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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report documents a traffic impact analysis performed for the proposed Park Plaza redevelopment located on the west side of Hillcrest Avenue between Daniel Avenue and Haynie Avenue in the City of University Park, Texas. Based on information provided by Strode Property Company, the redevelopment is proposed to include 85,900 square feet of general office, 27,285 square feet of shopping center, and 19,595 square feet of restaurant. The redevelopment is anticipated to be completed by 2018. Access will be provided via a parking garage anticipated to have two project access driveways, one along Daniel Avenue and one along Haynie Avenue. Additional consideration was given to parking requirements and operations of the parking garage as well as other components of the site plan.

## Traffic Impact Analysis

The purpose of the traffic impact analysis was to quantify the impacts that the proposed redevelopment will have on the surrounding roadway network, and to identify any mitigation measures needed to ensure that the roadways and intersections will operate at an acceptable level of service at the project build-out.

The traffic evaluation was comprised of three (3) scenarios for which both AM and PM peak hour level of service analyses were performed. For both signalized and unsignalized intersections, analysis was accomplished via Synchro $9^{\mathrm{TM}}$ software. The scenarios are detailed in Table A below.

TABLE A: ANALYSIS SCENARIOS

| Scenario | Roadway Conditions | Development Assumptions | Traffic Volumes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing (2016) | Existing | Existing | Existing |
| Build Out (2018) | Existing + <br> Parking Garage Access Driveways | Existing + Removal of Existing Building + Build Out ( $85,900 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of General Office, $27,285 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of Shopping Center, $19,595 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of Restaurant) | Existing +2 years of Background Growth at 3\% per year + Build Out Site Traffic |
| Improved Build Out (2018) | Existing + <br> Parking Garage Access Driveways + Signal Timing Improvements | Existing + Removal of Existing Building + Build Out ( $85,900 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of General Office, $27,285 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of Shopping Center, $19,595 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of Restaurant) | Existing +2 years of Background Growth at 3\% per year + Build Out Site Traffic |

## Intersection Capacity Analysis

Based on the results of the intersection analysis, it is recommended to implement signal timing improvements to the traffic signal at Daniel Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue based on field conditions observed within the first few weeks of the opening of the Park Plaza redevelopment.

For analysis purposes, signal timings were altered slightly to maximize intersection efficiency and improve overall level of service. This was accomplished by extending green time for the northbound/southbound movements in the AM peak hour and the eastbound/westbound movements in the PM peak hour.

## Roadway Capacity Analysis

Based upon the results of the roadway capacity analysis, Daniel Avenue, west of Hillcrest Avenue, operates in a tolerable condition in the Build Out (2018) scenario. The westbound direction during the PM peak hour approaches capacity and should be monitored.

## Other Considerations

## Neighborhood Impacts

The Park Plaza redevelopment impact on the surrounding neighborhoods is expected to be minimal. 75\% of traffic is anticipated to access the site via Hillcrest Avenue and Daniel Avenue with the other $25 \%$ circulating through the neighborhood streets to the west. This $25 \%$ is expected to have the impact on the neighborhood. This additional traffic is only anticipated to add a total of 72 vehicles in the AM peak hour and 90 vehicles in the PM peak hour at the intersection of Daniel Avenue and Dickens Avenue (split between four movements). An additional 30 vehicles in the AM peak hour and 39 vehicles in the PM peak hour (split between three movements) at the Haynie Avenue and Dickens Avenue intersection are projected as well. Of this $25 \%$, the majority is anticipated to be current residents attempting to access the shopping center or restaurants. Due to this, and the minimal affect at the two intersections along Dickens Avenue, the neighborhood impact is not anticipated to be an observable issue.

## Parking

Based upon the two parking requirement analyses, the anticipated supply of 714 spaces well exceeds requirements set forth by both The City and ULI. In addition, it is anticipated that the garage will be reserved specifically for Park Plaza visitors. For this reason, the traffic impacts of potential shared parking demand from Snider Plaza visitors was not analyzed.

With the proposed location of the North Garage access driveway, the on-street parking provided along Daniel Avenue to the north may need to be removed.

## Truck Traffic and Loading Zones

One service dock is anticipated to be provided on site. The location is on the south side of the site along Haynie Avenue. Truck traffic will be directed along Hillcrest Avenue when attempting to access the site. These directions are in agreement with designated truck routes outlined by The City. It is also to be stressed that trucks serving the development are anticipated to be comparable to an SU-30 (single unit 2axle or similar) and that large trailer trucks with three or more axles are not expected to be attempting to access the site.

## Pedestrian Crossing

Three pedestrian crossings are indicated on the current site plan. Two will be provided at the Daniel Avenue and Snider Plaza intersection, one on the east and one on the west legs. The third is to be provided at the stop control at the intersection of Haynie Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue. Appropriate signage is recommended to be installed to make drivers well aware of these pedestrian crossings. In addition to signage, accessibility of pedestrian crossings should be reviewed and upgraded where necessary to ensure compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. Furthermore, at the signalized intersection of Daniel Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue, pedestrian equipment should be reviewed for compliance with ADA and Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) standards.

