67.1\% |  | 67.1\% | 67.1\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 3.2 | 3.2 |  | 3.2 | 3.2 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | Min | Min |  | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 20.6 |  |  | 20.6 |  | 31.4 | 31.4 |  | 31.4 | 31.4 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.33 |  |  | 0.33 |  | 0.50 | 0.50 |  | 0.50 | 0.50 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.19 |  |  | 1.08 |  | 0.08 | 0.56 |  | 0.87 | 0.74 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 17.4 |  |  | 89.5 |  | 7.6 | 11.2 |  | 38.8 | 16.9 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 17.4 |  |  | 89.5 |  | 7.6 | 11.2 |  | 38.8 | 16.9 |  |
| LOS |  | B |  |  | F |  | A | B |  | D | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 17.4 |  |  | 89.5 |  |  | 11.1 |  |  | 23.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |


| 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\frac{1}{1}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Stops (vph) | 42 |  |  | 305 |  | 7 | 237 |  | 177 | 365 |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 1 |  |  | 12 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 3 | 5 |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 39 |  |  | 872 |  | 6 | 221 |  | 229 | 348 |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 8 |  |  | 170 |  | 1 | 43 |  | 44 | 68 |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 9 |  |  | 202 |  | 1 | 51 |  | 53 | 81 |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 |  |  | 30 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 19 |  |  | ~226 |  | 3 | 105 |  | 88 | 183 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 51 |  |  | \#493 |  | 10 | 165 |  | 143 | 215 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 201 |  |  | 322 |  |  | 152 |  |  | 191 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 481 |  |  | 506 |  | 312 | 1365 |  | 519 | 1405 |  |
| 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 | 0.19 |  |  | 1.08 |  | 0.05 | 0.38 |  | 0.57 | 0.49 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 62.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 37.0 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 88.1\% ICU Level of Service E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Dolly Ridge Rd


|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\bullet$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 个4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 个个 | F |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 184 | 109 | 20 | 57 | 34 | 112 | 16 | 1256 | 226 | 118 | 255 | 31 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 184 | 109 | 20 | 57 | 34 | 112 | 16 | 1256 | 226 | 118 | 255 | 31 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length（ft） | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 115 |  | 0 | 140 |  | 350 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length（ft） | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.991 |  |  | 0.925 |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.971 |  |  | 0.986 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 0 | 1792 | 0 | 0 | 1699 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.638 |  |  | 0.825 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.071 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 0 | 1178 | 0 | 0 | 1422 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 132 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 3 |  |  | 55 |  |  |  | 207 |  |  | 89 |
| Link Speed（mph） |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance（ft） |  | 493 |  |  | 298 |  |  | 271 |  |  | 469 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 11.2 |  |  | 6.8 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 |  |
| 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 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 200 | 118 | 22 | 62 | 37 | 122 | 17 | 1365 | 246 | 128 | 277 | 34 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 340 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 0 | 17 | 1365 | 246 | 128 | 277 | 34 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | pm＋pt | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial（s） | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 5.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 5.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Minimum Split（s） | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 12.0 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 24.0 | 23.5 | 23.5 |
| Total Split（s） | 36.0 | 36.0 |  | 36.0 | 36.0 |  | 12.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 24.0 | 62.0 | 62.0 |
| Total Split（\％） | 32．7\％ | 32．7\％ |  | 32．7\％ | 32．7\％ |  | 10．9\％ | 45．5\％ | 45．5\％ | 21．8\％ | 56．4\％ | 56．4\％ |
| Maximum Green（s） | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 6.0 | 44.5 | 44.5 | 18.0 | 56.5 | 56.5 |
| Yellow Time（s） | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All－Red Time（s） | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 3.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| Lead／Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C－Min | C－Min | None | C－Min | C－Min |
| Walk Time（s） | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk（s） | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls（\＃／hr） | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Act Effct Green（s） |  | 30.7 |  |  | 30.7 |  | 5.5 | 53.3 | 53.3 | 66.8 | 63.0 | 63.0 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.28 |  |  | 0.28 |  | 0.05 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.61 | 0.57 | 0.57 |
| V／c Ratio |  | 1.03 |  |  | 0.51 |  | 0.19 | 0.80 | 0.28 | 0.62 | 0.14 | 0.04 |
| Control Delay |  | 97.1 |  |  | 29.7 |  | 55.1 | 28.5 | 4.7 | 31.5 | 10.5 | 0.5 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 97.1 |  |  | 29.7 |  | 55.1 | 28.5 | 4.7 | 31.5 | 10.5 | 0.5 |


|  |  | $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type: Other
Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 110
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBTL, Start of Green, Master Intersection
Natural Cycle: 110
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.03
Intersection Signal Delay: 33.3
Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 89.1\% ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 3: Columbiana Rd \& Shades Crest Rd/Vestaview Ln


|  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | 44 | F | ${ }^{1}$ | 44 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 58 | 74 | 1210 | 342 | 79 | 346 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 58 | 74 | 1210 | 342 | 79 | 346 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 0 |  | 160 | 150 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |
| Frt | 0.924 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.978 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1683 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 3539 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.978 |  |  |  | 0.158 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1683 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 294 | 3539 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | 52 |  |  | 329 |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 299 |  | 469 |  |  | 333 |
| Travel Time (s) | 6.8 |  | 7.1 |  |  | 5.0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 63 | 80 | 1315 | 372 | 86 | 376 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 143 | 0 | 1315 | 372 | 86 | 376 |
| Turn Type | Prot |  | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |
| Protected Phases | 8 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |  |
| Detector Phase | 8 |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 5.0 | 18.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 |  | 22.5 | 22.5 | 9.5 | 22.5 |
| Total Split (s) | 26.0 |  | 71.0 | 71.0 | 13.0 | 84.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 23.6\% |  | 64.5\% | 64.5\% | 11.8\% | 76.4\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 21.5 |  | 66.5 | 66.5 | 8.5 | 79.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lag | Lag | Lead |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 5.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None |  | C-Min | C-Min | None | C-Min |
| Walk Time (s) |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  |  | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 11.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 13.3 |  | 78.5 | 78.5 | 87.7 | 87.7 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.12 |  | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.57 |  | 0.52 | 0.30 | 0.27 | 0.13 |
| Control Delay | 37.1 |  | 4.0 | 0.4 | 5.0 | 3.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 37.1 |  | 4.2 | 0.7 | 5.0 | 3.0 |


|  | $\downarrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| LOS | D |  | A | A | A | A |
| Approach Delay | 37.1 |  | 3.4 |  |  | 3.4 |
| Approach LOS | D |  | A |  |  | A |
| Stops (vph) | 78 |  | 258 | 1 | 17 | 74 |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 2 |  | 8 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 121 |  | 550 | 76 | 32 | 131 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 24 |  | 107 | 15 | 6 | 26 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 28 |  | 128 | 18 | 7 | 30 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 |  | 40 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 61 |  | 94 | 0 | 10 | 25 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 119 |  | m42 | m0 | 26 | 46 |
| Internal Link Dist (t) | 219 |  | 389 |  |  | 253 |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  |  |  | 160 | 150 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 370 |  | 2524 | 1223 | 348 | 2820 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 437 | 358 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.39 |  | 0.63 | 0.43 | 0.25 | 0.13 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 110 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 110 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: $15(14 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBTL, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 5.5 |  |  |  |  | rsectio | OS: A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 56.8\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service B |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

m Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.
Splits and Phases: 6: Columbiana Rd \& Shades Crest Rd


| Lane Group | SEL | SER | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | F | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 190 | 371 | 635 | 258 | 143 | 56 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 190 | 371 | 635 | 258 | 143 | 56 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 0 | 300 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  | 25 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.951 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1787 | 1599 | 1787 | 1881 | 1789 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  | 0.263 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1787 | 1599 | 495 | 1881 | 1789 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 640 |  |  | 26 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  |  | 35 | 35 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 737 |  |  | 474 | 400 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 20.1 |  |  | 9.2 | 7.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.57 | 0.83 | 0.82 | 0.57 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 328 | 640 | 1114 | 311 | 174 | 98 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 328 | 640 | 1114 | 311 | 272 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | pm+pt | NA | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 16.0 | 16.0 | 14.0 | 24.5 | 24.5 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 52.0 | 77.5 | 25.5 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 22.5\% | 22.5\% | 52.0\% | 77.5\% | 25.5\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 18.5 | 18.5 | 48.0 | 73.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.2 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 18.5 | 18.5 | 72.9 | 72.4 | 20.4 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.21 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.99 | 0.78 | 1.13 | 0.23 | 0.70 |  |
| Control Delay | 88.6 | 10.8 | 91.8 | 4.9 | 43.9 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 88.6 | 10.8 | 91.8 | 4.9 | 43.9 |  |
| LOS | F | B | F | A | D |  |
| Approach Delay | 37.2 |  |  | 72.8 | 43.9 |  |


|  | $\cdots$ | $\lambda$ | \% | $>$ | $\checkmark$ | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | SEL | SER | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | E | D |  |
| Stops (vph) | 163 | 39 | 449 | 75 | 165 |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 5 | 3 | 17 | 2 | 4 |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 367 | 231 | 1217 | 119 | 251 |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 71 | 45 | 237 | 23 | 49 |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 85 | 53 | 282 | 28 | 58 |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 208 | 0 | $\sim 737$ | 54 | 146 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 184 | 0 | 325 | 75 | 208 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (t) | 657 |  |  | 394 | 320 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  |  | 300 |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 332 | 818 | 986 | 1381 | 398 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.99 | 0.78 | 1.13 | 0.23 | 0.68 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 99.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 140 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 56.9 |  |  |  |  | sectio | OS: E |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 72.8\% |  |  |  |  | Level | Service C |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Dolly Ridge Rd \& Gresham Dr


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | $>$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | $\hat{1}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 个个 | F | ${ }^{7}$ | 个4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 313 | 48 | 14 | 155 | 61 | 270 | 30 | 2032 | 114 | 46 | 726 | 35 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 313 | 48 | 14 | 155 | 61 | 270 | 30 | 2032 | 114 | 46 | 726 | 35 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length（ft） | 250 |  | 0 | 250 |  | 0 | 300 |  | 175 | 0 |  | 375 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length（ft） | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.966 |  |  | 0.878 |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1770 | 1799 | 0 | 1770 | 1635 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.140 |  |  | 0.697 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.030 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 261 | 1799 | 0 | 1298 | 1635 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 56 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 6 |  |  | 87 |  |  |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Speed（mph） |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance（ft） |  | 482 |  |  | 504 |  |  | 393 |  |  | 502 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 11.0 |  |  | 11.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 7.6 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 382 | 59 | 17 | 189 | 74 | 329 | 31 | 2117 | 119 | 56 | 885 | 43 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 382 | 76 | 0 | 189 | 403 | 0 | 31 | 2117 | 119 | 56 | 885 | 43 |
| Turn Type | pm＋pt | NA |  | pm＋pt | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | pm＋pt | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 7 | ， |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial（ $s$ ） | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 7.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Minimum Split（s） | 12.0 | 29.5 |  | 12.0 | 29.5 |  | 12.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 12.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Total Split（s） | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 20.0 | 130.0 | 130.0 | 20.0 | 130.0 | 130.0 |
| Total Split（\％） | 14．3\％ | 14．3\％ |  | 14．3\％ | 14．3\％ |  | 9．5\％ | 61．9\％ | 61．9\％ | 9．5\％ | 61．9\％ | 61．9\％ |
| Maximum Green（s） | 25.5 | 25.5 |  | 25.5 | 25.5 |  | 15.5 | 125.0 | 125.0 | 15.5 | 125.0 | 125.0 |
| Yellow Time（s） | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All－Red Time（s） | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Lead／Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C－Min | C－Min | None | C－Min | C－Min |
| Walk Time（s） |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk（s） |  | 18.0 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls（\＃／hr） |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Act Effct Green（s） | 53.1 | 28.6 |  | 47.9 | 25.5 |  | 10.2 | 131.0 | 131.0 | 141.2 | 132.6 | 132.6 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.25 | 0.14 |  | 0.23 | 0.12 |  | 0.05 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.67 | 0.63 | 0.63 |
| v／c Ratio | 1.53 | 0.30 |  | 0.55 | 1.47 |  | 0.36 | 0.96 | 0.12 | 0.49 | 0.40 | 0.04 |
| Control Delay | 302.5 | 80.1 |  | 70.5 | 272.8 |  | 107.6 | 48.6 | 9.0 | 44.7 | 20.2 | 2.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 302.5 | 80.1 |  | 70.5 | 272.8 |  | 107.6 | 48.6 | 9.0 | 44.7 | 20.2 | 2.0 |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | , | $\dagger$ | P |  | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| LOS | F | F |  | E | F |  | F | D | A | D | C | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 265.6 |  |  | 208.2 |  |  | 47.3 |  |  | 20.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |
| Stops (vph) | 192 | 51 |  | 130 | 176 |  | 29 | 1757 | 24 | 22 | 349 | 2 |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 22 | 2 |  | 4 | 21 |  | 1 | 47 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 0 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 1504 | 107 |  | 248 | 1440 |  | 76 | 3295 | 56 | 59 | 678 | 11 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 293 | 21 |  | 48 | 280 |  | 15 | 641 | 11 | 11 | 132 | 2 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 348 | 25 |  | 58 | 334 |  | 18 | 764 | 13 | 14 | 157 | 2 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | ~692 | 90 |  | 218 | $\sim 652$ |  | 43 | 1391 | 33 | 26 | 317 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | \#813 | 138 |  | 275 | \#768 |  | 85 | \#1681 | 69 | 70 | 336 | 9 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 402 |  |  | 424 |  |  | 313 |  |  | 422 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 250 |  |  | 250 |  |  | 300 |  | 175 |  |  | 375 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 249 | 250 |  | 372 | 274 |  | 130 | 2207 | 1008 | 165 | 2234 | 1020 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 1.53 | 0.30 |  | 0.51 | 1.47 |  | 0.24 | 0.96 | 0.12 | 0.34 | 0.40 | 0.04 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 210 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 210 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 51 (24\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBTL, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 86.6 |  |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 105.0\% ICU Level of Service G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: US-31 \& Shades Crest Rd


|  | $\cdots$ |  |  | $\pm$ | 4 | \# |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | NEL | NER |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 个44 | 444 | F | *** | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 274 | 3867 | 3020 | 191 | 448 | 159 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 274 | 3867 | 3020 | 191 | 448 | 159 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 350 |  |  | 0 | 100 | 100 |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 75 |  |  |  | 75 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.97 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 3433 | 5085 | 5085 | 1583 | 4990 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 3433 | 5085 | 5085 | 1583 | 4990 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | 79 |  | 173 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 | 55 |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 616 | 491 |  | 414 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.6 | 6.1 |  | 7.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 298 | 4203 | 3283 | 208 | 487 | 173 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 298 | 4203 | 3283 | 208 | 487 | 173 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | NA | Perm | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 | 6 |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 6 |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 8.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 12.5 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Total Split (s) | 40.0 | 200.0 | 160.0 | 160.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 16.7\% | 83.3\% | 66.7\% | 66.7\% | 16.7\% | 16.7\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 35.5 | 193.5 | 153.5 | 153.5 | 35.5 | 35.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | Max | Max | Max | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 25.4 | 193.5 | 163.6 | 163.6 | 28.1 | 28.1 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.11 | 0.83 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.12 | 0.12 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.79 | 0.99 | 0.92 | 0.18 | 0.81 | 0.50 |
| Control Delay | 116.8 | 31.0 | 34.8 | 8.2 | 110.8 | 15.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| Total Delay | 116.8 | 31.0 | 34.8 | 8.2 | 111.1 | 15.1 |


|  | M | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | 4 | ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | NEL | NER |
| LOS | F | C | C | A | F | B |
| Approach Delay |  | 36.7 | 33.3 |  | 85.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D | C |  | F |  |
| Stops (vph) | 263 | 3074 | 2378 | 40 | 431 | 16 |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 12 | 97 | 75 | 2 | 16 | 1 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 872 | 6753 | 5242 | 116 | 1091 | 76 |
| NOX Emissions (g/hr) | 170 | 1314 | 1020 | 23 | 212 | 15 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 202 | 1565 | 1215 | 27 | 253 | 18 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 81 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 234 | 2025 | 1478 | 61 | 263 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 295 | \#2509 | 1793 | 118 | 311 | 85 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 536 | 411 |  | 334 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 350 |  |  |  | 100 | 100 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 524 | 4231 | 3577 | 1136 | 761 | 388 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.57 | 0.99 | 0.92 | 0.18 | 0.67 | 0.46 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 240 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 232.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 39.1 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: D |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 92.4\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service F |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& US-280