Additional consideration should be given to the removal of the on-street parking provided in the channelized eastbound right-turn lane at the Daniel Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue intersection due to driver expectancy considerations as well as sight distance concerns for pedestrians.

## Valet Drop-off

A turning simulation was carried out to check the feasibility of westbound left-turns entering the valet area of the site. The analysis was carried out using a design vehicle that simulates a large passenger car.
From the simulation, it is recommended that the valet lane be constructed so it cut further into the site, by about three feet, while not impacting the location of the proposed building. With this change, it is projected that users should be able to make a left-turn into the valet area travelling westbound on Daniel Avenue and that the valet can exit turning left to access the parking garage.

Exhibit A summarizes the recommendations made.


## INTRODUCTION

## PURPOSE

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. was retained by Strode Property Company to perform a traffic impact analysis for the proposed Park Plaza redevelopment, located on the west side of Hillcrest Avenue between Daniel Avenue and Haynie Avenue in the City of University Park, Texas.

The purpose of this study is to address the traffic impacts of the proposed development on surrounding streets and intersections, and to determine if any mitigation is necessary. This traffic impact study was prepared based on criteria set forth by the City of University Park staff.

## METHODOLOGY

The traffic evaluation was comprised of three (3) scenarios for which AM and PM peak hour level of service analysis were performed. All intersection analyses were completed using Synchro $9^{T M}$ software. Table 1 provides a summary of the assumptions used in each scenario.

Table 1: Analysis Scenario

| Scenario | Roadway Conditions | Development Assumptions | Traffic Volumes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing (2016) | Existing | Existing | Existing |
| Build Out (2018) | Existing + Parking Garage Access Driveways | Existing + Removal of Existing Building + Build Out ( $85,900 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of General Office, $27,285 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of Shopping Center, $19,595 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of Restaurant) | Existing +2 years of growth at 3\% per year, + Build Out Site Traffic |
| Improved Build Out (2018) | Existing + Parking Garage Access Driveways + Signal Timing Improvements | Existing + Removal of Existing Building + Build Out (85,900 $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of General Office, 27,285 $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of Shopping Center, $19,595 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of Restaurant) | Existing +2 years of growth at $3 \%$ per year, + Build Out Site Traffic |

A list of the intersections analyzed within the study area and their existing control can be seen below, in addition to the roadway segments analyzed:

## Signalized

- Daniel Avenue \& Hillcrest Avenue


## Unsignalized

- Daniel Avenue \& Snider Plaza
- Daniel Avenue \& Dickens Avenue
- Daniel Avenue \& Parking Garage North (future)
- Haynie Avenue \& Parking Garage South (future)
- Haynie Avenue \& Dickens Avenue
- Haynie Avenue \& Hillcrest Avenue


## Roadway Segments

- Hillcrest Avenue south of Daniel Avenue
- Daniel Avenue west of Hillcrest Avenue


## EXISTING AND PROPOSED LAND USE

## SITE LOCATION / STUDY AREA

The Park Plaza redevelopment is located on the west side of Hillcrest Avenue between Daniel Avenue and Haynie Avenue in the City of University Park, Texas. A vicinity map is provided in Exhibit 1.

## EXISTING DEVELOPMENT

Currently, the site consists of a vacant bank/general office building and parking lot and as such does not generate traffic. Note this existing building is 27,000 square feet.

## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed Park Plaza redevelopment includes approximately 27,285 square feet of shopping center, 85,900 square feet of general office, and 19,595 square feet of restaurant. The development is expected to be completed by 2018.


## EXHIBIT 1

## TRANSPORATION SYSTEM

## THOROUGHFARE SYSTEM

Exhibit 2 displays the existing thoroughfares and lane assignments within the study area. The following is a general description of the major thoroughfares within the study area as they exist today.

Hillcrest Avenue is a four (4) lane undivided arterial running generally in a north-south direction east of the site. North of the study area, Hillcrest Avenue connects to Lovers Lane, and to the south of the study area, it connects to Mockingbird Lane. On-street parking is provided in the channelized right-turn from Daniel Avenue onto Hillcrest Avenue.

Daniel Avenue is currently a two (2) lane undivided residential type road that runs in an east-west direction. Daniel Avenue is anticipated to provide one project access driveway to the proposed parking garage. Daniel Avenue provides access to Hillcrest Avenue to the east and Dickens Avenue to the west. On-street parking is provided along Daniel Avenue in the study area.

Haynie Avenue is currently a two (2) lane undivided residential type road that runs in an east-west direction. Haynie Avenue is anticipated to provide one project access driveway to the proposed parking garage. Haynie Avenue runs parallel to Daniel Avenue and provides access to Hillcrest Avenue to the east and Dickens Avenue to the west as well. On-street parking is provided along Haynie Avenue in the study area.

Dickens Avenue is currently a two (2) lane undivided local type road that runs in a north-south direction. Dickens Avenue runs parallel to Hillcrest Avenue and provides access to Lovers Lane to the north and McFarlin Boulevard to the south.

Snider Plaza is currently a two (2) lane divided roadway that runs in a north-south direction. Snider Plaza provides two rows of parking in the median as well as a row on both the east and west sides. Snider Plaza provides access to Lovers Lane to the north and terminates at Daniel Avenue to the south.

During field observations, no posted speed limits were seen in the study area with the exception of a school speed zone north of the site. For this reason, it was assumed in the analysis that all roadways have an operating speed of 30 mph .

## ANTICIPATED BUILD OUT YEAR (2018) ROADWAY NETWORK

Near the study area, six Hillcrest Avenue traffic signals will be replaced from Binkley Avenue to Milton Avenue. The traffic signal at Daniel Avenue is not expected to be one of these six to be replaced. No roadway improvements are anticipated within the next two years in the study area.

Exhibit 3 displays the proposed thoroughfares and lane assignments within the study area with the addition of the two garage access driveways.



## EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Turning movement counts were collected during the AM and PM peak periods at the following study area intersections on Wednesday January $20^{\text {th }}, 2016$ when SMU was in session:

- Daniel Avenue \& Hillcrest Avenue
- Daniel Avenue \& Snider Plaza
- Daniel Avenue \& Dickens Avenue
- Haynie Avenue \& Dickens Avenue
- Haynie Avenue \& Hillcrest Avenue

Machine tube counts were recorded for a 24 hour period on Wednesday January $20^{\text {th }}, 2016$ at the following locations:

- Hillcrest Avenue south of Daniel Avenue
- Daniel Avenue west of Hillcrest Avenue

Exhibit 4 represents the collected AM and PM peak hour intersection turning movement volumes, which were used for the existing conditions analysis. This count data has been included in the Appendix.

## ANTICIPATED BUILD OUT (2018) BACKGROUND TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Due to limited access to historic data, a generally accepted growth rate of $3 \%$ was used. This annual growth rate was used to grow existing traffic counts for two (2) years to determine the background growth for the Build Out scenario.

Exhibit 5 represents the Build Out (2018) Background turning movement volumes for the study intersections.



## SITE TRAFFIC CHARACTERISTICS

## PROPOSED SITE TRIP GENERATION

Traffic projections were prepared for the Park Plaza redevelopment based on the trip generation rates and equations found in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) publication entitled Trip Generation, $9^{\text {th }}$ Edition. This recognized standard for trip generation is based on actual surveys (traffic counts) of existing types of development. Table 2 provides the rates and equations included in the ITE Trip Generation Manual in addition to the entering and exiting distribution splits for the redevelopment's specific land uses.

Table 2: Site Trip Generation Equations/Rates

| Land Use Description | Variable | Daily |  | AMPeak Hour |  | PMPeak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Equation/Rate | Split | Equation/Rate | Split | Equation/Rate | Split |
| Shopping Center (ITE \#820) | $1,000$ <br> Square Feet | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Ln}(T)= \\ 0.65^{*} \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+5.83 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \% \text { In } \\ 50 \% \text { Out } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})= \\ 0.61 * \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+2.24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 62 \% \text { In } \\ 38 \% \text { Out } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})= \\ 0.67 * \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+3.31 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48 \% \text { In } \\ 52 \% \text { Out } \end{gathered}$ |
| General Office (ITE \#710) | $1,000$ <br> Square Feet | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})= \\ 0.76 * \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+3.68 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \% \text { In } \\ 50 \% \text { Out } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})= \\ 0.80 * \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+1.57 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 88 \% \text { In } \\ 12 \% \text { Out } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{T}= \\ 1.12 *(\mathrm{X})+78.45 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \% \text { In } \\ 83 \% \text { Out } \end{gathered}$ |
| High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant (ITE \#932) | $1,000$ <br> Square Feet | 127.15 * (X) | $\begin{gathered} 50 \% \text { In } \\ 50 \% \text { Out } \end{gathered}$ | 10.81 * (X) | $\begin{gathered} 55 \% \text { In } \\ 45 \% \text { Out } \end{gathered}$ | 9.85 * (X) | $60 \%$ In <br> $40 \%$ Out |

Number of trips generated $=$ Trip Rate (Development Unit); $X=1,000$ square feet

Table 3 provides the total number of trips that are projected to be generated by the proposed development during the AM and PM peak hours which includes:

- 85,900 square feet of general office
- 27,285 square feet of shopping center
- 19,595 square feet of restaurant

The number of trips generated represents the number of vehicles entering and exiting the proposed development to and from the adjacent street system. Reductions to the base trip generation estimates are sometimes applied due to internal capture, pass-by trips, or mode share. Internal capture is the tendency for customers or residents to visit retail, office, or residential sections of a site in one trip, but can be counted multiple times in the trip generation since the methodology assumes developments are isolated. Internal capture reductions were performed, consistent with the procedures from ITE's Trip Generation Manual. Once internal capture was accounted for, pass-by trip reduction could be considered. Pass-by capture rates of $34 \%$ and $43 \%$ were used for the PM peak hour for shopping center and restaurant land uses, respectively. Pass-by capture rates were based on information provided in ITE's Trip Generation Handbook.

Worksheets summarizing the internal capture anticipate to occur on site can be found in the Appendix.