|  | $\rightarrow$ | 2 | 4 | 7 | $\cdots$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 「 |  | ¢ ${ }^{4}$ | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 151 | 22 | 7 | 456 | 294 | 171 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 151 | 22 | 7 | 456 | 294 | 171 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 100 | 125 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 75 |  | 75 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.999 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1583 | 0 | 3536 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1583 | 0 | 3362 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 24 |  |  |  | 186 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  |  | 40 | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 484 |  |  | 376 | 414 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 13.2 |  |  | 6.4 | 7.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 164 | 24 | 8 | 496 | 320 | 186 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 164 | 24 | 0 | 504 | 320 | 186 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | Perm | NA | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  |  | 6 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 6 |  |  | 2 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 44.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 42.9\% | 42.9\% | 57.1\% | 57.1\% | 57.1\% | 57.1\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 28.7 | 28.7 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 39.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.3 | 4.3 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | Max | Max | Max | Max | Max | Max |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 28.7 | 28.7 |  | 39.0 | 39.0 | 39.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.37 | 0.37 |  | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.25 | 0.04 |  | 0.30 | 0.34 | 0.21 |
| Control Delay | 18.0 | 6.9 |  | 11.6 | 12.6 | 2.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 18.0 | 6.9 |  | 11.6 | 12.6 | 2.4 |


|  | $\rightarrow$ | 2 | b | $\not$ |  | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| LOS | B | A |  | B | B | A |
| Approach Delay | 16.6 |  |  | 11.6 | 8.8 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | B | A |  |
| Stops (vph) | 100 | 6 |  | 253 | 165 | 16 |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 2 | 0 |  | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 109 | 10 |  | 333 | 224 | 50 |
| NOX Emissions (g/hr) | 21 | 2 |  | 65 | 44 | 10 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 25 | 2 |  | 77 | 52 | 12 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 |  | 30 | 19 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 53 | 0 |  | 69 | 86 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 96 | 14 |  | 100 | 139 | 29 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 404 |  |  | 296 | 334 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 659 | 605 |  | 1702 | 943 | 893 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.25 | 0.04 |  | 0.30 | 0.34 | 0.21 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 11.2 |  |  |  |  | sectio | OS: B |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 33.7\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 2: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Shades Crest Rd


| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 18 | 12 | 5 | 224 | 6 | 354 | 6 | 707 | 405 | 222 | 292 | 13 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 18 | 12 | 5 | 224 | 6 | 354 | 6 | 707 | 405 | 222 | 292 | 13 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 200 | 75 |  | 200 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.981 |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.994 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.975 |  |  | 0.954 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1782 | 0 | 0 | 1777 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1852 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.629 |  |  | 0.725 |  | 0.526 |  |  | 0.085 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1149 | 0 | 0 | 1350 | 1583 | 980 | 1863 | 1583 | 158 | 1852 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 9 |  |  |  | 265 |  |  | 412 |  | 4 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 281 |  |  | 402 |  |  | 232 |  |  | 271 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  | 5.3 |  |  | 6.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 33 | 22 | 9 | 303 | 8 | 478 | 7 | 842 | 482 | 292 | 384 | 17 |

Shared Lane Traffic (\%)

| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 311 | 478 | 7 | 842 | 482 | 292 | 401 | 0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  | 4 |  | 4 | 6 |  | 6 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 8 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 2 |  |  |

Switch Phase

| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 7.0 | 15.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Split (s) | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 12.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 12.0 | 20.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 12.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 14.0 | 52.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 28.9\% | 28.9\% | 28.9\% | 28.9\% | 28.9\% | 13.3\% | 55.6\% | 55.6\% | 15.6\% | 57.8\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 8.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 10.0 | 47.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | Min | Min | None | Min |
| Walk Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 11.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 21.5 |  | 21.5 | 21.5 | 51.1 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 57.9 | 54.9 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.25 |  | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.58 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.66 | 0.63 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.22 |  | 0.94 | 0.81 | 0.01 | 0.92 | 0.49 | 1.01 | 0.35 |
| Control Delay |  | 26.5 |  | 71.3 | 26.6 | 5.3 | 37.8 | 4.3 | 81.0 | 9.5 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 26.5 |  | 71.3 | 26.6 | 5.3 | 37.8 | 4.3 | 81.0 | 9.5 |

Rocky Ridge Rd at Dolly Ridge Rd 03/04/2019 2019 AM LT Improved with Trip Gen

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Dolly Ridge Rd


|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  | \% | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 0 | 272 | 0 | 597 | 80 | 92 | 253 | 0 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 0 | 272 | 0 | 597 | 80 | 92 | 253 | 0 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 180 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.927 |  |  | 0.984 |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  | 0.978 |  |  |  |  | 0.950 | 0.998 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1881 | 0 | 0 | 1705 | 0 | 0 | 1851 | 0 | 1698 | 1784 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  | 0.853 |  |  |  |  | 0.082 | 0.695 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1881 | 0 | 0 | 1488 | 0 | 0 | 1851 | 0 | 147 | 1242 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 73 |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 15 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 267 |  |  | 530 |  |  | 435 |  |  | 521 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 12.1 |  |  | 10.3 |  |  | 8.5 |  |  | 10.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 267 | 0 | 316 | 0 | 796 | 107 | 106 | 291 | 0 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10\% |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 583 | 0 | 0 | 903 | 0 | 95 | 302 | 0 |
| Turn Type |  |  |  | Perm | NA |  |  | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 5.0 | 12.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 22.5 | 22.5 |  | 12.0 | 22.5 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  | 12.0 | 58.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 35.6\% | 35.6\% |  | 35.6\% | 35.6\% |  | 51.1\% | 51.1\% |  | 13.3\% | 64.4\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 27.5 | 27.5 |  | 27.5 | 27.5 |  | 41.5 | 41.5 |  | 7.5 | 53.5 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | Max | Max |  | None | Max |  |
| Act Efft Green (s) |  |  |  |  | 27.5 |  |  | 44.0 |  | 53.5 | 53.5 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  | 0.31 |  |  | 0.49 |  | 0.59 | 0.59 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  | 1.15 |  |  | 0.99 |  | 0.46 | 0.39 |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |  | 117.8 |  |  | 53.7 |  | 16.9 | 10.7 |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |  | 117.8 |  |  | 53.7 |  | 16.9 | 10.7 |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |  | F |  |  | D |  | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |  | 117.8 |  |  | 53.7 |  |  | 12.2 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Splits and Phases: 3: Blue Lake Rd/Cahaba Heights Rd \& Driveway/Sicard Hollow Rd


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | $\dagger$ | 7 | ( | $\frac{1}{\dagger}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  | ${ }^{*}$ | t |  | ${ }^{*}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 18 | 12 | 5 | 224 | 6 | 354 | 6 | 707 | 405 | 222 | 292 | 13 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 18 | 12 | 5 | 224 | 6 | 354 | 6 | 707 | 405 | 222 | 292 | 13 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 75 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.981 |  |  | 0.918 |  |  | 0.945 |  |  | 0.994 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.975 |  |  | 0.981 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1782 | 0 | 0 | 1678 | 0 | 1770 | 1760 | 0 | 1770 | 1852 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.672 |  |  | 0.852 |  | 0.524 |  |  | 0.056 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1228 | 0 | 0 | 1457 | 0 | 976 | 1760 | 0 | 104 | 1852 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 7 |  |  | 62 |  |  | 31 |  |  | 3 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 281 |  |  | 402 |  |  | 232 |  |  | 271 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  | 5.3 |  |  | 6.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 33 | 22 | 9 | 303 | 8 | 478 | 7 | 842 | 482 | 292 | 384 | 17 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 789 | 0 | 7 | 1324 | 0 | 292 | 401 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 15.0 |  | 7.0 | 15.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 20.0 |  | 12.0 | 20.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 45.0 | 45.0 |  | 45.0 | 45.0 |  | 12.0 | 69.0 |  | 16.0 | 73.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 34.6\% | 34.6\% |  | 34.6\% | 34.6\% |  | 9.2\% | 53.1\% |  | 12.3\% | 56.2\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 41.0 | 41.0 |  | 41.0 | 41.0 |  | 8.0 | 64.0 |  | 12.0 | 68.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 3.0 | 3.2 |  | 3.0 | 3.2 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | Min |  | None | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 41.0 |  |  | 41.0 |  | 72.0 | 64.0 |  | 81.0 | 77.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.32 |  |  | 0.32 |  | 0.55 | 0.49 |  | 0.62 | 0.60 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.16 |  |  | 1.57 |  | 0.01 | 1.50 |  | 1.34 | 0.36 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 30.0 |  |  | 297.8 |  | 9.7 | 258.9 |  | 211.9 | 15.1 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 30.0 |  |  | 297.8 |  | 9.7 | 258.9 |  | 211.9 | 15.1 |  |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | F |  | A | F |  | F | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 30.0 |  |  | 297.8 |  |  | 257.6 |  |  | 98.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |


| 4 |  |  |  |  |  | - | $\uparrow$ | 7 | , | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Stops (vph) | 22 |  |  | 382 |  | 3 | 786 |  | 128 | 153 |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 0 |  |  | 40 |  | 0 | 65 |  | 11 | 2 |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 27 |  |  | 2794 |  | 3 | 4542 |  | 752 | 170 |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 5 |  |  | 544 |  | 1 | 884 |  | 146 | 33 |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 6 |  |  | 648 |  | 1 | 1053 |  | 174 | 39 |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 |  |  | 14 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 34 |  |  | ~912 |  | 2 | ~1544 |  | $\sim 272$ | 155 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 40 |  |  | \#867 |  | 8 | \#1638 |  | \#347 | 216 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 201 |  |  | 322 |  |  | 152 |  |  | 191 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) |  |  |  |  |  | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 392 |  |  | 501 |  | 596 | 882 |  | 218 | 1109 |  |
| 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 | 0.16 |  |  | 1.57 |  | 0.01 | 1.50 |  | 1.34 | 0.36 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 130 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 130 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 140 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 225.1 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 124.3\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Dolly Ridge Rd


|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | P |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 个4 | F' | \% | 个4 | F |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 65 | 88 | 13 | 113 | 166 | 108 | 28 | 460 | 115 | 199 | 894 | 295 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 65 | 88 | 13 | 113 | 166 | 108 | 28 | 460 | 115 | 199 | 894 | 295 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 115 |  | 0 | 140 |  | 350 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Fit |  | 0.989 |  |  | 0.962 |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.981 |  |  | 0.986 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1807 | 0 | 0 | 1767 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.662 |  |  | 0.831 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.314 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1220 | 0 | 0 | 1489 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 585 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 6 |  |  | 25 |  |  |  | 142 |  |  | 304 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance ( ft ) |  | 493 |  |  | 298 |  |  | 271 |  |  | 469 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 11.2 |  |  | 6.8 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 74 | 100 | 15 | 123 | 180 | 117 | 35 | 568 | 142 | 205 | 922 | 304 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 189 | 0 | 0 | 420 | 0 | 35 | 568 | 142 | 205 | 922 | 304 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial ( $s$ ) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 5.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 5.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 23.0 | 23.0 |  | 23.0 | 23.0 |  | 12.0 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 12.0 | 23.5 | 23.5 |
| Total Split (s) | 40.0 | 40.0 |  | 40.0 | 40.0 |  | 12.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 18.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 44.4\% | 44.4\% |  | 44.4\% | 44.4\% |  | 13.3\% | 35.6\% | 35.6\% | 20.0\% | 42.2\% | 42.2\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 34.0 | 34.0 |  | 34.0 | 34.0 |  | 6.0 | 26.5 | 26.5 | 12.0 | 32.5 | 32.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 3.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C-Min | C-Min | None | C-Min | C-Min |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 10.0 | 10.0 |  | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 28.4 |  |  | 28.4 |  | 5.8 | 34.4 | 34.4 | 49.0 | 42.7 | 42.7 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.32 |  |  | 0.32 |  | 0.06 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.54 | 0.47 | 0.47 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.49 |  |  | 0.86 |  | 0.31 | 0.42 | 0.20 | 0.46 | 0.55 | 0.33 |
| Control Delay |  | 27.3 |  |  | 44.6 |  | 47.5 | 23.5 | 5.2 | 10.5 | 14.0 | 1.5 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 27.3 |  |  | 44.6 |  | 47.5 | 23.5 | 5.2 | 10.5 | 14.0 | 1.5 |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  | D | C | A | B | B | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 27.3 |  |  | 44.6 |  |  | 21.1 |  |  | 10.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Stops (vph) |  | 124 |  |  | 332 |  | 28 | 336 | 16 | 59 | 554 | 29 |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 1 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  | 157 |  |  | 436 |  | 47 | 502 | 37 | 123 | 850 | 94 |
| NOX Emissions (g/hr) |  | 31 |  |  | 85 |  | 9 | 98 | 7 | 24 | 165 | 18 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  | 36 |  |  | 101 |  | 11 | 116 | 8 | 29 | 197 | 22 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 82 |  |  | 207 |  | 19 | 125 | 0 | 29 | 238 | 25 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 130 |  |  | 305 |  | 45 | 171 | 31 | 68 | 165 | 2 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 413 |  |  | 218 |  |  | 191 |  |  | 389 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 115 |  |  | 140 |  | 350 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 464 |  |  | 578 |  | 120 | 1353 | 693 | 479 | 1680 | 911 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.41 |  |  | 0.73 |  | 0.29 | 0.42 | 0.20 | 0.43 | 0.57 | 0.33 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBTL, Start of Green, Master Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 19.8 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 69.0\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Columbiana Rd \& Shades Crest Rd/Vestaview Ln


|  | 7 |  |  |  | $\pm$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | * ${ }^{\prime}$ |  | 44 | F | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 291 | 114 | 537 | 96 | 78 | 1097 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 291 | 114 | 537 | 96 | 78 | 1097 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 0 |  | 160 | 150 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |
| Frt | 0.962 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.965 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1729 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 3539 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.965 |  |  |  | 0.292 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1729 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 544 | 3539 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | 26 |  |  | 120 |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 299 |  | 469 |  |  | 333 |
| Travel Time (s) | 6.8 |  | 7.1 |  |  | 5.0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 327 | 128 | 671 | 120 | 83 | 1167 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 455 | 0 | 671 | 120 | 83 | 1167 |
| Turn Type | Prot |  | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |
| Protected Phases | 8 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |  |
| Detector Phase | 8 |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 5.0 | 18.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 |  | 22.5 | 22.5 | 12.0 | 22.5 |
| Total Split (s) | 41.0 |  | 37.0 | 37.0 | 12.0 | 49.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 45.6\% |  | 41.1\% | 41.1\% | 13.3\% | 54.4\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 36.5 |  | 32.5 | 32.5 | 7.5 | 44.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lag | Lag | Lead |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 5.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None |  | C-Min | C-Min | None | C-Min |
| Walk Time (s) |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  |  | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 11.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 29.5 |  | 42.0 | 42.0 | 51.5 | 51.5 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.33 |  | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.57 | 0.57 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.78 |  | 0.41 | 0.15 | 0.20 | 0.58 |
| Control Delay | 35.0 |  | 10.9 | 0.9 | 11.7 | 14.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 35.0 |  | 10.9 | 0.9 | 11.7 | 14.8 |


m Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.
Splits and Phases: 2: Columbiana Rd \& Shades Crest Rd


| Lane Group | SEL | SER | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | T | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 12 | 9 | 0 | 167 | 229 | 7 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 12 | 9 | 0 | 167 | 229 | 7 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 0 | 300 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  | 25 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.996 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1787 | 1599 | 1881 | 1881 | 1874 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1787 | 1599 | 1881 | 1881 | 1874 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 16 |  |  | 3 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  |  | 35 | 35 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 737 |  |  | 474 | 400 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 20.1 |  |  | 9.2 | 7.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 21 | 16 | 0 | 217 | 241 | 7 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 21 | 16 | 0 | 217 | 248 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | pm+pt | NA | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  | 5 | 2 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10.0 | 10.0 | 6.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 14.0 | 12.0 | 16.5 | 16.5 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 20.0 | 20.0 | 12.0 | 60.0 | 48.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 25.0\% | 25.0\% | 15.0\% | 75.0\% | 60.0\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 16.0 | 16.0 | 8.0 | 55.5 | 43.5 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.2 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.2 | 10.2 |  | 28.9 | 28.9 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.29 | 0.29 |  | 0.82 | 0.82 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.04 | 0.03 |  | 0.14 | 0.16 |  |
| Control Delay | 11.0 | 6.7 |  | 3.5 | 3.6 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 11.0 | 6.7 |  | 3.5 | 3.6 |  |
| LOS | B | A |  | A | A |  |
| Approach Delay | 9.1 |  |  | 3.5 | 3.6 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Splits and Phases: 1: Dolly Ridge Rd \& Gresham Dr