Table 3: Proposed Trip Generation

| Land Use Description | ITE <br> Code | Intensity / Units | Daily | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Build Out (2018) External Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Office | 710 | 85,900 SF | 1,170 | 149 | 20 | 169 | 30 | 145 | 175 |
| Shopping Center | 820 | 27,285 SF | 2,919 | 44 | 27 | 71 | 120 | 131 | 251 |
| Restaurant* | 932 | 19,595 SF | 2,492 | 58 | 48 | 106 | 116 | 77 | 193 |
| Build Out (2018) Internal Capture Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Office | 710 | 85,900 SF | 189 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Shopping Center | 820 | 27,285 SF | 825 | 14 | 9 | 23 | 17 | 27 | 44 |
| Restaurant* | 932 | 19,595 SF | 810 | 10 | 13 | 23 | 25 | 17 | 42 |
| EXTERNAL BUILD OUT (2018) TRIPS |  |  | 4,757 | 225 | 69 | 294 | 218 | 305 | 523 |
| Build Out (2018) Pass-By Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shopping Center (34\% Reduction in PM) | 820 | 27,285 SF | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 36 | 70 |
| Restaurant (43\% Reduction in PM) | 932 | 19,595 SF | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 26 | 65 |
| NET NEW EXTERNAL BUILD OUT (2018) TRIPS |  |  | 4,757 | 225 | 69 | 294 | 145 | 243 | 388 |

*Average Rates Used When Equations are not Available. For AM peak it is assumed that only $50 \%$ of the restaurant space will be open.

## TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND TRAFFIC ASSIGNMENT

The distribution and assignment of site traffic to the study area roadway network was based on existing traffic patterns, the locations of the proposed driveway access to/from the site, and the anticipated local traffic patterns.

Based on a review of recent traffic data and an examination of the existing roadway network, reasonable assumptions for the trip distribution were made. The following percentages of trip distribution were assumed on the surrounding roadway network:

- 30\% - Hillcrest Avenue, north of Daniel Avenue
- $25 \%$ - Hillcrest Avenue, south of Haynie Avenue
- $15 \%$ - Daniel Avenue, east of Hillcrest Avenue
- $15 \%$ - Dickens Avenue, north of Daniel Avenue
- $10 \%$ - Dickens Avenue, south of Haynie Avenue
- $5 \%$ - Snider Plaza, north of Daniel Avenue

The site trip distribution used for Build Out (2018) is shown in Exhibit 6.
The anticipated turning movement volumes were computed based on the trip generation information and directional distribution assumptions. Multiplying the trip generation by the traffic assignment percentages results in the turning movements at each intersection. Exhibit 7 shows the projected trip assignment for the site. Pass-by distribution percentages are included in Exhibit 8. These percentages were applied to the pass-by trip generation numbers to obtain pass-by trip assignment (Exhibit 9). Exhibit 10 combines site trip assignment (Exhibit 7) and pass-by trip assignment (Exhibit 9) to obtained total site traffic volumes.

Build Out total traffic volumes for the AM and PM peak hours are presented in Exhibit 11. These volumes were estimated by combining the anticipated Build Out site traffic volumes (Exhibit 10) with the projected Build Out Background traffic volumes (Exhibit 5).

It should be noted that the existing northbound traffic at Daniel Avenue and Snider Plaza was rerouted through the study area intersections for the Build Out scenario.







## SITE DRIVEWAY ACCESS

Access to the Park Plaza redevelopment is provided via a parking garage anticipated to have two (2) project access locations, one (1) along Daniel Avenue (Garage North) and one (1) along Haynie Avenue (Garage South). The Parking Garage South access driveway is planned to be right-in, leftout. Due to the difficulties anticipated in prohibiting right-outs, some site traffic was assigned to make this movement out of the Parking Garage South gate onto Haynie Avenue. However, eastbound leftturns can be physically restricted by the design of the driveway. The distribution and assignment of site traffic at the driveway locations can be seen in Exhibits 6 and 7. It should be noted that the onstreet parking provided on the north side of Daniel Avenue may need to be removed based on the proposed location of the Parking Garage North access driveway.

The conceptual site plan provided in the Appendix shows the anticipated access to the parking garage.

## SIGHT DISTANCE

Based on field observations the proposed driveways are expected to have adequate sight distance. Some vegetation may need to be trimmed west of the anticipated Parking Garage North access driveway along Daniel Avenue to provide a clear line of sight.

## AUXILIARY LANE ANALYSIS

## Right-Turn Deceleration Lanes

The City of University Park defaults to criteria for auxiliary lanes set forth in TxDOT's Access Management Manual. Per Table 2.3 (Auxiliary Lane Thresholds), a right-turn deceleration lane should be considered on roads with a posted speed of 45 mph or less if the projected right-turn volume into a driveway is greater than 60 vehicles per hour (vph). As shown in Table 4, the right-turn deceleration lane threshold is not projected to be exceeded in the AM or PM peak hour at either Parking Garage access location.