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


|  | 4 |  |  | $\psi$ |  |  |  | $\dagger$ | P |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| LOS | F | E |  | F | E |  | F | B | A | C | D | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 75.4 |  |  | 114.5 |  |  | 18.9 |  |  | 31.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |
| Stops (vph) | 61 | 102 |  | 133 | 110 |  | 33 | 489 | 23 | 76 | 1685 | 61 |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 2 | 3 |  | 7 | 3 |  | 1 | 12 | 1 | 3 | 43 | 2 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 121 | 197 |  | 455 | 218 |  | 86 | 864 | 66 | 207 | 3012 | 159 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 24 | 38 |  | 89 | 42 |  | 17 | 168 | 13 | 40 | 586 | 31 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 28 | 46 |  | 105 | 50 |  | 20 | 200 | 15 | 48 | 698 | 37 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 112 | 192 |  | ~261 | 169 |  | 52 | 393 | 31 | 98 | 1345 | 78 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 141 | 212 |  | \#427 | 248 |  | 95 | 423 | 62 | 148 | \#1592 | 140 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 400 |  |  | 424 |  |  | 313 |  |  | 422 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 250 |  |  | 250 |  |  | 300 |  | 175 |  |  | 375 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 174 | 367 |  | 168 | 366 |  | 314 | 2317 | 1087 | 370 | 2422 | 1144 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.54 | 0.47 |  | 1.07 | 0.45 |  | 0.13 | 0.49 | 0.20 | 0.74 | 0.93 | 0.31 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 188 (94\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBTL, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 140 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 36.1 |  |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 94.2\% ICU Level of Service F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: US-31 \& Shades Crest Rd


|  | H |  |  | $\pm$ |  | \# |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | NEL | NER |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1 / 1}$ | 444 | 444 | T | ${ }^{* * *}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 309 | 2834 | 4637 | 668 | 324 | 265 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 309 | 2834 | 4637 | 668 | 324 | 265 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 350 |  |  | 0 | 100 | 100 |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 75 |  |  |  | 75 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.97 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 3433 | 5085 | 5085 | 1583 | 4990 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 3433 | 5085 | 5085 | 1583 | 4990 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | 180 |  | 205 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 | 55 |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 616 | 491 |  | 414 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.6 | 6.1 |  | 7.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 315 | 2892 | 4986 | 718 | 405 | 331 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 315 | 2892 | 4986 | 718 | 405 | 331 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | NA | Perm | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 | 6 |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 6 |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 8.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 12.5 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Total Split (s) | 40.0 | 200.0 | 160.0 | 160.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 16.7\% | 83.3\% | 66.7\% | 66.7\% | 16.7\% | 16.7\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 35.5 | 193.5 | 153.5 | 153.5 | 35.5 | 35.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | Max | Max | Max | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 26.5 | 193.7 | 162.7 | 162.7 | 27.4 | 27.4 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.11 | 0.83 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.12 | 0.12 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.81 | 0.68 | 1.40 | 0.62 | 0.69 | 0.90 |
| Control Delay | 116.4 | 8.9 | 211.2 | 16.8 | 104.3 | 65.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Total Delay | 116.4 | 8.9 | 211.2 | 16.8 | 104.3 | 65.8 |


|  | H | $\dagger$ |  | $\pm$ | 4 | $\square$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | NEL | NER |
| LOS | F | A | F | B | F | E |
| Approach Delay |  | 19.5 | 186.7 |  | 87.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B | F |  | F |  |
| Stops (vph) | 298 | 1041 | 3338 | 275 | 306 | 107 |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 14 | 36 | 276 | 9 | 11 | 5 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 983 | 2485 | 19280 | 662 | 755 | 371 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 191 | 483 | 3751 | 129 | 147 | 72 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 228 | 576 | 4468 | 153 | 175 | 86 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 61 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 246 | 544 | ~3702 | 416 | 215 | 209 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 311 | 703 | \#3894 | 667 | 227 | 262 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 536 | 411 |  | 334 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 350 |  |  |  | 100 | 100 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 525 | 4243 | 3564 | 1163 | 763 | 415 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.60 | 0.68 | 1.40 | 0.62 | 0.53 | 0.82 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 240 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 232.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 123.5 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: F |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 118.0\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service H |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& US-280


|  | $\rightarrow$ | 2 | b | - | $\cdots$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 「 |  | ¢4 | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 264 | 19 | 17 | 325 | 693 | 284 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 264 | 19 | 17 | 325 | 693 | 284 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 100 | 125 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 75 |  | 75 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.997 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1583 | 0 | 3529 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.894 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1583 | 0 | 3164 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 21 |  |  |  | 305 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  |  | 40 | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 484 |  |  | 376 | 414 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 13.2 |  |  | 6.4 | 7.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 293 | 21 | 20 | 374 | 745 | 305 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 293 | 21 | 0 | 394 | 745 | 305 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | Perm | NA | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  |  | 6 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 6 |  |  | 2 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 32.0 | 32.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 41.6\% | 41.6\% | 58.4\% | 58.4\% | 58.4\% | 58.4\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 27.7 | 27.7 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.3 | 4.3 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | Max | Max | Max | Max | Max | Max |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 27.7 | 27.7 |  | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.36 | 0.36 |  | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.46 | 0.04 |  | 0.24 | 0.77 | 0.32 |
| Control Delay | 21.8 | 7.4 |  | 10.6 | 21.6 | 2.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 10.4 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 21.8 | 7.4 |  | 10.6 | 32.0 | 2.2 |



Splits and Phases: 2: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Shades Crest Rd


| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 30 | 12 | 9 | 102 | 8 | 90 | 16 | 375 | 67 | 109 | 691 | 35 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 30 | 12 | 9 | 102 | 8 | 90 | 16 | 375 | 67 | 109 | 691 | 35 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 200 | 75 |  | 200 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( t ) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.975 |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.993 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.972 |  |  | 0.956 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1765 | 0 | 0 | 1781 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1850 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.771 |  |  | 0.699 |  | 0.244 |  |  | 0.363 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1400 | 0 | 0 | 1302 | 1583 | 455 | 1863 | 1583 | 676 | 1850 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 11 |  |  |  | 108 |  |  | 84 |  | 5 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 281 |  |  | 402 |  |  | 232 |  |  | 271 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  | 5.3 |  |  | 6.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 35 | 14 | 11 | 123 | 10 | 108 | 20 | 469 | 84 | 122 | 776 | 39 |


| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 133 | 108 | 20 | 469 | 84 | 122 | 815 | 0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA | custom | pm +pt | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Turn Type |  | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Protected Phases | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | 8 | 6 |  | 6 | 2 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 2 |  |

Switch Phase

| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 7.0 | 15.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 12.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 12.0 | 23.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 12.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 12.0 | 41.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | $29.3 \%$ | $29.3 \%$ | $29.3 \%$ | $29.3 \%$ | $29.3 \%$ | $16.0 \%$ | $54.7 \%$ | $54.7 \%$ | $16.0 \%$ | $54.7 \%$ |
| Maximum Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 8.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 8.0 | 36.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | Min | Min | None | Min |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 11.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 10.8 |  | 10.8 | 10.8 | 32.5 | 27.5 | 27.5 | 35.4 | 34.7 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.21 |  | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.63 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.68 | 0.67 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.20 |  | 0.49 | 0.26 | 0.04 | 0.47 | 0.10 | 0.20 | 0.66 |
| Control Delay | 18.9 |  | 27.8 | 7.2 | 4.3 | 13.8 | 3.2 | 4.8 | 13.4 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 18.9 |  | 27.8 | 7.2 | 4.3 | 13.8 | 3.2 | 4.8 | 13.4 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Dolly Ridge Rd


|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 464 | 256 | 184 | 320 | 0 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 464 | 256 | 184 | 320 | 0 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 180 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.937 |  |  | 0.952 |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  | 0.974 |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1881 | 0 | 0 | 1717 | 0 | 0 | 1791 | 0 | 1787 | 1881 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  | 0.833 |  |  |  |  | 0.181 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1881 | 0 | 0 | 1468 | 0 | 0 | 1791 | 0 | 340 | 1881 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 77 |  |  | 48 |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 15 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 267 |  |  | 530 |  |  | 435 |  |  | 521 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 12.1 |  |  | 10.3 |  |  | 8.5 |  |  | 10.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 504 | 278 | 214 | 372 | 0 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192 | 0 | 0 | 782 | 0 | 214 | 372 | 0 |
| Turn Type |  |  |  | Perm | NA |  |  | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 |  | 22.5 | 22.5 |  | 22.5 | 22.5 |  | 12.0 | 22.5 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 22.6 | 22.6 |  | 22.6 | 22.6 |  | 48.4 | 48.4 |  | 14.0 | 62.4 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 26.6\% | 26.6\% |  | 26.6\% | 26.6\% |  | 56.9\% | 56.9\% |  | 16.5\% | 73.4\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 18.1 | 18.1 |  | 18.1 | 18.1 |  | 43.9 | 43.9 |  | 9.5 | 57.9 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | Max | Max |  | None | Max |  |
| Act Efft Green (s) |  |  |  |  | 11.6 |  |  | 45.5 |  | 58.1 | 58.1 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  | 0.15 |  |  | 0.58 |  | 0.74 | 0.74 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  | 0.68 |  |  | 0.74 |  | 0.54 | 0.27 |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |  | 31.6 |  |  | 18.6 |  | 8.9 | 4.5 |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |  | 31.6 |  |  | 18.6 |  | 8.9 | 4.5 |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |  | C |  |  | B |  | A | A |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |  | 31.6 |  |  | 18.6 |  |  | 6.1 |  |


| $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\frac{1}{7}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |
| Stops (vph) |  |  |  | 94 |  |  | 485 |  | 53 | 97 |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 9 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  | 171 |  |  | 603 |  | 99 | 156 |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  | 33 |  |  | 117 |  | 19 | 30 |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  | 40 |  |  | 140 |  | 23 | 36 |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  |  |  | 9 |  |  | 38 |  | 0 | 20 |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  |  |  | 53 |  |  | 245 |  | 25 | 47 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  |  |  | 114 |  |  | \#549 |  | 57 | 99 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 187 |  |  | 450 |  |  | 355 |  |  | 441 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 180 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  |  | 397 |  |  | 1054 |  | 426 | 1388 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  |  | 0.48 |  |  | 0.74 |  | 0.50 | 0.27 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 78.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 15.5 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 77.9\% |  |  |  | Level | Servic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 3: Blue Lake Rd/Cahaba Heights Rd \& Driveway/Sicard Hollow Rd


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 30 | 12 | 9 | 102 | 8 | 90 | 16 | 375 | 67 | 109 | 691 | 35 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 30 | 12 | 9 | 102 | 8 | 90 | 16 | 375 | 67 | 109 | 691 | 35 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 75 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.975 |  |  | 0.940 |  |  | 0.977 |  |  | 0.993 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.972 |  |  | 0.975 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1765 | 0 | 0 | 1707 | 0 | 1770 | 1820 | 0 | 1770 | 1850 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.769 |  |  | 0.808 |  | 0.207 |  |  | 0.274 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1397 | 0 | 0 | 1415 | 0 | 386 | 1820 | 0 | 510 | 1850 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 11 |  |  | 54 |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 281 |  |  | 402 |  |  | 232 |  |  | 271 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  | 5.3 |  |  | 6.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 35 | 14 | 11 | 123 | 10 | 108 | 20 | 469 | 84 | 122 | 776 | 39 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 0 | 20 | 553 | 0 | 122 | 815 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 15.0 |  | 7.0 | 15.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 20.0 |  | 12.0 | 20.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 12.0 | 38.0 |  | 12.0 | 38.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 23.1\% | 23.1\% |  | 23.1\% | 23.1\% |  | 18.5\% | 58.5\% |  | 18.5\% | 58.5\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 8.0 | 33.0 |  | 8.0 | 33.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 3.0 | 3.2 |  | 3.0 | 3.2 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | Min |  | None | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 10.5 |  |  | 10.5 |  | 29.7 | 23.3 |  | 32.6 | 30.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.20 |  |  | 0.20 |  | 0.57 | 0.45 |  | 0.63 | 0.58 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.21 |  |  | 0.73 |  | 0.05 | 0.67 |  | 0.24 | 0.75 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 19.8 |  |  | 33.7 |  | 3.6 | 16.3 |  | 4.6 | 15.1 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 19.8 |  |  | 33.7 |  | 3.6 | 16.3 |  | 4.6 | 15.1 |  |
| LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  | A | B |  | A | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 19.8 |  |  | 33.7 |  |  | 15.9 |  |  | 13.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Dolly Ridge Rd


| Lane Group | SEL | SER | NEL | NET | SWT | SWR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 7 | * | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 75 | 298 | 205 | 154 | 149 | 107 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 75 | 298 | 205 | 154 | 149 | 107 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 0 | 300 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  | 25 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.948 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1787 | 1599 | 1787 | 1881 | 1783 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  | 0.373 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1787 | 1599 | 702 | 1881 | 1783 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 608 |  |  | 34 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  |  | 35 | 35 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 737 |  |  | 474 | 400 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 20.1 |  |  | 9.2 | 7.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.94 | 0.83 | 0.82 | 0.94 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 153 | 608 | 218 | 186 | 182 | 114 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 153 | 608 | 218 | 186 | 296 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | pm+pt | NA | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10.0 | 10.0 | 6.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 14.0 | 12.0 | 16.5 | 16.5 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 38.0 | 38.0 | 23.0 | 52.0 | 29.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 42.2\% | 42.2\% | 25.6\% | 57.8\% | 32.2\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 34.0 | 34.0 | 19.0 | 47.5 | 24.5 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.2 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 15.8 | 15.8 | 29.2 | 28.7 | 15.1 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.55 | 0.54 | 0.28 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.29 | 0.67 | 0.38 | 0.18 | 0.56 |  |
| Control Delay | 16.9 | 6.1 | 9.3 | 7.9 | 20.5 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 16.9 | 6.1 | 9.3 | 7.9 | 20.5 |  |
| LOS | B | A | A | A | C |  |
| Approach Delay | 8.2 |  |  | 8.6 | 20.5 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 26 | 27 | 15 | 221 | 30 | 231 | 14 | 314 | 137 | 229 | 500 | 35 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 26 | 27 | 15 | 221 | 30 | 231 | 14 | 314 | 137 | 229 | 500 | 35 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 200 | 75 |  | 200 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.970 |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.990 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.981 |  |  | 0.958 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1773 | 0 | 0 | 1785 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1844 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.790 |  |  | 0.759 |  | 0.325 |  |  | 0.369 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1427 | 0 | 0 | 1414 | 1583 | 605 | 1863 | 1583 | 687 | 1844 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 20 |  |  |  | 263 |  |  | 156 |  | 7 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 281 |  |  | 402 |  |  | 232 |  |  | 271 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  | 5.3 |  |  | 6.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 34 | 36 | 20 | 251 | 34 | 263 | 16 | 357 | 156 | 297 | 649 | 45 |

Shared Lane Traffic (\%)

| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 285 | 263 | 16 | 357 | 156 | 297 | 694 | 0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 8 |  | 8 | 6 |  | 6 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 2 |  |  |

Switch Phase

| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 7.0 | 15.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Minimum Split (s) | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 12.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 12.0 | 20.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 12.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 15.0 | 29.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | $31.7 \%$ | $31.7 \%$ | $31.7 \%$ | $31.7 \%$ | $31.7 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $43.3 \%$ | $43.3 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ | $48.3 \%$ |
| Maximum Green (s) | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 8.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 11.0 | 24.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | Min | Min | None | Min |
| Walk Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 11.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 13.8 |  | 13.8 | 13.8 | 25.5 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 32.5 | 29.5 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.25 |  | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.47 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.60 | 0.54 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.24 |  | 0.79 | 0.44 | 0.04 | 0.60 | 0.25 | 0.49 | 0.69 |
| Control Delay | 16.0 |  | 39.0 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 20.8 | 4.2 | 8.4 | 16.6 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay |  | 16.0 |  | 39.0 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 20.8 | 4.2 | 8.4 | 16.6 |

Rocky Ridge Rd at Dolly Ridge Rd 03/04/2019 2019 School PM LT Improved

| 4 |  |  |  |  |  | - | $\uparrow$ | 7 | * | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| LOS | B |  |  | D | A | A | C | A | A | B |  |
| Approach Delay | 16.0 |  |  | 23.0 |  |  | 15.4 |  |  | 14.1 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Stops (vph) | 43 |  |  | 203 | 34 | 8 | 248 | 20 | 98 | 329 |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 1 |  |  | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 38 |  |  | 297 | 83 | 6 | 229 | 33 | 99 | 332 |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 7 |  |  | 58 | 16 | 1 | 44 | 6 | 19 | 65 |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 9 |  |  | 69 | 19 | 1 | 53 | 8 | 23 | 77 |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 |  |  | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 18 |  |  | 85 | 0 | 2 | 101 | 0 | 42 | 137 |  |
| Queue Length 95th ( t ) | 42 |  |  | \#205 | 45 | 7 | 168 | 30 | 61 | \#293 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 201 |  |  | 322 |  |  | 152 |  |  | 191 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  | 200 | 75 |  | 200 |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 411 |  |  | 393 | 630 | 468 | 726 | 712 | 631 | 1002 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.22 |  |  | 0.73 | 0.42 | 0.03 | 0.49 | 0.22 | 0.47 | 0.69 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other <br> Cycle Length: 60  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 54.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.79 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 16.8 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 65.6\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two | ycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Dolly Ridge Rd


|  | $\rangle$ |  | $\geqslant$ | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $>$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | $\hat{F}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 26 | 27 | 15 | 221 | 30 | 231 | 14 | 314 | 137 | 229 | 500 | 35 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 26 | 27 | 15 | 221 | 30 | 231 | 14 | 314 | 137 | 229 | 500 | 35 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 75 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.970 |  |  | 0.935 |  |  | 0.954 |  |  | 0.990 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.981 |  |  | 0.978 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1773 | 0 | 0 | 1703 | 0 | 1770 | 1777 | 0 | 1770 | 1844 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.790 |  |  | 0.823 |  | 0.231 |  |  | 0.171 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1427 | 0 | 0 | 1433 | 0 | 430 | 1777 | 0 | 319 | 1844 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 18 |  |  | 58 |  |  | 27 |  |  | 5 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 281 |  |  | 402 |  |  | 232 |  |  | 271 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  | 5.3 |  |  | 6.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 34 | 36 | 20 | 251 | 34 | 263 | 16 | 357 | 156 | 297 | 649 | 45 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 548 | 0 | 16 | 513 | 0 | 297 | 694 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 15.0 |  | 7.0 | 15.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 20.0 |  | 12.0 | 20.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 37.0 | 37.0 |  | 37.0 | 37.0 |  | 12.0 | 36.0 |  | 17.0 | 41.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 41.1\% | 41.1\% |  | 41.1\% | 41.1\% |  | 13.3\% | 40.0\% |  | 18.9\% | 45.6\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 8.0 | 31.0 |  | 13.0 | 36.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 2.7 | 2.7 |  | 3.0 | 3.2 |  | 3.0 | 3.2 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | Min |  | None | Min |  |
| Act Efft Green (s) |  | 32.3 |  |  | 32.3 |  | 35.4 | 27.3 |  | 44.9 | 41.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.38 |  |  | 0.38 |  | 0.42 | 0.32 |  | 0.53 | 0.49 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.16 |  |  | 0.95 |  | 0.06 | 0.88 |  | 0.78 | 0.77 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 16.6 |  |  | 52.3 |  | 10.5 | 43.5 |  | 29.6 | 25.9 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 16.6 |  |  | 52.3 |  | 10.5 | 43.5 |  | 29.6 | 25.9 |  |
| LOS |  | B |  |  | D |  | B | D |  | C | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 16.6 |  |  | 52.3 |  |  | 42.5 |  |  | 27.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |


| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | / |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Stops (vph) | 36 |  |  | 361 |  | 9 | 375 |  | 123 | 383 |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) | 1 |  |  | 9 |  | 0 | 7 |  | 3 | 6 |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) | 37 |  |  | 646 |  | 7 | 481 |  | 178 | 424 |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) | 7 |  |  | 126 |  | 1 | 94 |  | 35 | 82 |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) | 9 |  |  | 150 |  | 2 | 111 |  | 41 | 98 |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) | 0 |  |  | 24 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Queue Length 50th ( t ) | 27 |  |  | 277 |  | 4 | 250 |  | 87 | 276 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 49 |  |  | \#478 |  | 13 | \#401 |  | 128 | 405 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 201 |  |  | 322 |  |  | 152 |  |  | 191 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 567 |  |  | 594 |  | 310 | 668 |  | 391 | 918 |  |
| 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 | 0.16 |  |  | 0.92 |  | 0.05 | 0.77 |  | 0.76 | 0.76 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 85.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 36.8 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 83.0\% ICU Level of Service EAnalysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Rocky Ridge Rd \& Dolly Ridge Rd


## Appendix C - Level of Service Description

## Levels of Service Signalized Intersections

Level of service criteria for signalized intersections is defined in terms of delay. Delay is a measure of driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption, and lost travel time. Specifically, level-of-service criteria are stated in terms of the average stopped delay per vehicle for a 15 -minute analysis period.

Level of service A describes operations with very low delay, less than 10 seconds per vehicle. This occurs when progression is extremely favorable, and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay.

Level of service B describes operations with delay in the range of > 10 to 20 seconds per vehicle. This generally occurs with good progression and/or short cycle lengths. More vehicles stop than for LOS A, causing higher levels of average delay.

Level of service C describes operations with delay in the range of > 20 to 35 seconds per vehicle. These higher delays may result from fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear in this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at this level, although many still pass through the intersection without stopping.

Level of service $D$ describes operations with delay in the range of $>35$ to 55 seconds per vehicle. At level D , the influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high vehicle/capacity ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable.

Level of service E describes operations with delay in the range of $>55$ to 80 seconds per vehicle. This is considered to be the limit of acceptable delay. These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high vehicle/capacity ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences.

Level of service $F$ describes operations with delay in excess of 80 seconds per vehicle. This is considered to be unacceptable to most drivers. This condition often occurs with over saturation, i.e., when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also be major contributing causes to such delay levels.

## Levels of Service Unsignalized Intersections

Level of service criteria for unsignalized intersections is stated in terms of average control delay. Control delay is defined as the total elapsed time from a vehicle joining the queue until its departure from the stopped position at the head of the queue. The criteria for each level of service are cited in the table below.

| Level of <br> Service | Average Control Delay <br> (seconds/vehicle) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $0-10$ |
| B | $>10-15$ |
| C | $>15-25$ |
| D | $>25-35$ |
| E | $>50$ |
| F |  |

## Levels of Service Daily Volume

The criteria for daily level of service are derived from ALDOT defined roadway capacities for urban 2-lane and 3-lane arterials and are cited in the table below.

| Level of <br> Service | Daily Service Volume |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2-lane | 3-lane |
| A | 6,500 | 8,200 |
| B | 9,400 | 11,600 |
| C | 11,600 | 14,400 |
| D | 14,000 | 17,500 |
| E | 18,700 | 23,300 |
| F | $>18,700$ | $>23,300$ |

Appendix D - Trip Generation Methodology

## Trip Generation Methodology

The following information outlines the steps taken to perform trip generation analysis for the intersections of Dolly Ridge Road at Gresham:

- Collected count data at Dolly Ridge Road and Gresham Drive intersection on February 6, 2019. Received counts performed by Jefferson County at Rocky Ridge Road and Dolly Ridge Road intersection on January 15, 2019.
- Compiled ingress and egress traffic volumes from the 2013-2014 school year at Cahaba Heights Elementary.
- Compiled data from the Vestavia Hills City Schools website including the following:
- Cahaba Heights Elementary School enrollment from 2014-2018
- Dolly Ridge Elementary School estimated enrollment for 2019-2020
- Calculated average annual growth for Cahaba Heights Elementary School from 2014 through the estimated enrollment for 2019-2020 school year. Used the average annual growth rate for Cahaba Heights Elementary School to backcalculate an estimated enrollment for the 2013-2014 school year.
- Calculated a trip per student rate at Cahaba Heights Elementary for ingress and egress. Applied the trip per student rate from Cahaba Heights Elementary to the new Dolly Ridge Elementary School estimated enrollment for 2019-2020.
- Used the ITE Trip Generation Manual Land Use Code 210 to estimate the trips generated by the residential homes behind the new Dolly Ridge Elementary School.
- Cleared the Gresham Drive leg of all traffic volume and replaced it with volumes from the trip generation for Dolly Ridge Elementary and the residential homes.
- The following distributions were developed for school-related traffic at the intersection of Dolly Ridge Road and Gresham Drive:
- AM Ingress (Gresham Drive northbound): $92 \%$ left turn from Dolly Ridge Road eastbound, $8 \%$ right turn from Dolly Ridge Road westbound (based on shortest path for population distribution zoned for Dolly Ridge Elementary)
- AM Egress (Gresham Drive southbound): $67 \%$ right turn onto Dolly Ridge Road westbound, 33\% left turn onto Dolly Ridge Road eastbound (estimate based on the assumption that a certain percentage will tripchain and commute downtown via the 280 corridor)
- PM Ingress (Gresham Drive northbound): Inverse of the AM Egress.
- PM Egress (Gresham Drive southbound): 80\% right turn onto Dolly Ridge Road westbound, $20 \%$ left turn onto Dolly Ridge Road eastbound (based on the inverse of the AM Ingress with added cushion for trip-chaining to after school activities)
- Distributions for the residential trips generated can be found in Appendix D.
- Applied all generated trips to the appropriate distributions to calculate estimated turning movement volumes once the new Dolly Ridge Elementary opens for the 2019-2020 school year.

The following information outlines the steps taken to perform trip generation analysis for the intersection of Rocky Ridge Road at Dolly Ridge Road:

- Performed a shortest path analysis on the population zoned for Dolly Ridge Elementary to estimate the percentage of traffic arriving at the intersection from each direction. Applied estimated percentages to calculate an estimated amount of trips coming from each direction at the intersection.
- Removed the equivalent volume from the intersection based on the existing left turn volume from Dolly Ridge Road to Gresham Drive and the existing right turn volume from Gresham Drive to Dolly Ridge Road. Volumes were removed based on the distribution of existing traffic at the intersection from each direction.
- Added estimated amount of trips to each approach based on the current turning movement volume distributions for AM and PM ingress and egress.

| Vestavia Hills, AL <br> SA\# 18-0337 | Student Trip Rate Ingress Egress |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {PM }}^{\text {PM }}$ | (10.0.4 | 0.75 per studentemonoled 0.50 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Fectional Distril |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Residential | ${ }_{\text {PM }}^{\text {AM }}$ | 25\% 63\% |  | per welinn |  |
| Geneation Estimate |  |  | peakh hours |  |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { TrEuc } \\ \text { Code }}}{\text { cese }}$ |
|  |  |  | Swuens | In | out |  |
| Dolly Risge Elenenay - Am dopooff | 355 sudents |  | 735 | ${ }^{688}$ | ${ }^{550}$ | None |
|  |  |  | 735 | 302 | 368 | None |
|  | 15 homes |  | Weekray | 10 | out |  |
|  |  |  | -15 | 10 | ${ }^{11}$ | ${ }^{210}$ |
|  |  |  |  | 10 |  | 210 |

## Peak Hourn metercept Tip Ratace

## Daly Prigge Elemematar

Adjusted Am Peak Hour Tips
Dolvy Ridege Elementary
Residonial

Adjusted PM Peak Hour Trips
Dolly fige Eelenentay
Residential

| Year | Total Vestavia hills School District | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Cahaba Heights } \\ \text { Elem. } \\ \text { Enrollment } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Growth | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { Growth } \end{aligned}$ | Data Type Measured | Source: Annual Report | Cahaba Heights Elementary Volume Data (2013-14 School Year) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2013-14 | 6701 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ingress | Egress |
| 2014.15 | 6760 | 379 |  |  | Measured | Source: Anual Report | AM | 334 | 267 |
| $2015-16$ | 7014 | 401 | 22 | 5.80\% | Measured | Source: Annual Report | PM | 147 | 179 |
| 201617 | 7083 | 421 | 20 | 4.99\% | Measured | Source: Annual Report |  |  |  |
| $2017-18$ | 7192 | 466 | 45 | 10.69\% | Measured | Source: Anual Report |  | er Student |  |
| $2018-19$ |  | 469 | 3 | 0.64\% | Projected | Source: VH Schools Website |  | Ingress | Egress |
| $2019-20$ |  | 491 | 22 | 4.69\% | Projected | Source: VH Schools Website | AM | 0.94 | 0.75 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM | 0.41 | 0.50 |
| Annual Avg. Growth | 1.8\% |  |  | 5.9\% | Calculated | Used 5.9\% to back-calculate CHE 2013-14 En | ollment |  |  |
| 2014-15 to 201 | -18 average annual gro | owh at CH Elem. |  | 7.7\% | Calculated |  |  |  |  |



Avg. Annual Growth
1.6\%
$\begin{aligned} & \text { Vestavia Hills, AL } \\ & \text { SA\# 18-0337 } \\ & \text { AM Existing }\end{aligned}$
Dolly Ridge Rd

Vestavia Hills, AL
SA\# 18-0337
School PM Existing


Vestavia Hills, AL
SA\# 18-0337
AM Existing


Vestavia Hills, AL
SA\# 18-0337
School PM Existing



Vestavia Hills, AL
SA\# 18-0337
School PM - Remove Existing Gresham Trips

0 Gresham Ex LT in
40 Gresham Ex RT out

Vestavia Hills, AL
SA\# 18-0337
School PM - New Trips

202 LT into Gresham Trip Gen
294 RT out of Gresham Trip Gen


Vestavia Hills, AL
SA\# 18-0337
School PM - Estimated Future Volumes



| In | 688 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Out | 550 |



| New | In | 688 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| New | Out | 550 |
|  |  | 3 |
| Res | In | 11 |
| Res | Out |  |
|  |  |  |
| Total | In | 691 |
| Total | Out | 561 |

Vestavia Hills, AL
SA\# 18-0337
School PM New Trips
$\begin{aligned} & \text { Check } \\ & \begin{array}{l}\text { In } \\ \text { Out }\end{array} \text { 302 } \\ & \text { Dolly Ridge Rd }\end{aligned}$

| In | 302 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Out | 368 |



| New In | 302 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| New | Out | 368 |
|  |  |  |
| Res $\ln$ | 10 |  |
| Res | Out | 5 |
|  |  |  |
| Total | In | 312 |
| Total | Out | 373 |




Vestavia Hills, AL
SA\# 18-0337
School PM New Dist In
Check
In $100 \%$
Out

Vestavia Hills, AL
SA\# 18-0337
School PM Res Dist In

| Check |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| In |  |
| Out |  |

## Appendix E - Base Signal Timings

Intersection: Rocky Ridge Road at Dolly Ridge Road

Controller: EPAC 300
Fault(s): Clock is not correct.

|  | Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |
| Min green | 7 | 15 |  | 7 | 7 | 15 |  | 7 |  |
| Passage | 2.7 | 3.2 |  | 2.7 | 2.7 | 3.2 |  | 2.7 |  |
| Max Green | 8 | 69 |  | 41 | 13 | 64 |  | 41 |  |
| Yellow | 3 | 4 |  | 3 | 3 | 4 |  | 3 |  |
| Red | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| Min Recall |  | Min |  |  |  | Min |  |  |  |
| Number Lock |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dual Entry |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |  |


| Density Timings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phase | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| AINI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX INI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIM BEF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIM TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MGAP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Split: 0 / 0 / 1




Split:
I $/ \quad$ Cycle Length:

Green: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Split:




Notes: Jefferson County-owned signal. Reset clock. Detection is active.
Both left turn phase should be protected-permissive.
Use a Flashing Yellow Arrow configuration for both left turn conditions.

Controller: EPAC 300

Fault(s): Clock is not correct.

|  | Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |
| Min green | 6 | 12 |  | 10 |  | 12 |  |  |  |
| Passage | 3 | 3.2 |  | 5 |  | 3.2 |  |  |  |
| Max Green | 48 | 24.5 |  | 34 |  | 47.5 |  |  |  |
| Yellow | 3 | 3.5 |  | 3 |  | 3.5 |  |  |  |
| Red | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Min Recall |  | Min |  |  |  | Min |  |  |  |
| Number Lock | Y |  |  | Y |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dual Entry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Density Timings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phase | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |
| AINI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX INI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIM BEF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIM TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MGAP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |






Split: / / Cycle Length:

Green: 




Notes: Jefferson County-owned signal. Reset clock. Detection is active. Dolly Ridge Road eastbound left turn phase should be protected-permissive.