Table 4: Build Out Right-Turn Deceleration Lane Analysis

| INTERSECTION | Posted <br> Speed | Volume <br> Threshold | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Warranted? | Turn <br> Volume | Warranted? |  |
| Daniel Ave \& North Garage Access | 30 mph | 60 | 56 | No | 36 | No |
| Daniel Ave \& South Garage Access | 30 mph | 60 | 56 | No | 36 | No |

## Left-Turn Deceleration Lanes

The Park Plaza North Garage access driveway was analyzed to determine the need for a left-turn deceleration lane. A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets by AASHTO outlines criteria for consideration of a left-turn deceleration lane. This criteria is based on the advancing and opposing volumes, as well as the left-turn percentage. The advancing volume is 317 vph , with $36 \%$ being left turns, and the opposing volume is 176 vph in the AM peak hour. Based upon these values and Table 2-1 in the NCHRP Report 780 (referencing AASHTO), a left-turn deceleration lane is not warranted in the AM peak hour. This is also the case in the PM peak hour with 305 vph as the advancing volume with $48 \%$ being left-turns and 196 vph in the opposing volume. Based on the results of this analysis, a left-turn deceleration lane is not recommended at the Park Plaza North Garage access driveway.

## SITE DRIVEWAY ACCESS

Access to the Park Plaza redevelopment is provided via a parking garage anticipated to have two (2) project access locations, one (1) along Daniel Avenue (Garage North) and one (1) along Haynie Avenue (Garage South). The Parking Garage South access driveway is planned to be right-in, leftout. Due to the difficulties anticipated in enforcing this, some site traffic was assigned to make a southbound right-turn out of the Parking Garage South gate and this can be seen in Exhibits 6 and 7. It should be noted that the on-street parking provided on the north side of Daniel Avenue may need to be removed based on the proposed location of the Parking Garage North access driveway.

The conceptual site plan provided in the Appendix shows the anticipated access to the parking garage.

## SIGHT DISTANCE

Based on field observations the proposed driveways are expected to have adequate sight distance. Some vegetation may need to be trimmed west of the anticipated Parking Garage North access driveway along Daniel Avenue to provide a clear line of sight.

## AUXILIARY LANE ANALYSIS

## Right-Turn Deceleration Lanes

The City of University Park defaults to criteria for auxiliary lanes set forth in TxDOT's Access Management Manual. Per Table 2.3 (Auxiliary Lane Thresholds), a right-turn deceleration lane should be considered on roads with a posted speed of 45 mph or less if the projected right-turn volume into a driveway is greater than 60 vehicles per hour (vph). As shown in Table 4, the right-turn deceleration lane threshold is not projected to be exceeded in the AM or PM peak hour at either Parking Garage access location.

Table 4: Build Out Right-Turn Deceleration Lane Analysis

| INTERSECTION | Posted <br> Speed | Volume <br> Threshold | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Warranted? | Turn <br> Volume | Warranted? |  |
| Daniel Ave \& North Garage Access | 30 mph | 60 | 56 | No | 36 | No |
| Daniel Ave \& South Garage Access | 30 mph | 60 | 56 | No | 36 | No |

## Left-Turn Deceleration Lanes

The Park Plaza North Garage access driveway was analyzed to determine the need for a left-turn deceleration lane. A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets by AASHTO outlines criteria for consideration of a left-turn deceleration lane. This criteria is based on the advancing and opposing volumes, as well as the left-turn percentage. The advancing volume is 317 vph , with $36 \%$ being left turns, and the opposing volume is 176 vph in the AM peak hour. Based upon these values and Table 2-1 in the NCHRP Report 780 (referencing AASHTO), a left-turn deceleration lane is not warranted in the AM peak hour. This is also the case in the PM peak hour with 305 vph as the advancing volume with $48 \%$ being left-turns and 196 vph in the opposing volume. Based on the results of this analysis, a left-turn deceleration lane is not recommended at the Park Plaza North Garage access driveway.

Warrant spreadsheets for left-turn deceleration lanes can be found in the Appendix for the AM and PM peak hours.

## INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS

## LEVEL OF SERVICE METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of traffic operations in the study area was comprised of peak hour level of service analyses for each of the peak hours using the Synchro $9^{\text {TM }}$ software. The previously referenced Exhibit 2 details the lane assignments assumed for the existing conditions analysis. The purpose of this analysis was to determine if any deficiencies exist or are anticipated within the network short term so that recommendations for improvements can be made.

Capacity defines the volume of traffic that can be accommodated by a roadway at a specified "level of service." Capacity is affected by various geometric factors including roadway type (e.g. divided or undivided), number of lanes, lane widths, and grades. Level of service (LOS), which is a measure of the degree of congestion, ranges from LOS "A" (free flowing) to LOS " F " (a congested, forced flow condition). A description of each operational state for both signalized and unsignalized intersections is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Level of Service Definitions

| Level of <br> Service | Average Control Delay per <br> Vehicle (sec/veh) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | Signalized | Unsignalized |  |
| A and B | $\leq 10$ (A) | $\leq 10$ (A) | No delays at intersections with continuous flow traffic. <br> Uncongested operations; high frequency of long gaps <br> available for all left and right-turning traffic; no observable <br> queues. |
| C | $>20$ and $\leq 35$ | $>15$ and $\leq 25$ | Moderate delays at intersections with satisfactory to good <br> (Baffic flow. Light congestion; infrequent backups on critical <br> approaches. |
| D | $>35$ and $\leq 55$ | $>25$ and $\leq 35$ | Increased probability of delays along every approach. <br> Significant congestion on critical approaches, but <br> intersection functional. No long standing lines formed. |
| E | $>55$ and $\leq 80$ | $>35$ and $\leq 50$ | Heavy traffic flow condition. Heavy delays probable. No <br> available gaps for cross-street traffic or main street turning <br> traffic. Limit of stable flow. |
| F | $>80$ | $>50$ | Unstable traffic flow. Heavy congestion. Traffic moves in <br> forced flow condition. Average delays greater than one <br> minute highly probable. Total breakdown. |

## EXISTING (2016) TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

The existing conditions analysis is shown in Table 6 below; the level of service (LOS) minimum threshold is LOS D. Synchro $9^{\text {TM }}$ output sheets are provided in the Appendix. The analysis was performed with existing signal operations and controller timings observed in the field. Peak hour factors observed during the turning movement counts were used for existing conditions.