## Appendix F - Signal Warrant Analysis Reports

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

| City/Town: | Vestavia Hills |
| ---: | :---: |
| County: | Jefferson |
| Division: | RPCGB |
| Data Date: | $2 / 6 / 2019$ |
| Major Route: | Blue Lake Drive |
| Minor Route: | Sicard Hollow Road |

Analysis Performed By: DC

Date Analysis Performed:
Project Number if Applicable: Weather Conditions:

| DC |
| :---: |
| $2 / 26 / 2019$ |
| 180337 |
| Showers |

Appr. Lanes: $\frac{1}{1} \quad$ Critical Approach Speed (mph): 35 Appr. Lanes: 1

## Volume Level Criteria

1. Is the critical speed of major street traffic $>70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}(40 \mathrm{mph})$ ?
2. Is the intersection in a built-up area or isolated community of $<10,000$ population?

| $\square$ Yes | $\boxed{X}$ No |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ Yes | $\boxed{X}$ No |
| $\square 70 \%$ | $\boxed{X} 100 \%$ |
| $\square$ |  |

## WARRANT 1 - EIGHT-HOUR VEHICULAR VOLUME

Warrant 1 is satisfied if Condition A or Condition B is "100\%" satisfied.
Satisfied: $\quad \square$ Yes $\quad \mathbf{X}$ No
Warrant is also satisfied if both Condition A and Condition B are " $80 \%$ " satisfied, given
adequate trials of other remedial measures have been tried.
Adequate trial(s) of other remedial measures tried:
List Remedial Measures Tried (Required for $80 \%$ Combination of A \& B)
$\square$
Condition A - Minimum Vehicular Volume \& Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic 100\% Satisfied: $\quad \square$ Yes $\quad \bar{X}$ No (Used if neither Condition A or B is satisfied) $\mathbf{8 0 \%}$ Satisfied: $\quad \square$ Yes $\quad \mathrm{X}$ No

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { (volumes in veh/hr) } \\ \hline \text { Approach Lanes } \\ \text { Volume Level } \end{gathered}$ | Minimum Requirements |  |  |  | Eight Highest Hours |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{5}{5}^{5}$ | $\theta^{s}$ | $e^{s}$ | $3_{3}^{x^{2}}$ | ${ }_{8}^{5}$ | $6^{\text {o }}$ | $n^{2}$ | $\imath^{2}$ |
|  |  | 1 |  | 2 or more |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 100\% | 70\% | 100\% | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} \mathbb{1} & \circ \\ 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 \end{array}\right.$ | Both Approaches on Major Street | 500 | 350 | 600 | 420 | 991 | 1,195 | 1,137 | 753 | 634 | 715 | 639 | 603 |
|  | Highest Approach on Minor Street | 150 | 105 | 200 | 140 | 423 | 162 | 181 | 236 | 351 | 150 | 115 | 125 |
|  | (volumes in veh/hr) | Minimum Requirements |  |  |  | $\wedge^{\text {p }}$ | $9^{5}$ | $0^{0}$ | $n^{5}$ | $\imath^{s}$ | $3_{3}^{8}$ | $\theta^{8}$ | ¢ |
|  | Approach Lanes | 1 |  | 2 or more |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Volume Level | 100\% | 70\% | 100\% | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} n & \text { o } \\ 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 \end{array}\right.$ | Both Approaches on Major Street | 750 | 525 | 900 | 630 | 991 | 1,195 | 1,137 | 753 | 634 | 715 | 639 | 603 |
|  | Highest Approach on Minor Street | 75 | 53 | 100 | 70 | 423 | 162 | 181 | 236 | 351 | 150 | 115 | 125 |
|  | (volumes in veh/hr) | Minimum Requirements |  |  |  | $\hat{1}^{5}$ | $9^{5}$ | $0^{5}$ | $n^{5}$ | $\imath^{s}$ | $3^{8}$ | $x^{*}$ | ¢ |
|  | Approach Lanes | 1 |  | 2 or more |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Volume Level | 100\% | 70\% | 100\% | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} \mathbb{1} & \circ \\ 1 & 0 \\ \text { B } \end{array}\right.$ | Both Approaches on Major Street | 400 | 280 | 480 | 336 | 991 | 1,195 | 1,137 | 753 | 634 | 715 | 639 | 603 |
|  | Highest Approach on Minor Street | 120 | 84 | 160 | 112 | 423 | 162 | 181 | 236 | 351 | 150 | 115 | 125 |
|  | (volumes in veh/hr) | Minimum Requirements |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{p}$ | $9^{5}$ | $0^{0}$ | $n^{5}$ | $\imath^{s}$ | $3_{3}^{8}$ | $x^{x}$ | $\varsigma^{s}$ |
|  | Approach Lanes | 1 |  | 2 or more |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Volume Level | 100\% | 70\% | 100\% | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lll} \frac{\infty}{N} & 0 \\ 1 \\ \vdots & 0 \end{array}\right.$ | Both Approaches on Major Street | 600 | 420 | 720 | 504 | 991 | 1,195 | 1,137 | 753 | 634 | 715 | 639 | 603 |
|  | Highest Approach on Minor Street | 60 | 42 | 80 | 56 | 423 | 162 | 181 | 236 | 351 | 150 | 115 | 125 |

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

WARRANT 2 - FOUR-HOUR VEHICULAR VOLUME Satisfied: $\quad \mathrm{X}$ Yes $\square$ No
If all four points lie above the appropriate line, then this warrant is satisfied.

| (Volumes in veh/hr) | Four Highest Hours |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | S | $$ | ¢ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| SUM of Both Approaches on Major Street | 991 | 1,195 | 1,137 | 753 |
| Highest Minor Street Approach | 423 | 162 | 181 | 236 |

FIGURE W-2: Criteria for "100\%" Volume Level


* Note: 115 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor route approach with two or more lanes and 80 vph applies as the lower threshold volume threshold for a minor route approach with one lane.

FIGURE W-2: Criteria for "70\%" Volume Level
(Community less-than 10,000 population or speeds greater-than $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ [ 40 mph ] on Major Street)


* Note: 80 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor route approach with two or more lanes and

60 vph applies as the lower threshold volume threshold for a minor route approach with one lane.

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

## WARRANT 3 - PEAK HOUR VEHICULAR VOLUME

This signal warrant sahll be applied only in unsual cases, such as office complexes, manufacturing plants, industrial complexes, or high-ocupancy vehicle

Applicable: $\square$ Yes $\quad \mathbf{X}$ No
Satisfied: Yes X No facilities that attract or discharge large numbers of vehicles over a short time period.

Signalization shall be considered if a point lies above the appropriate line or the Delay criteria is met.

## Unusual case(s) justifying this Warrant:



| Peak Hour Data |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak <br> Hour | Major <br> Route | Minor <br> Route |
|  |  |  |

## FIGURE W-3: Criteria for " $100 \%$ " Volume Level



* Note: 150 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor route approach with two or more lanes and

100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume threshold for a minor route approach with one lane.
FIGURE W-3: Criteria for " $70 \%$ " Volume Level
(Community less-than 10,000 population or speeds greater-than $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ [ 40 mph ] on Major Street)


* Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor route approach with two or more lanes and

75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume threshold for a minor route approach with one lane.

| $\frac{\pi}{\frac{\pi}{4}}$ | 1. Delay on Minor Approach (vehiclehours) |  |  |  | 2. Volume on Minor Approach (veh/hr) |  |  |  | 3. Total Entering Volume (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Number of Approaches |
|  |  |  |  |  | No. of Approaches |  | 4 or more |  |
|  | Approaches Lanes: |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | Approaches |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  | Delay Criteria: |  | 4.0 | 5.0 | Volume Cri |  | 100 | 150 | Volume Criteria |  | 650 | 800 |
|  | Delay: |  |  |  | Volume : |  |  |  | Volume : |  |  |  |
|  | Fullfilled? | Yes | X | NO | Fullfilled? | Yes | X | NO | Fulffilled? | Yes | X | NO |

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

WARRANT 4 - PEDESTRIAN VOLUME
Satisfied:


| Pedestrian Signal Location Criteria |  | $$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The nearest traffic control device (signal or STOP sign) controlling traffic on the major route is more than 90 m ( 300 ft ) away: <br> If no above, will this proposed signal restrict the progrssive movement of traffic? | $\square$ Yes <br> X No <br> $X$ Yes $\square$ No |  | X |


| Vehicle volumes in veh/hr and Pedestrian | Four Greatest Hours |  |  |  | Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| volumnes in ped/hr |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUM of Both Approaches on Major Route |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians crossing the Major Route |  |  |  |  |  |

FIGURE W-4a: Criteria for 100\% Volume Level, Four-Hour Volumes


MAJOR ROUTE, TOTAL OF BOTH APPROACHES - VEHICLES PER HOUR (VPH)

* Note: 107 pph applies as the lower threshold volume for the 100\% Volume Level.

75 pph applies as the lower threshold volume for the $70 \%$ Volume Level.
FIGURE W-4b: Criteria for 100\% Volume Level, Peak Hour Volume


* Note: 133 pph applies as the lower threshold volume for the 100\% Volume Level.

93 pph applies as the lower threshold volume for the 70\% Volume Level.

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

## WARRANT 5 - SCHOOL CROSSING

Satisfied: $\square$
This warrant is intended for application where the fact that schoolchildren crossing the major route is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal. For the purposes of this warrant, the word "schoolchildren" includes elementary through high school students. This warrant is satisfied if all three of the criteria below are fulfilled after remedial measures have been considered.

Any remedial measures implemented in or around the intersection to improve the safety of the students as noted in Section 4C. 06 Warrant 5, School Crossing in the MUTCD:


## WARRANT 6 - COORDINATED SIGNAL SYSTEM

Satisfied: $\square$ Yes

Progressive movement in a coordinated signal system sometimes necessitates the installtion of traffic control signals at intersections that would not otherwise be considered in order to maintain proper paltooning of vehicles. This warrant is satisfied if the below criteria is satified as follows: criteria 1 is satisfied and either criteria 2 or 3 is satisfied.

| Criteria | Fulfilled? |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes | No |
| 1. The inclusion of this proposed signal, into the coordinated system, does not result in a signal spacing of less than $305 \mathrm{~m}(1,000 \mathrm{ft})$ ? |  | X |
| a. On a one-way street or a street that has traffic predominantly in one direction, are the adjacent traffic control signals so far apart that they do not provide the necessary degree of vehiclular platooning? |  | X |
| 2. b. On a two-way street, do adjacent traffic control signals not provide the necessary degree of platooning and will the proposed and adjacent traffic control signals collectively provide a progressive operation? |  | X |

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

## WARRANT 7 - CRASH EXPERIENCE

Satisfied: $\square$
This warrant is intended for application where the severity and frequency of crashes are the principal reasons to consider the installation of a traffic control signal. The need for a traffic control signal shall be considered if an engineering study finds that criteria 1, 2, and 3 are met.

| Criteria |  | Fulfilled? <br> Yes |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No |  |  |$|$

## WARRANT 8 - ROADWAY NETWORK

Satisfied:
 No

This warrant is used to encourage the concentration and organization of traffic flow on a roadway network. This warrant is satisfied if one of the following 2 criteria is met and both routes meet at least on of the characteristics of a Major Route below.


* Supporting data required for verification of the projected 5 year traffic Warrants.

| A major route, as used in this signal warrant, shall have at least one of the following characteristics: |  | Met? |  | Fulfilled? |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Characteristics of Major Routes |  | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| 1. Is it a part of the street or highway system that serves as the principal roadway network for through traffic flow? | Major Route |  | X |  | X |
|  | * Minor Route |  | X |  |  |
| 2. Does it include rural or suburban highways outside, entering, or traversing a city? | Major Route |  | X |  |  |
|  | * Minor Route |  | X |  |  |
| 3. Does it appear as a major route on an official plan, such as a major street plan in an urban area traffic and transportation study? | Major Route |  | X |  |  |
|  | * Minor Route |  | X |  |  |

* This is a minor route, but for the purposes of this Warrant, shall be considered as the other major route.

Note: Supporting data shall be required to verify the routes meet one of the characteristics of a major route.

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

## WARRANT 9 - INTERSECTION NEAR A GRADE CROSSING

## Applicable

$\square$ Yes
The need for a traffic control signal may be considered if an intersection that is controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign has a rail crossing within 140 feet of the stop/yield line and the highest Equivalent Minor Approach Traffic value lies above the curve represented on the graph below.

| Minor Route Adjustment Factors - Enter the following: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | The number of occurrances of rail traffic/day: |  |
| 2.The percentage of "High-Occupancy Buses" crossing the track/day: <br> (A high-occupancy bus is defined as a bus occupied by at least 20 people) |  |  |
| 3.The percentage of Tractor-trailer Trucks crossing the track/day: |  |  |

Satisfied: $\square$ Yes $\square$ No


Enter the distance value "D" from the STOP/YIELD bar to the track as shown below: $\square$

(Two or More Approach Lanes at the Track Crossing)

FIGURE W-9: Intersection Near a Grade Crossing (One Approach Lane at the Track Crossing)


* VPH after applying the adjustment factors for Rail, Bus, and Tractor-Trailer traffic

25 vph applies as the lower threshold volume


## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

| City/Town: | Vestavia Hills |
| ---: | :---: |
| County: | Jefferson County |
| Division: | RPCGB |
| Data Date: | $2 / 6 / 2019$ |
| Major Route: | Pro |
| Minor Route: | Columbiana Rd |

Analysis Performed By:

| $D C$ |
| :---: |
| $3 / 8 / 2019$ |
| 180337 |
| Showers |

Appr. Lanes: $\frac{2}{1} \quad$ Critical Approach Speed (mph): $\quad 45 \quad 1$
Appr. Lanes: 10

## Volume Level Criteria

1. Is the critical speed of major street traffic $>70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}(40 \mathrm{mph})$ ?
2. Is the intersection in a built-up area or isolated community of $<10,000$ population?

If Question 1 or 2 above is answered "Yes", then use " $70 \%$ " volume level

| $\mathbf{X}$ <br> Yes | $\square$ No |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ Yes | $\square$ No |
| $\square \mathbf{X} 70 \%$ | $\square 100 \%$ |

## WARRANT 1 - EIGHT-HOUR VEHICULAR VOLUME

Warrant 1 is satisfied if Condition A or Condition B is "100\%" satisfied.
Satisfied:


Warrant is also satisfied if both Condition A and Condition B are " $80 \%$ " satisfied, given adequate trials of other remedial measures have been tried.

Adequate trial(s) of other remedial measures tried:
List Remedial Measures Tried (Required for $80 \%$ Combination of A \& B)
$\square$
Condition A - Minimum Vehicular Volume \& Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic 100\% Satisfied: $\quad$ XYes $\square$ No (Used if neither Condition A or B is satisfied) $\mathbf{8 0 \%}$ Satisfied: $\quad \square$ Yes $\quad \square$ No

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { (volumes in veh } / \mathrm{hr} \text { ) } \\ \hline \text { Approach Lanes } \\ \hline \text { Volume Level } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Minimum Requirements |  |  |  | Eight Highest Hours |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $s^{s}$ | $\wedge^{5}$ | $\alpha^{s}$ | ${ }_{8}^{5}$ | $3_{3}^{8}$ | ${ }^{5}$ | $6^{5}$ | $\sim^{\text {o }}$ |
|  |  | 1 |  | 2 or more |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 100\% | 70\% | 100\% | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{array}\right.$ | Both Approaches on Major Street | 500 | 350 | 600 | 420 | 1,806 | 1,863 | 1,557 | 1,508 | 1,157 | 1,183 | 1,074 | 995 |
|  | Highest Approach on Minor Street | 150 | 105 | 200 | 140 | 405 | 128 | 422 | 123 | 289 | 125 | 223 | 200 |
|  | (volumes in veh/hr) | Minimum Requirements |  |  |  | $\bigotimes^{s}$ | $\hat{v}^{5}$ | $a^{s}$ | $8_{8}^{5}$ | $3^{s}$ | $0^{5}$ | $6^{8}$ | $\sim^{\text {o }}$ |
|  | Approach Lanes | 1 |  | 2 or more |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Volume Level | 100\% | 70\% | 100\% | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} n & \text { o } \\ 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 \end{array}\right.$ | Both Approaches on Major Street | 750 | 525 | 900 | 630 | 1,806 | 1,863 | 1,557 | 1,508 | 1,157 | 1,183 | 1,074 | 995 |
|  | Highest Approach on Minor Street | 75 | 53 | 100 | 70 | 405 | 128 | 422 | 123 | 289 | 125 | 223 | 200 |
|  | (volumes in veh/hr) | Minimum Requirements |  |  |  | $Q^{s}$ | $1^{5}$ | $a^{s}$ | $8_{8}^{5}$ | $3_{3}^{8}$ | $9$ | $6^{8}$ | $\imath^{\text {o }}$ |
|  | Approach Lanes | 1 |  | 2 or more |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Volume Level | 100\% | 70\% | 100\% | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} \mathbb{1} & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ \mathfrak{1} & \infty \end{array}\right.$ | Both Approaches on Major Street | 400 | 280 | 480 | 336 | 1,806 | 1,863 | 1,557 | 1,508 | 1,157 | 1,183 | 1,074 | 995 |
|  | Highest Approach on Minor Street | 120 | 84 | 160 | 112 | 405 | 128 | 422 | 123 | 289 | 125 | 223 | 200 |
|  | (volumes in veh/hr) | Minimum Requirements |  |  |  | $s^{s}$ | $\hat{v}^{5}$ | $a^{s}$ | $8_{8}^{5}$ | $3_{3}^{8}$ | $9^{5}$ | $6^{8}$ | $\sim^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | Approach Lanes | 1 |  | 2 or more |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Volume Level | 100\% | 70\% | 100\% | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{s}^{\alpha}$ | Both Approaches on Major Street | 600 | 420 | 720 | 504 | 1,806 | 1,863 | 1,557 | 1,508 | 1,157 | 1,183 | 1,074 | 995 |
|  | Highest Approach on Minor Street | 60 | 42 | 80 | 56 | 405 | 128 | 422 | 123 | 289 | 125 | 223 | 200 |

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS



* Note: 115 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor route approach with two or more lanes and 80 vph applies as the lower threshold volume threshold for a minor route approach with one lane.

FIGURE W-2: Criteria for "70\%" Volume Level
(Community less-than 10,000 population or speeds greater-than $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ [ 40 mph ] on Major Street)


* Note: 80 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor route approach with two or more lanes and

60 vph applies as the lower threshold volume threshold for a minor route approach with one lane.

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

## WARRANT 3 - PEAK HOUR VEHICULAR VOLUME

This signal warrant sahll be applied only in unsual cases, such as office complexes, manufacturing plants, industrial complexes, or high-ocupancy vehicle

Applicable: $\square$ Yes $\quad \mathbf{X}$ No
Satisfied: Yes X No facilities that attract or discharge large numbers of vehicles over a short time period.

Signalization shall be considered if a point lies above the appropriate line or the Delay criteria is met.

## Unusual case(s) justifying this Warrant:



| Peak Hour Data |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak <br> Hour | Major <br> Route | Minor <br> Route |
|  |  |  |

## FIGURE W-3: Criteria for " $100 \%$ " Volume Level



* Note: 150 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor route approach with two or more lanes and

100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume threshold for a minor route approach with one lane.
FIGURE W-3: Criteria for " $70 \%$ " Volume Level
(Community less-than 10,000 population or speeds greater-than $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ [ 40 mph ] on Major Street)


* Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor route approach with two or more lanes and

75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume threshold for a minor route approach with one lane.

| $\frac{\pi}{\frac{\pi}{4}}$ | 1. Delay on Minor Approach (vehiclehours) |  |  |  | 2. Volume on Minor Approach (veh/hr) |  |  |  | 3. Total Entering Volume (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Number of Approaches |
|  |  |  |  |  | No. of Approaches |  | 4 or more |  |
|  | Approaches Lanes: |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | Approaches |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  | Delay Criteria: |  | 4.0 | 5.0 | Volume Cri |  | 100 | 150 | Volume Criteria |  | 650 | 800 |
|  | Delay: |  |  |  | Volume : |  |  |  | Volume : |  |  |  |
|  | Fullfilled? | Yes | X | NO | Fullfilled? | Yes | X | NO | Fullfilled? | Yes | X | NO |

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

WARRANT 4 - PEDESTRIAN VOLUME
Satisfied:


| Pedestrian Signal Location Criteria |  | Fulfilled? |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The nearest traffic control device (signal or STOP sign) controlling traffic on the major route is more than $90 \mathrm{~m}(300 \mathrm{ft})$ away: <br> If no above, will this proposed signal restrict the progrssive movement of traffic? | $\square$ Yes $\boxed{X}$ No <br> $X$ Yes $\square$ No |  | X |


| Vehicle volumes in veh/hr and Pedestrian | Four Greatest Hours |  |  |  | Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| volumnes in ped/hr |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUM of Both Approaches on Major Route |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians crossing the Major Route |  |  |  |  |  |

FIGURE W-4a: Criteria for 70\% Volume Level, Four-Hour Volumes


* Note: 107 pph applies as the lower threshold volume for the $100 \%$ Volume Level.

75 pph applies as the lower threshold volume for the $70 \%$ Volume Level.
FIGURE W-4b: Criteria for 70\% Volume Level, Peak Hour Volume


* Note: 133 pph applies as the lower threshold volume for the 100\% Volume Level.

93 pph applies as the lower threshold volume for the $70 \%$ Volume Level.

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

## WARRANT 5 - SCHOOL CROSSING

Satisfied: $\square$
This warrant is intended for application where the fact that schoolchildren crossing the major route is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal. For the purposes of this warrant, the word "schoolchildren" includes elementary through high school students. This warrant is satisfied if all three of the criteria below are fulfilled after remedial measures have been considered.

Any remedial measures implemented in or around the intersection to improve the safety of the students as noted in Section 4C. 06 Warrant 5, School Crossing in the MUTCD:


## WARRANT 6 - COORDINATED SIGNAL SYSTEM

Satisfied: $\square$ Yes

Progressive movement in a coordinated signal system sometimes necessitates the installtion of traffic control signals at intersections that would not otherwise be considered in order to maintain proper paltooning of vehicles. This warrant is satisfied if the below criteria is satified as follows: criteria 1 is satisfied and either criteria 2 or 3 is satisfied.

| Criteria | Fulfilled? |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes | No |
| 1. The inclusion of this proposed signal, into the coordinated system, does not result in a signal spacing of less than $305 \mathrm{~m}(1,000 \mathrm{ft})$ ? |  | X |
| a. On a one-way street or a street that has traffic predominantly in one direction, are the adjacent traffic control signals so far apart that they do not provide the necessary degree of vehiclular platooning? |  | X |
| 2. b. On a two-way street, do adjacent traffic control signals not provide the necessary degree of platooning and will the proposed and adjacent traffic control signals collectively provide a progressive operation? |  | X |

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

## WARRANT 7 - CRASH EXPERIENCE

Satisfied: $\square$
This warrant is intended for application where the severity and frequency of crashes are the principal reasons to consider the installation of a traffic control signal. The need for a traffic control signal shall be considered if an engineering study finds that criteria 1, 2, and 3 are met.


## WARRANT 8 - ROADWAY NETWORK

Satisfied:
 No

This warrant is used to encourage the concentration and organization of traffic flow on a roadway network. This warrant is satisfied if one of the following 2 criteria is met and both routes meet at least on of the characteristics of a Major Route below.


* Supporting data required for verification of the projected 5 year traffic Warrants.

| A major route, as used in this signal warrant, shall have at least one of the following characteristics: |  | Met? |  | Fulfilled? |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Characteristics of Major Routes |  | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| 1. Is it a part of the street or highway system that serves as the principal roadway network for through traffic flow? | Major Route |  | X |  | X |
|  | * Minor Route |  | X |  |  |
| 2. Does it include rural or suburban highways outside, entering, or traversing a city? | Major Route |  | X |  |  |
|  | * Minor Route |  | X |  |  |
| 3. Does it appear as a major route on an official plan, such as a major street plan in an urban area traffic and transportation study? | Major Route |  | X |  |  |
|  | * Minor Route |  | X |  |  |

* This is a minor route, but for the purposes of this Warrant, shall be considered as the other major route.

Note: Supporting data shall be required to verify the routes meet one of the characteristics of a major route.

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

## WARRANT 9 - INTERSECTION NEAR A GRADE CROSSING

## Applicable

$\square$ Yes
The need for a traffic control signal may be considered if an intersection that is controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign has a rail crossing within 140 feet of the stop/yield line and the highest Equivalent Minor Approach Traffic value lies above the curve represented on the graph below.

| Minor Route Adjustment Factors - Enter the following: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | The number of occurrances of rail traffic/day: |  |
| 2.The percentage of "High-Occupancy Buses" crossing the track/day: <br> (A high-occupancy bus is defined as a bus occupied by at least 20 people) |  |  |
| 3.The percentage of Tractor-trailer Trucks crossing the track/day: |  |  |

Satisfied: $\square$ Yes $\square$ No


Enter the distance value "D" from the STOP/YIELD bar to the track as shown below: $\square$

(Two or More Approach Lanes at the Track Crossing)

FIGURE W-9: Intersection Near a Grade Crossing (One Approach Lane at the Track Crossing)


* VPH after applying the adjustment factors for Rail, Bus, and Tractor-Trailer traffic

25 vph applies as the lower threshold volume


Appendix G - CARS Reports

## Safe Curve Speed Analysis Report

Curve: Blue Lake Drive at Sicard Hollow Road Corridor: N/ A
Mile Post: N/A

Lateral Friction Limit: $12^{\circ}$
Model Geometry: Parabolic

Posted Speed: 35 mph
Selected RAS - Left: 25 mph Selected RAS - Right: 20 mph

| Pass \# | Turn Direction | Travel Direction | Point of Curvature Latitude Longitude | Point of Tangent Latitude Longitude | GPS Fit | Average Test Speed | Curve Radius | Curve Length | Deflection Angle | Curve Class. | Elevation at Apex | Curve Grade | Min. Calculated Advisory Speed | Recommended Advisory Speed (RAS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Right | South-West | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45109^{\circ} \\ -86.71785^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45027^{\circ} \\ -86.71828^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 98.3\% | 35.1 mph | 292 ft | 346 ft | $58^{\circ}$ | F | -1.9\% | A | 21.3 mph | 20 mph |
| 2 | Left | East | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45031^{\circ} \\ -86.71824^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45115^{\circ} \\ -86.71781^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 98.3\% | 35.9 mph | 297 ft | 352 ft | $58^{\circ}$ | F | -2.0\% | B | 25.0 mph | 25 mph |
| 3* | Left | North-East | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45031^{\circ} \\ -86.71823^{\circ} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45116^{\circ} \\ -86.71781^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 98.8\% | 35.0 mph | 288 ft | 354 ft | $60^{\circ}$ | F | -2.6\% | A | 24.3 mph | 25 mph |
| 4* | Right | South | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45113^{\circ} \\ -86.71786^{\circ} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45035^{\circ} \\ -86.71822^{\circ} \end{array}$ | 98.3\% | 36.1 mph | 294 ft | 322 ft | $55^{\circ}$ | F | -5.3\% | A | 23.2 mph | 20 mph |

Sign recommendation summary

| Pass \# | Differential | Curve Sign | Curve Sign Requirements | Advisory Speed Sign | Speed Sign Requirements | Chevron Sign | Chevron Spacing | Chevron Requirements | Note |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | -15 mph | W1-1 | required | 20 mph | required | W1-8 | 80 ft | required |  |
| 2 | -10 mph | W1-1 | required | 25 mph | required | W1-8 | 80 ft | recommended |  |
| 3* | -10 mph | W1-1 | required | 25 mph | required | W1-8 | 80 ft | recommended |  |
| 4* | -15 mph | W1-1 | required | 20 mph | required | W1-8 | 80 ft | required |  |

[^6]Curve: Blue Lake Drive at Sicard Hollow Road Corridor: N/A Mile Post: N/A

Safe Curve Speed Analysis Report

## Curve map reference - Blue Lake Drive at Sicard Hollow Road



Curve: Blue Lake Drive at Sicard Hollow Road Corridor: N/ A
Mile Post: N/A

Lateral Friction Limit: $12^{\circ}$
Model Geometry: Parabolic

Posted Speed: 35 mph Selected RAS - Left: 25 mph Selected RAS - Right: 20 mph

Side friction summary - Blue Lake Drive at Sicard Hollow Road, pass 3
Radius: 301 ft ; Super elevation: $-7.8 \%$

| Advisory Speed (mph) | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auto Side friction guideline (deg) | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Max side friction (deg) | 4.8 | 5.7 | 7.3 | 9.4 | 12.2 | 15.5 | 19.3 | 23.4 | 27.8 | 32.3 | 36.8 | 41.2 | 45.4 | 49.4 |

Theoretical side friction at point generating the maximum side friction value

Curve: Blue Lake Drive at Sicard Hollow Road Corridor: N/ A
Mile Post: N/A

Lateral Friction Limit: $12^{\circ}$
Model Geometry: Parabolic

Posted Speed: 35 mph Selected RAS - Left: 25 mph Selected RAS - Right: 20 mph

Side friction summary - Blue Lake Drive at Sicard Hollow Road, pass 4
Radius: 300 ft ; Super elevation: -9.0\%

| Advisory Speed (mph) | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auto Side friction guideline (deg) | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Max side friction (deg) | 5.4 | 6.4 | 7.9 | 10.1 | 12.9 | 16.2 | 19.9 | 24.0 | 28.4 | 32.9 | 37.3 | 41.7 | 45.8 | 49.7 |

Theoretical side friction at point generating the maximum side friction value

## Safe Curve Speed Analysis Report

Curve: Blue Lake Drive at Sicard Hollow Road Corridor: N/ A
Mile Post: N/A

Lateral Friction Limit: $12^{\circ}$
Model Geometry: Parabolic

Data session summary - Blue Lake Drive at Sicard Hollow Road

| Pass \# | Data Session File Name | Collected On Collected By | Prior Calibration Subsequent Calibration |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ccochran@sain.com 2017/ 07/ 11 15:37:30 SN808770 | 07/ 11/ 17 15:37 ccochran@sain.com | Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 15:07 Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 16:55 |
| 2 | ccochran@sain.com 2017/ 07/ 11 15:40:49 SN808770 | 07/ 11/ 17 15:40 ccochran@sain.com | Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 15:07 Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 16:55 |
| 3 | ccochran@sain.com 2017/ 07/ 11 15:44:53 SN808770 | 07/ 11/ 17 15:44 ccochran@sain.com | Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 15:07 Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 16:55 |
| 4 | ccochran@sain.com 2017/ 07/ 11 15:48:22 SN808770 | 07/ 11/ 17 15:48 ccochran@sain.com | Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 15:07 Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 16:55 |

## Safe Curve Speed Analysis Report

Curve: Cahaba Heights Road at Sicard Hollow Road Corridor: N/ A
Mile Post: N/A

Lateral Friction Limit: $12^{\circ}$
Model Geometry: Parabolic

Posted Speed: 35 mph Selected RAS - Right: 35 mph Selected RAS - Left: 35 mph

| Pass \# | Turn Direction | Travel Direction | Point of Curvature Latitude Longitude | Point of Tangent Latitude Longitude | GPS Fit | Average Test Speed | Curve Radius | Curve Length | Deflection Angle | Curve Class. | Elevation at Apex | Curve Grade | Min. Calculated Advisory Speed | Recommended Advisory Speed (RAS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Left | South-West | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45192^{\circ} \\ -86.71749^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45132^{\circ} \\ -86.71783^{\circ} \end{array}$ | 98.1\% | 36.5 mph | 364 ft | 253 ft | $36^{\circ}$ | F | 8.3\% | A | 38.8 mph | 35 mph |
| 2* | Right | East | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45148^{\circ} \\ -86.71777^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45208^{\circ} \\ -86.71731^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 99.2\% | 35.8 mph | 368 ft | 265 ft | $38^{\circ}$ | F | 8.5\% | A | 38.3 mph | 35 mph |
| 3 | Right | East | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45122^{\circ} \\ -86.71781^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45216^{\circ} \\ -86.71717^{\circ} \end{array}$ | 98.4\% | 35.2 mph | 381 ft | 426 ft | $55^{\circ}$ | F | 7.3\% | A | 38.9 mph | 35 mph |
| 4* | Left | South-West | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45216^{\circ} \\ -86.71718^{\circ} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45136^{\circ} \\ -86.71784^{\circ} \end{array}$ | 99.0\% | 35.7 mph | 414 ft | 373 ft | $46^{\circ}$ | F | 6.0\% | B | 38.7 mph | 35 mph |