Table 6: Existing (2016) Intersection Capacity Analysis

| INTERSECTION | APPROACH | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELAY } \\ (\mathrm{Sec} / \text { Veh }) \end{gathered}$ | LOS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELAY } \\ \text { (Sec/Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | LOS |
| UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hillcrest Ave \& Haynie Ave | EB | 9.5 | A | 9.5 | A |
| Daniel Ave \& Snider Plz | NB | 10.8 | B | 10.1 | B |
|  | SB | 11.1 | B | 12.7 | B |
| Dickens Ave \& Haynie Ave | EB | 9.0 | A | 8.7 | A |
|  | WB | 9.4 | A | 8.1 | A |
|  | NB | 9.2 | A | 8.4 | A |
|  | SB | 11.3 | B | 8.9 | A |
| Daniel Ave \& Dickens Ave | WB | 14.9 | B | 12.5 | B |
| SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daniel Ave \& Hillcrest Ave | Overall | 21.8 | C | 22.7 | C |
|  | EB | 33.0 | C | 43.4 | D |
|  | WB | 27.7 | C | 33.7 | C |
|  | NB | 22.8 | C | 18.6 | B |
|  | SB | 17.0 | B | 16.0 | B |

Based on the capacity analysis for the AM and PM peak hours, all study intersections are operating at LOS D or better, and as such, no recommendations are made based upon the Existing intersection capacity analysis.

## BUILD OUT (2018) TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

The evaluation of the Build Out (2018) system was comprised of both the AM and PM peak hour level of service analyses. The addition of the parking garage access driveways along Daniel Avenue and Haynie Avenue were included in the analysis. To obtain background growth, the existing volumes were grown at a rate of $3 \%$ for two (2) years. This background growth was added to the anticipated site traffic after internal capture and pass-by deductions were made to obtain the Build Out Total Traffic Volumes (Exhibit 11) turning movements for the intersections analyzed in 2018.

Table 7 summarizes the results of the level of service (LOS) analysis for the Build Out (2018) scenario. Synchro $9^{\text {TM }}$ output sheets are provided in the Appendix.

Table 7: Build Out (2018) Intersection Capacity Analysis

| INTERSECTION | APPROACH | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | DELAY (Sec/Veh) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELAY } \\ (\mathrm{Sec} / \text { Veh }) \end{gathered}$ | LOS |
| UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hillcrest Ave \& Haynie Ave | EB | 9.4 | A | 9.9 | A |
| Daniel Ave \& Snider Plz | SB | 12.5 | B | 22.0 | C |
| Dickens Ave \& Haynie Ave | EB | 9.5 | A | 9.0 | A |
|  | WB | 10.1 | B | 8.3 | A |
|  | NB | 10.1 | B | 8.8 | A |
|  | SB | 12.9 | B | 9.5 | A |
| Daniel Ave \& Dickens Ave | WB | 21.2 | C | 14.9 | B |
| Daniel Ave \& Parking Garage North | NB | 11.0 | B | 14.0 | B |
| Daniel Ave \& Parking Garage South | SB | 9.4 | A | 9.3 | A |
| SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daniel Ave \& Hillcrest Ave | Overall | 25.5 | C | 29.6 | C |
|  | EB | 34.3 | C | 61.5 | E |
|  | WB | 29.9 | C | 47.6 | D |
|  | NB | 27.1 | C | 18.5 | B |
|  | SB | 21.0 | C | 17.6 | B |

Based on the capacity analysis for the AM and PM peak hours, all study intersections are operating at an acceptable LOS, however, the eastbound approach at Daniel Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue is projected to operate at LOS E in the PM peak hour. Based upon the analysis, the following recommendation is made:

- Recommendation: It is recommended to improve the signal timing at Daniel Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue, based on field conditions observed within the first few weeks of the opening of the Park Plaza redevelopment. For analysis purposes, signal timings were altered slightly to maximize intersection efficiency and improve overall level of service. This was accomplished by extending green time for the northbound/southbound movements in the AM peak hour and the eastbound/westbound movements in the PM peak hour.


## BUILD OUT (2018) TRAFFIC ANALYSIS WITH IMPROVEMENTS

Table 8 summarizes the results of the level of service (LOS) analysis for the Build Out (2018) with Improvements scenario. This scenario includes signal timing improvements at the intersection of Daniel Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue. Synchro $9^{\text {TM }}$ output sheets are provided in the Appendix.