Sign recommendation summary

| Pass \# | Differential | Curve Sign | Curve Sign Requirements | Advisory Speed Sign | Speed Sign Requirements | Chevron Sign | Chevron Spacing | Chevron Requirements | Note |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | N/ A | W1-2 | none | 35 mph | none | W1-8 | 80 ft | none | The Recommended Advisory Speed for this pass is at or above the posted speed limit |
| 2* | NA | W1-2 | none | 35 mph | none | W1-8 | 80 ft | none | The Recommended Advisory Speed for this pass is at or above the posted speed limit |
| 3 | N/ A | W1-2 | none | 35 mph | none | W1-8 | 80 ft | none | The Recommended Advisory Speed for this pass is at or above the posted speed limit |
| 4* | NA | W1-2 | none | 35 mph | none | W1-8 | 120 ft | none | The Recommended Advisory Speed for this pass is at or above the posted speed limit |

[^7]
## Safe Curve Speed Analysis Report

Curve: Cahaba Heights Road at Sicard Hollow Road Corridor: N/ A Mile Post: N/ A

Lateral Friction Limit: $12^{\circ}$
Model Geometry: Parabolic

Posted Speed: 35 mph Selected RAS - Right: 35 mph Selected RAS - Left: 35 mph

## Curve map reference - Cahaba Heights Road at Sicard Hollow Road



## Safe Curve Speed Analysis Report

Curve: Cahaba Heights Road at Sicard Hollow Road Corridor: N/ A
Mile Post: N/A

Lateral Friction Limit: $12^{\circ}$
Model Geometry: Parabolic

Posted Speed: 35 mph Selected RAS - Right: 35 mph
Selected RAS - Left: 35 mph

Side friction summary - Cahaba Heights Road at Sicard Hollow Road, pass 2
Radius: 402 ft ; Super elevation: 3.5\%

| Advisory Speed (mph) | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auto Side friction guideline (deg) | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Max side friction (deg) | -1.8 | -1.1 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 3.9 | 6.5 | 9.5 | 13.0 | 16.8 | 20.8 | 25.1 | 29.4 | 33.7 | 37.9 |

Theoretical side friction at point generating the maximum side friction value

## Safe Curve Speed Analysis Report

Curve: Cahaba Heights Road at Sicard Hollow Road Corridor: N/ A

Lateral Friction Limit: $12^{\circ}$
Model Geometry: Parabolic

Posted Speed: 35 mph Selected RAS - Right: 35 mph Selected RAS - Left: 35 mph

Side friction summary - Cahaba Heights Road at Sicard Hollow Road, pass 4
Radius: 417 ft ; Super elevation: 3.1\%

| Advisory Speed (mph) | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auto Side friction guideline (deg) | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Max side friction (deg) | -1.6 | -0.9 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 3.9 | 6.4 | 9.4 | 12.7 | 16.3 | 20.3 | 24.4 | 28.6 | 32.9 | 37.0 |

Theoretical side friction at point generating the maximum side friction value

## Safe Curve Speed Analysis Report

Curve: Cahaba Heights Road at Sicard Hollow Road Corridor: N/ A
Mile Post: N/A

Lateral Friction Limit: $12^{\circ}$
Model Geometry: Parabolic

Posted Speed: 35 mph Selected RAS - Right: 35 mph Selected RAS - Left: 35 mph

Data session summary - Cahaba Heights Road at Sicard Hollow Road

| Pass \# | Data Session File Name | Collected On Collected By | Prior Calibration Subsequent Calibration |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ccochran@sain.com 2017/ 07/ 11 15:37:30 SN808770 | 07/ 11/ 17 15:37 ccochran@sain.com | Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 15:07 Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 16:55 |
| 2 | ccochran@sain.com 2017/ 07/ 11 15:40:49 SN808770 | 07/ 11/ 17 15:40 ccochran@sain.com | Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 15:07 <br> Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 16:55 |
| 3 | ccochran@sain.com 2017/ 07/ 11 15:44:53 SN808770 | 07/ 11/ 17 15:44 ccochran@sain.com | Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 15:07 Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 16:55 |
| 4 | ccochran@sain.com 2017/ 07/ 11 15:48:22 SN808770 | 07/ 11/ 17 15:48 ccochran@sain.com | Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 15:07 Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 16:55 |

Curve: Cahaba Heights Road
Corridor: N/ A
Mile Post: N/A

Lateral Friction Limit: $12^{\circ}$
Model Geometry: Parabolic

Posted Speed: 35 mph Selected RAS-Right: 35 mph Selected RAS - Left: 40 mph

| Pass \# | Turn Direction | Travel Direction | Point of Curvature Latitude Longitude | Point of Tangent Latitude Longitude | GPS Fit | Average Test Speed | Curve Radius | Curve Length | Deflection Angle | Curve Class. | Elevation at Apex | Curve Grade | Min. Calculated Advisory Speed | Recommended Advisory Speed (RAS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Right | South | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45342^{\circ} \\ -86.71635^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45252^{\circ} \\ -86.71665^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 99.1\% | 40.2 mph | 425 ft | 351 ft | $43^{\circ}$ | F | 4.5\% | C | 38.9 mph | 35 mph |
| 2 | Left | North-East | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45245^{\circ} \\ -86.71674^{\circ} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45411^{\circ} \\ -86.71672^{\circ} \end{array}$ | 95.9\% | 34.5 mph | 397 ft | 700 ft | $77^{\circ}$ | F | 10.5\% | C | 37.3 mph | 35 mph |
| 3* | Right | South | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45408^{\circ} \\ -86.71673^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45246^{\circ} \\ -86.71673^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 97.3\% | 35.4 mph | 382 ft | 668 ft | $77^{\circ}$ | F | 9.8\% | C | 34.7 mph | 35 mph |
| 4* | Left | North-East | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45283^{\circ} \\ -86.71642^{\circ} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45413^{\circ} \\ -86.71674^{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 97.6\% | 34.5 mph | 383 ft | 530 ft | $65^{\circ}$ | F | 9.7\% | C | 40.5 mph | 40 mph |
| 5 | Right | South | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45407^{\circ} \\ -86.71673^{\circ} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.45245^{\circ} \\ -86.71674^{\circ} \end{array}$ | 97.0\% | 35.1 mph | 382 ft | 681 ft | $77^{\circ}$ | F | 9.4\% | C | 36.7 mph | 35 mph |

Sign recommendation summary

| Pass \# | Differential | Curve Sign | Curve Sign Requirements | Advisory Speed Sign | Speed Sign Requirements | Chevron Sign | Chevron Spacing | Chevron Requirements | Note |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | N/ A | W1-2 | none | 35 mph | none | W1-8 | 120 ft | none | The Recommended Advisory Speed for this pass is at or above the posted speed limit |
| 2 | N/ A | W1-2 | none | 35 mph | none | W1-8 | 80 ft | none | The Recommended Advisory Speed for this pass is at or above the posted speed limit |
| 3* | NA | W1-2 | none | 35 mph | none | W1-8 | 80 ft | none | The Recommended Advisory Speed for this pass is at or above the posted speed limit |
| 4* | NA | W1-2 | none | 40 mph | none | W1-8 | 80 ft | none | The Recommended Advisory Speed for this pass is at or above the posted speed limit |
| 5 | N/ A | W1-2 | none | 35 mph | none | W1-8 | 80 ft | none | The Recommended Advisory Speed for this pass is at or above the posted speed limit |

[^8]Curve: Cahaba Heights Road Corridor: N/ A
Mile Post: N/A

## Safe Curve Speed Analysis Report

## Curve map reference - Cahaba Heights Road



## Safe Curve Speed Analysis Report

Curve: Cahaba Heights Road Corridor: N/ A

Lateral Friction Limit: $12^{\circ}$
Model Geometry: Parabolic

Posted Speed: 35 mph Selected RAS - Right: 35 mph
Selected RAS - Left: 40 mph

Side friction summary - Cahaba Heights Road, pass 3
Radius: 446 ft ; Super elevation: $-2.9 \%$

| Advisory Speed (mph) | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auto Side friction guideline (deg) | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Max side friction (deg) | 1.8 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 9.3 | 12.0 | 15.0 | 18.3 | 21.9 | 25.7 | 29.6 | 33.4 | 37.3 |

Theoretical side friction at point generating the maximum side friction value

## Safe Curve Speed Analysis Report

Curve: Cahaba Heights Road Corridor: N/ A
Mile Post: N/A

Lateral Friction Limit: $12^{\circ}$
Model Geometry: Parabolic

Posted Speed: 35 mph Selected RAS - Right: 35 mph
Selected RAS - Left: 40 mph

Side friction summary - Cahaba Heights Road, pass 4
Radius: 402 ft ; Super elevation: 6.3\%

| Advisory Speed (mph) | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auto Side friction quideline (deg) | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Max side friction (deg) | -3.4 | -2.7 | -1.5 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 4.9 | 8.0 | 11.4 | 15.3 | 19.4 | 23.7 | 28.1 | 32.5 | 36.9 |

Theoretical side friction at point generating the maximum side friction value

Curve: Cahaba Heights Road
Corridor: N/ A
Mile Post: N/A

Lateral Friction Limit: $12^{\circ}$
Model Geometry: Parabolic

Posted Speed: 35 mph Selected RAS - Right: 35 mph Selected RAS - Left: 40 mph

## Data session summary - Cahaba Heights Road

| Pass \# | Data Session File Name | Collected On Collected By | Prior Calibration Subsequent Calibration |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ccochran@sain. com 2017/ 07/ 11 15:37:30 SN808770 | 07/ 11/ 17 15:37 ccochran@sain.com | Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 15:07 Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 16:55 |
| 2 | ccochran@sain.com 2017/ 07/ 11 15:40:49 SN808770 | 07/ 11/ 17 15:40 ccochran@sain.com | Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 15:07 Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 16:55 |
| 3 | ccochran@sain.com 2017/ 07/ 11 15:42:30 SN808770 | 07/ 11/ 17 15: 42 ccochran@sain.com | Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 15:07 Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 16:55 |
| 4 | ccochran@sain.com 2017/ 07/ 11 15:44:53 SN808770 | 07/ 11/ 17 15: 44 ccochran@sain.com | Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 15:07 Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 16:55 |
| 5 | ccochran@sain. com 2017/ 07/ 11 15:48:22 SN808770 | 07/ 11/ 17 15: 48 ccochran@sain.com | Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 15:07 Passed on 07/ 11/ 17 16:55 |

Appendix H - Previous Study Recommendations at US-31 and Columbiana Road/I-65 Northbound Ramps



## Appendix I - Opinion of Probable Costs

Improvement Recommendations Opinion of Probable Cost

| Rocky Ridge Road @ Dolly Ridge Road (Short Term) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| Concrete Slope Paving ${ }^{1}$ | CY | 60 | \$250 | \$15,000 |
| Installation of Left Turn Phase ${ }^{2}$ | LS | 1 | \$11,000 | \$11,000 |
| Span Wire Reconfiguration ${ }^{3}$ | LS | 1 | \$13,000 | \$13,000 |
| Pedestian Facilities ${ }^{4}$ | By Others |  | By Others |  |
| Traffic Control | LS | 1 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 |
|  |  |  | Subt | \$49,000 |
| Contigency ${ }^{5}$ |  |  | 25\% | \$13,000 |
| Construction Costs |  |  |  | \$62,000 |
| Engineering Controls |  |  | 1.3\% | \$1,000 |
| Mobilization |  |  | 9.7\% | \$7,000 |
| Construction Engineering and Inspection |  |  | 15\% | \$11,000 |
| Construction Subtotal |  |  |  | \$81,000 |
| Preliminary Engineering (Environmental, Survey, Geotech, Traffic, Design) |  |  | 17\% | \$14,000 |
| Utility Relocation and Right-of-Way Cost $^{6}$ |  |  |  | NOT INCLUDED |
| Total Estimated Project Cost (2019) ${ }^{7}$ |  |  |  | \$95,000 |
|  |  |  |  | \$100,000 |

Notes:

1. Raised channelizing island at the right-in, right-out gas station driveway along Rocky Ridge Road just north of the intersection.
2. Left turn phase for Rocky Ridge Road northbound and southbound approaches with a flashing yellow arrow (FYA) signal head arrangement for both left turn conditions. Includes the installation of two signal heads and $2^{\prime \prime}$ conduit.
3. The existing span wire connection should be converted to a box arrangement. Long term recommendations should be considered in the placement of any new signal poles. Rock excavation for signal pole installation is not expected. If traditional poles are not feasible or desired, poles with double mast arms could be used; however, this would increase the construction cost by $\$ 75 \mathrm{k}$ to $\$ 100 \mathrm{k}$.
4. Pedestrian timings, signal heads, and crosswalks in accordance with the plans for sidewalks in the area will be done by others.
5. Contingency cost includes miscellaneous and/or unknown items that can not be quantified at the time this study was conducted.
6. Right-of-Way and Utility Relocation were not included in this estimate; however, some improvements may require right-of-way acquisition and/or utility relocations.
7. The total estimated project cost was prepared for the 2019 planning year. This number should be increased to account for rising costs due to inflation should the improvements not be implemented in 2019.

NOTE: ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST PROVIDED IS MADE ON THE BASIS OF ENGINEER'S EXPERIENCES AND QUALIFICATION AND REPRESENTS ENGINEER'S BEST JUDGMENT WITHIN THE INDUSTRY. ENGINEER DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT PROPOSALS, BIDS, OR ACTUAL COST WILL NOT VARY FROM ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE COST. ALDOT'S INDIRECT COSTS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS.

Improvement Recommendations Opinion of Probable Cost


NOTE: ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST PROVIDED IS MADE ON THE BASIS OF ENGINEER'S EXPERIENCES AND QUALIFICATION AND REPRESENTS ENGINEER'S BEST JUDGMENT WITHIN THE INDUSTRY. ENGINEER DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT PROPOSALS, BIDS, OR ACTUAL COST WILL NOT VARY FROM ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE COST.
*See additional notes on following sheet

Notes:

1. Clearing and grubbing includes clearing of trees in the right of way on Rocky Ridge and Dolly Ridge Roads.
2. Includes roadway and non-roadway signs.
3. Rock excavation for signal pole installation is not expected.
4. Contingency cost includes miscellaneous and/or unknown items that can not be quantified at the time this study was conducted.
5. Right-of-Way and Utility Relocation were not included in this estimate; however, some improvements will require right-of-way acquisition and/or utility relocations.
6. The total estimated project cost was prepared for the 2019 planning year. This number should be increased to account for rising costs due to inflation should the improvements not be implemented in 2019.

NOTE: ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST PROVIDED IS MADE ON THE BASIS OF ENGINEER'S EXPERIENCES AND QUALIFICATION AND REPRESENTS ENGINEER'S BEST JUDGMENT WITHIN THE INDUSTRY. ENGINEER DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT PROPOSALS, BIDS, OR ACTUAL COST WILL NOT VARY FROM ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE COST.

Improvement Recommendations Opinion of Probable Cost

| Sicard Hollow Road @ Blue Lake Drive/Cahaba Heights Road (Short Term) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| Clearing and Grubbing (\$4000/Acre) ${ }^{1}$ | LS | 1 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 |
| Roadway Signs | SF | 100 | \$30 | \$3,000 |
| Signs Posts | LF | 150 | \$15 | \$2,250 |
| Roadway Lighting ${ }^{2}$ | LS | 1 | \$150,000 | \$150,000 |
| Traffic Control | LS | 1 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 |
|  |  |  | Subt | \$169,250 |
| Contigency ${ }^{3}$ |  |  | 25\% | \$43,000 |
| Construction Costs |  |  |  | \$213,000 |
| Engineering Controls |  |  | 1.3\% | \$3,000 |
| Mobilization |  |  | 9.7\% | \$21,000 |
| Construction Engineering and Inspection |  |  | 15\% | \$36,000 |
| Construction Subtotal |  |  |  | \$273,000 |
| Preliminary Engineering (Environmental, Survey, Geotech, Traffic, Design) |  |  | 17\% | \$47,000 |
| Utility Relocation and Right-of-Way Cost ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  | NOT INCLUDED |
|  |  |  | Subt | \$320,000 |
| Total Estimated Project Cost (2019) ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  | \$320,000 |

Notes:

1. Clearing and Grubbing includes trimming vegetation to improve intersection sight distance.
2. Install lighting at the intersection to improve intersection visibility during nighttime conditions.
3. Contingency cost includes miscellaneous and/or unknown items that can not be quantified at the time this study was conducted.
4. Right-of-Way and Utility Relocation were not included in this estimate; however, some improvements will require right-of-way acquisition and/or utility relocations.
5. The total estimated project cost was prepared for the 2019 planning year. This number should be increased to account for rising costs due to inflation should the improvements not be implemented in 2019.

NOTE: ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST PROVIDED IS MADE ON THE BASIS OF ENGINEER'S EXPERIENCES AND QUALIFICATION AND REPRESENTS ENGINEER'S BEST JUDGMENT WITHIN THE INDUSTRY. ENGINEER DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT PROPOSALS, BIDS, OR ACTUAL COST WILL NOT VARY FROM ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE COST. ALDOT'S INDIRECT COSTS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS.

Improvement Recommendations Opinion of Probable Cost


Notes:

1. Rock excavation is anticipated.
2. Contingency cost includes miscellaneous and/or unknown items that can not be quantified at the time this study was conducted.
3. Increased percentage due to the complexity of roundabout design.
4. Right-of-Way and Utility Relocation were not included in this estimate; however, some improvements will require right-of-way acquisition and/or utility relocations.
5. The total estimated project cost was prepared for the 2019 planning year. This number should be increased to account for rising costs due to inflation should the improvements not be implemented in 2019.

Improvement Recommendations Opinion of Probable Cost


Notes:

1. Rock excavation is likely.
2. Contingency cost includes miscellaneous and/or unknown items that can not be quantified at the time this study was conducted.
3. Right-of-Way and Utility Relocation were not included in this estimate; however, some improvements will require right-of-way acquisition and/or utility relocations.
4. The total estimated project cost was prepared for the 2019 planning year. This number should be increased to account for rising costs due to inflation should the improvements not be implemented in 2019.

NOTE: ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST PROVIDED IS MADE ON THE BASIS OF ENGINEER'S EXPERIENCES AND QUALIFICATION AND REPRESENTS ENGINEER'S BEST JUDGMENT WITHIN THE INDUSTRY. ENGINEER DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT PROPOSALS, BIDS, OR ACTUAL COST WILL NOT VARY FROM ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE COST.

Improvement Recommendations Opinion of Probable Cost


Notes:

1. Convert US-31 northbound left turn phase to protected-only.
2. Contingency cost includes miscellaneous and/or unknown items that can not be quantified at the time this study was conducted.
3. Right-of-Way and Utility Relocation were not included in this estimate; however, some improvements will require right-of-way acquisition and/or utility relocations.
4. The total estimated project cost was prepared for the 2019 planning year. This number should be increased to account for rising costs due to inflation should the improvements not be implemented in 2019.

NOTE: ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST PROVIDED IS MADE ON THE BASIS OF ENGINEER'S EXPERIENCES AND QUALIFICATION AND REPRESENTS ENGINEER'S BEST JUDGMENT WITHIN THE INDUSTRY. ENGINEER DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT PROPOSALS, BIDS, OR ACTUAL COST WILL NOT VARY FROM ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE COST. ALDOT'S INDIRECT COSTS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS.

Improvement Recommendations Opinion of Probable Cost


Notes:

1. Dual widening was assume for both both Shades Crest Rd approaches to US-31. Six feet on each side for additional turn lane.
2. Cost for installing new signal poles is included since widening of Shades Crest may impact existing pole locations. Rock excavation for signal pole installation is not expected.
3. Contingency cost includes miscellaneous and/or unknown items that can not be quantified at the time this study was conducted.
4. Right-of-Way and Utility Relocation were not included in this estimate; however, some improvements will require right-ofway acquisition and/or utility relocations.
5. The total estimated project cost was prepared for the 2019 planning year. This number should be increased to account for rising costs due to inflation should the improvements not be implemented in 2019.

NOTE: ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST PROVIDED IS MADE ON THE BASIS OF ENGINEER'S EXPERIENCES AND QUALIFICATION AND REPRESENTS ENGINEER'S BEST JUDGMENT WITHIN THE INDUSTRY. ENGINEER DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT PROPOSALS, BIDS, OR ACTUAL COST WILL NOT VARY FROM ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE COST.

Improvement Recommendations Opinion of Probable Cost

| US-31 @ Columbiana Road/l-65 Northbound Ramps |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| Pavement Removal | SY | 850 | \$25 | \$21,250 |
| Milling | SY | 1800 | \$5 | \$9,000 |
| Wearing Surface (1.5") | TON | 150 | \$90 | \$13,500 |
| Tack Coat | GALLON | 110 | \$2 | \$220 |
| Concrete Islands (6") | CY | 2 | \$250 | \$500 |
| Curb and Gutter | LF | 950 | \$20 | \$19,000 |
| Storm Pipe | LF | 200 | \$50 | \$10,000 |
| Storm Pipe End Treatment | EACH | 2 | \$1,500 | \$3,000 |
| Structure Excavation | CY | 200 | \$15 | \$3,000 |
| Foundation Backfill | CY | 100 | \$30 | \$3,000 |
| Topsoil | CY | 150 | \$15 | \$2,250 |
| Solid Sod | SY | 850 | \$8 | \$6,800 |
| Traffic Stripe | MILE | 1 | \$3,200 | \$3,200 |
| Traffic Markings, \& Legends | SF | 600 | \$4 | \$2,400 |
| Roadway Signs | SF | 50 | \$30 | \$1,500 |
| Sign Posts | LF | 75 | \$15 | \$1,125 |
| Erosion Control | LS | 1 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 |
| Traffic Control | LS | 1 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$169,745 |
| Contigency ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | 25\% | \$43,000 |
| Construction Costs |  |  |  | \$213,000 |
| Engineering Controls |  |  | 1.3\% | \$3,000 |
| Mobilization |  |  | 9.7\% | \$21,000 |
| Construction Engineering and Inspection |  |  | 15\% | \$36,000 |
| Construction Subtotal |  |  |  | \$273,000 |
| Preliminary Engineering (Environmental, Survey, Geotech, Traffic, Design) $17 \%$ |  |  |  | \$47,000 |
| Utility Relocation and Right-of-Way Cost ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | NOT INCLUDED |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$320,000 |
| ALDOT Indirect Costs |  |  | 13.63\% | \$44,000 |
| Total Estimated Project Cost (2019) ${ }^{\mathbf{3}} \quad \$ 370,000$ |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Contingency cost includes miscellaneous and/or unknown items that can not be quantified at the time this study was conducted.
2. Right-of-Way and Utility Relocation were not included in this estimate; however, some improvements will require right-of-way acquisition and/or utility relocations.
3. The total estimated project cost was prepared for the 2019 planning year. This number should be increased to account for rising costs due to inflation should the improvements not be implemented in 2019.

NOTE: ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST PROVIDED IS MADE ON THE BASIS OF ENGINEER'S EXPERIENCES AND QUALIFICATION AND REPRESENTS ENGINEER'S BEST JUDGMENT WITHIN THE INDUSTRY. ENGINEER DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT PROPOSALS, BIDS, OR ACTUAL COST WILL NOT VARY FROM ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE COST.

Improvement Recommendations Opinion of Probable Cost

| Columbiana Road @ Shades Crest Road/Vestaview Lane |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| Clearing and Grubbing (\$4000/Acre) | LS | 1 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 |
| Unclassified Excavation | CY | 2000 | \$15 | \$30,000 |
| Borrow Excavation | CY | 1400 | \$15 | \$21,000 |
| Pavement Removal | SY | 700 | \$25 | \$17,500 |
| Wearing Surface (1.5") | TON | 50 | \$90 | \$4,500 |
| Binder (2-2" layers) | TON | 110 | \$100 | \$11,000 |
| Aggregate Base (6") | SY | 500 | \$25 | \$12,500 |
| Tack Coat | GALLON | 30 | \$2 | \$60 |
| Concrete Islands (6") | CY | 6 | \$250 | \$1,500 |
| Concrete Sidewalk (4") | SY | 100 | \$70 | \$7,000 |
| Topsoil | CY | 150 | \$15 | \$2,250 |
| Solid Sod | SY | 850 | \$8 | \$6,800 |
| Traffic Stripe | MILE | 1 | \$3,200 | \$3,200 |
| Traffic Markings, \& Legends | SF | 600 | \$4 | \$2,400 |
| Roadway Signs | SF | 20 | \$30 | \$600 |
| Sign Posts | LF | 50 | \$15 | \$750 |
| Pedestrian Signal Heads w/ Countdown Display | LS | 1 | \$15,000 | \$15,000 |
| Signalization ${ }^{1}$ | LS | 1 | \$150,000 | \$150,000 |
| Erosion Control | LS | 1 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 |
| Traffic Control | LS | 1 | \$60,000 | \$60,000 |
|  |  |  | Subt | \$356,060 |
| Contigency ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | 25\% | \$90,000 |
| Construction Costs |  |  |  | \$447,000 |
| Engineering Controls |  |  | 1.3\% | \$6,000 |
| Mobilization |  |  | 9.7\% | \$44,000 |
| Construction Engineering and Inspection |  |  | 15\% | \$75,000 |
| Construction Subtotal |  |  |  | \$572,000 |
| Preliminary Engineering (Environmental, Survey, Geotech, Traffic, Design) |  |  | 17\% | \$98,000 |
| Utility Relocation and Right-of-Way Cost ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  | NOT INCLUDED |
| Subtota |  |  |  | \$670,000 |
| ALDOT Indirect Costs |  |  | 13.63\% | \$92,000 |
| Total Estimated Project Cost (2019) ${ }^{4} \quad$ \$770,000 |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Cost of signalization only necessary if the city opts for signalization of the northern intersection of Columbiana Road and Shades Crest Road. Rock excavation for signal pole installation is not expected.
2. Contingency cost includes miscellaneous and/or unknown items that can not be quantified at the time this study was conducted.
3. Right-of-Way and Utility Relocation were not included in this estimate; however, some improvements will require right-of-way acquisition and/or utility relocations.
4. The total estimated project cost was prepared for the 2019 planning year. This number should be increased to account for rising costs due to inflation should the improvements not be implemented in 2019.

NOTE: ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST PROVIDED IS MADE ON THE BASIS OF ENGINEER'S EXPERIENCES AND QUALIFICATION AND REPRESENTS ENGINEER'S BEST JUDGMENT WITHIN THE INDUSTRY. ENGINEER DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT PROPOSALS, BIDS, OR ACTUAL COST WILL NOT VARY FROM ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE COST.

Improvement Recommendations Opinion of Probable Cost

| US-31 @ Vestavia Plaza/City Hall |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| Unclassified Excavation | CY | 40 | \$15 | \$600 |
| Borrow Excavation | CY | 30 | \$15 | \$450 |
| Concrete Sidewalk (4") | SY | 330 | \$70 | \$23,100 |
| Curb and Gutter | LF | 150 | \$20 | \$3,000 |
| Storm Pipe | LF | 150 | \$50 | \$7,500 |
| Storm Inlet | EACH | 2 | \$2,500 | \$5,000 |
| Structure Excavation | CY | 80 | \$15 | \$1,200 |
| Foundation Backfill | CY | 40 | \$30 | \$1,200 |
| Topsoil | CY | 10 | \$15 | \$150 |
| Solid Sod | SY | 330 | \$8 | \$2,640 |
| Traffic Stripe | MILE | 1 | \$3,200 | \$3,200 |
| Traffic Markings, \& Legends | SF | 800 | \$4 | \$3,200 |
| Pedestrian Signal Head Pedastals w/ Countdown <br> Display | LS | 1 | \$21,000 | \$21,000 |
| Erosion Control | LS | 1 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 |
| Traffic Control | LS | 1 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$132,240 |
| Contigency ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | 25\% | \$34,000 |
| Construction Costs |  |  |  | \$167,000 |
| Engineering Controls |  |  | 1.3\% | \$3,000 |
| Mobilization |  |  | 9.7\% | \$17,000 |
| Construction Engineering and Inspection |  |  | 15\% | \$29,000 |
| Construction Subtotal |  |  |  | \$216,000 |
| Preliminary Engineering (Environmental, Survey, Geotech, Traffic, Design) $17 \%$ <br> Utility Relocation and Right-of-Way Cost  |  |  |  | \$37,000 |
|  |  |  |  | NOT INCLUDED |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$253,000 |
| Total Estimated Project Cost (2019) ${ }^{\mathbf{3}} \quad \mathbf{\$ 2 6 0 , 0 0 0}$ |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Contingency cost includes miscellaneous and/or unknown items that can not be quantified at the time this study was conducted.
2. Right-of-Way and Utility Relocation were not included in this estimate; however, some improvements will require right-of-way acquisition and/or utility relocations.
3. The total estimated project cost was prepared for the 2019 planning year. This number should be increased to account for rising costs due to inflation should the improvements not be implemented in 2019.

NOTE: ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST PROVIDED IS MADE ON THE BASIS OF ENGINEER'S EXPERIENCES AND QUALIFICATION AND REPRESENTS ENGINEER'S BEST JUDGMENT WITHIN THE INDUSTRY. ENGINEER DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT PROPOSALS, BIDS, OR ACTUAL COST WILL NOT VARY FROM ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE COST. ALDOT'S INDIRECT COSTS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE ESTIMATED PROJECT COST.

Improvement Recommendations Opinion of Probable Cost

| US-31 @ Pizitz Drive |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| Unclassified Excavation | CY | 80 | \$15 | \$1,200 |
| Borrow Excavation | CY | 50 | \$15 | \$750 |
| Concrete Sidewalk (4") | SY | 80 | \$70 | \$5,600 |
| Concrete Island (6") | CY | 20 | \$250 | \$5,000 |
| Curb and Gutter | LF | 150 | \$20 | \$3,000 |
| Storm Pipe | LF | 150 | \$50 | \$7,500 |
| Storm Inlet | EACH | 3 | \$2,500 | \$7,500 |
| Structure Excavation | CY | 80 | \$15 | \$1,200 |
| Foundation Backfill | CY | 40 | \$30 | \$1,200 |
| Topsoil | CY | 15 | \$15 | \$225 |
| Solid Sod | SY | 80 | \$8 | \$640 |
| Traffic Stripe | MILE | 1 | \$3,200 | \$3,200 |
| Remove Traffic Stripe | MILE | 1 | \$2,725 | \$2,725 |
| Traffic Markings, \& Legends | SF | 350 | \$4 | \$1,400 |
| Pedestrian Signal Head Pedastals w/ Countdown <br> Display | LS | 1 | \$15,000 | \$15,000 |
| Erosion Control | LS | 1 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 |
| Traffic Control | LS | 1 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$116,140 |
| Contigency ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | 25\% | \$30,000 |
| Construction Costs |  |  |  | \$147,000 |
| Engineering Controls |  |  | 1.3\% | \$2,000 |
| Mobilization |  |  | 9.7\% | \$15,000 |
| Construction Engineering and Inspection |  |  | 15\% | \$25,000 |
| Construction Subtotal |  |  |  | \$189,000 |
| Preliminary Engineering (Environmental, Survey, Geotech, Trafic, Design) |  |  | 17\% | \$33,000 |
| Utility Relocation and Right-of-Way Cost ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | NOT INCLUDED |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$222,000 |
| Total Estimated Project Cost (2019) ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  | \$230,000 |

Notes:

1. Contingency cost includes miscellaneous and/or unknown items that can not be quantified at the time this study was conducted.
2. Right-of-Way and Utility Relocation were not included in this estimate; however, some improvements will require right-of-way acquisition and/or utility relocations.
3. The total estimated project cost was prepared for the 2019 planning year. This number should be increased to account for rising costs due to inflation should the improvements not be implemented in 2019.

NOTE: ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST PROVIDED IS MADE ON THE BASIS OF ENGINEER'S EXPERIENCES AND QUALIFICATION AND REPRESENTS ENGINEER'S BEST JUDGMENT WITHIN THE INDUSTRY. ENGINEER DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT PROPOSALS, BIDS, OR ACTUAL COST WILL NOT VARY FROM ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE COST. ALDOT'S INDIRECT COSTS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE OVERALL PROJECT COST.

Improvement Recommendations Opinion of Probable Cost


Notes:

1. Clearing and grubbing includes trimming vegetation that is blocking Dolly Ridge Road eastbound drivers' view of the signal heads at the intersection of Gresham Drive.
2. Implement base signal timings. This does not include periodic monitoring of detection.
3. Contingency cost includes miscellaneous and/or unknown items that can not be quantified at the time this study was conducted.
4. Internal school circulation plan is not included in the Preliminary Engineering fee.
5. Right-of-Way and Utility Relocation were not included in this estimate; however, some improvements will require right-of-way acquisition and/or utility relocations.
6. The total estimated project cost was prepared for the 2019 planning year. This number should be increased to account for rising costs due to inflation should the improvements not be implemented in 2019.

NOTE: ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST PROVIDED IS MADE ON THE BASIS OF ENGINEER'S EXPERIENCES AND QUALIFICATION AND REPRESENTS ENGINEER'S BEST JUDGMENT WITHIN THE INDUSTRY. ENGINEER DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT PROPOSALS, BIDS, OR ACTUAL COST WILL NOT VARY FROM ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE COST.
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