Table 8: Build Out (2018) Intersection Capacity Analysis with Improvements

| INTERSECTION | APPROACH | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELAY } \\ (\text { Sec/Veh }) \end{gathered}$ | LOS | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELAY } \\ (\mathrm{Sec} / \mathrm{Veh}) \end{gathered}$ | LOS |
| UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hillcrest Ave \& Haynie Ave | EB | 10.0 | A | 9.5 | A |
| Daniel Ave \& Snider Plz | SB | 12.6 | B | 22.1 | C |
| Dickens Ave \& Haynie Ave | EB | 9.5 | A | 9.0 | A |
|  | WB | 10.1 | B | 8.3 | A |
|  | NB | 10.1 | B | 8.8 | A |
|  | SB | 12.9 | B | 9.5 | A |
| Daniel Ave \& Dickens Ave | WB | 21.2 | C | 14.9 | B |
| Daniel Ave \& Parking Garage North | NB | 11.0 | B | 14.0 | B |
| Daniel Ave \& Parking Garage South | SB | 9.4 | A | 9.3 | A |
| SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daniel Ave \& Hillcrest Ave | Overall | 19.0 | $B$ | 27.8 | C |
|  | EB | 39.5 | D | 36.6 | D |
|  | WB | 39.3 | D | 27.5 | C |
|  | NB | 11.1 | B | 24.8 | C |
|  | SB | 13.2 | B | 27.0 | C |

Based on the capacity analysis for the AM and PM peak hours, signal timing improvements are anticipated to improve operations at the intersection of Daniel Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue in the AM peak hour while keeping LOS to the existing condition of C , with slightly greater delay in the PM peak hour.

## ROADWAY CAPACITY ANALYSIS

Roadway capacity analyses were completed using level of service criteria outlined by the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG). The traffic condition criteria is based on the volume-tocapacity ratio for traffic volumes and roadway capacity. Table 9 provides a description of this criterion as it applies to roadways.

Table 9: Traffic Condition Criteria for Roadway Capacity Analysis


V = Peak Hour Directional Volume (vehicles per hour)
$\mathrm{C}=$ Per Lane Directional Capacity (vehicles per hour)
An "Acceptable" operating condition means the facility is underutilized, while a "Failing" operating condition indicates the approximate carrying capacity has been met or exceeded. Considering the roadway facility types, a capacity of 750 vehicles per hour per lane was used during analyses for Hillcrest Avenue, while a capacity of 475 vehicles per hour per lane was used for Daniel Avenue.

## EXISTING (2016) ANALYSIS

Table 10 provides a summary of directional and two-way roadway capacity analysis for Hillcrest Avenue and Daniel Avenue. Based upon the results of the Existing (2016) thoroughfare capacity analysis, all roadway segments are operating at an acceptable overall traffic condition for the Existing scenario.

Table 10: Existing Roadway Capacity Analysis

| Roadway | Segment | Section | Direction | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Vol | V/C <br> Ratio | Traffic Condition | Vol | V/C <br> Ratio | Traffic Condition |
| Hillcrest Avenue | South of Daniel Avenue | Four-Lane Undivided | NB | 753 | 0.50 | Acceptable | 811 | 0.54 | Acceptable |
|  |  |  | SB | 999 | 0.67 | Tolerable | 878 | 0.59 | Acceptable |
|  |  |  | Total | 1,752 | 0.58 | Acceptable | 1,689 | 0.56 | Acceptable |
| Daniel Avenue | West of Hillcrest Avenue | Two-Lane Undivided | EB | 101 | 0.21 | Acceptable | 195 | 0.41 | Acceptable |
|  |  |  | WB | 297 | 0.63 | Acceptable | 323 | 0.68 | Tolerable |
|  |  |  | Total | 398 | 0.42 | Acceptable | 518 | 0.55 | Acceptable |

## BUILD OUT (2018) ANALYSIS

Table 11 provides a summary of directional and two-way roadway capacity analysis for Hillcrest Avenue and Daniel Avenue. Based upon the results of the Build Out (2018) roadway capacity analysis, Daniel Avenue is projected to approach capacity in the PM peak hour in the westbound direction.

Table 11: Build Out Roadway Capacity Analysis

| Roadway | Segment | Section | Direction | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Vol | V/C Ratio | Traffic Condition | Vol | V/C <br> Ratio | Traffic Condition |
| Hillcrest Avenue | South of Daniel Avenue | Four-Lane Undivided | NB | 833 | 0.56 | Acceptable | 883 | 0.59 | Acceptable |
|  |  |  | SB | 1,094 | 0.73 | Tolerable | 947 | 0.63 | Acceptable |
|  |  |  | Total | 1,927 | 0.64 | Acceptable | 1,830 | 0.61 | Acceptable |
| Daniel Avenue | West of Hillcrest Avenue | Two-Lane Undivided | EB | 146 | 0.31 | Acceptable | 385 | 0.81 | Tolerable |
|  |  |  | WB | 417 | 0.88 | Tolerable | 482 | 1.01 | Failing |
|  |  |  | Total | 563 | 0.59 | Acceptable | 867 | 0.91 | Tolerable |

Based upon the results of the roadway capacity analysis the following recommendation is made:

- Recommendation: Daniel Avenue operates in a tolerable condition overall. With the westbound direction during the PM peak hour approaching capacity, it is recommended to be monitored.


## OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

## NEIGHBORHOOD IMPACT

The impact on the neighborhood streets of the Park Plaza redevelopment was quantified through the projected site traffic distribution and assignment. It is anticipated that the majority of site traffic ( $75 \%$ ) will be accessing the site via Hillcrest Avenue and Daniel Avenue and not traveling through the neighborhood streets to the west.

The remaining $25 \%$ of traffic is projected to circulate through the neighborhoods to the west. This percentage results in an increase of 72 additional vehicles in the AM peak hour and 90 additional vehicles in the PM peak hours at the intersection of Daniel Avenue and Dickens Avenue, split between four movements. At the intersection of Haynie Avenue and Dickens Avenue, an additional 30 vehicles in the AM and 39 vehicles in the PM peak hours, split between three movements.

This translates to an average additional .93 seconds of delay on each approach at the Dickens Avenue and Haynie Avenue intersection in the AM peak hour, which is nearly unnoticeable. At the Daniel Avenue and Dickens Avenue intersection, the westbound approach delay is anticipated to increase by 6.3 seconds while still operating at an acceptable LOS, C.

Of this $25 \%$ of site-generated traffic that is projected to circulate through the west neighborhood, the majority is anticipated to be current residents attempting to access the shopping center or restaurants. Due to this, and the minimal effects at the two intersections discussed, the neighborhood impact is not anticipated to be an issue.

## PARKING AND PARKING GARAGE ANALYSIS

## Parking Needs

The purpose of this parking analysis is to determine if the planned 714 spaces is anticipated to provide adequate parking for the proposed development.

Parking needs for the Park Plaza redevelopment were analyzed in two ways. One analysis was carried out using University Park's off-street parking requirements while another was done using base rates and time distribution of parking demand throughout the day from the Urban Land Institute (ULI).

University Park provides parking space requirements for specified land uses which are provided in Sec. 26-100 of the City of University Park Zoning Ordinance. Table 12 summarizes the anticipated parking needs based upon The City's requirements. It was found that 620 spaces were needed based upon these requirements.

Table 12: University Park Off-street Parking Requirements

| Land Use | Units | Base Ratio | Stand Alone <br> Demand |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Office | 85,900 | 1 space $/ 300 \mathrm{sf}$ | 287 |
| Retail | 27,285 | 1 space $/ 200 \mathrm{sf}$ | 137 |
| Restaurant | 19,595 | 1 space $/ 100 \mathrm{sf}$ | 196 |
| Total | $\mathbf{y y}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 0}$ |  |

For comparison purposes, base rates and time distribution of parking demand recommended by ULI were used in the second analysis that was carried out. A special time distribution is provided for a shopping center for the month of December. By factoring the peak parking demand of each land use, which may have different peak times, the actual parking demand in each hour of the day can be modeled, taking into account the fact that the same space can be used by different land uses during different peaks.

From the analysis, it was found that the projected weekday peak time during December is anticipated to be 11:00 AM - 12:00 PM for the Park Plaza redevelopment. While the stand alone demand is anticipated to be very similar to the demand found using The City's requirements, when time of day factors are considered, the parking required is anticipate to be reduced by 124 spaces. This brings ULl's parking requirements to 510 spaces. The findings of the analysis can be found in Table 13.

Table 13: ULI Parking Requirements

| Use | Building Area <br> (1,000 sf) | Base <br> Ratio | Time of <br> Day Factor | Parking <br> Required | Stand Alone <br> Demand |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Office | 85.9 | 0.30 | $85 \%$ | 22 | 26 |
| Office Employee | 85.9 | 3.50 | $95 \%$ | 286 | 301 |
| Restaurant | 19.595 | 9.00 | $45 \%$ | 80 | 177 |
| Restaurant Empolyee | 19.595 | 1.50 | $100 \%$ | 30 | 30 |
| Retail | 27.285 | 2.90 | $90 \%$ | 72 | 80 |
| Retail Employee | 27.285 | 0.70 | $100 \%$ | 20 | 20 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

The parking garage at Park Plaza is anticipated to provide 714 spaces, which well exceeds parking requirements outlined by The City and ULI. In addition, it is anticipated that the garage will be reserved specifically for Park Plaza visitors. For this reason, the traffic impacts of potential shared parking demand from Snider Plaza visitors was not analyzed.

## Parking Garage Analysis

A portal capacity analysis was carried out by HWA Parking. The results of this analysis can be found in the Appendix. Based upon the analysis, the maximum $90 \%$ probability design queue is projected to be two vehicles for the PM peak departure. It should be stressed that this analysis was done with the conservative approach of considering only one garage access location, the North Garage access driveway. If the South Garage access driveway were to be included in the analysis, it is anticipated that the peak hour departure queue lengths would decrease.

These results are consistent with that of the Build Out scenario intersection capacity results which project a queue length of 2 vehicles exiting northbound in the PM peak hour. Based upon the current site plan, a queue of approximately 4 vehicle lengths ( 85 ft ) can be accommodated in the garage stacking area shown. Therefore, queueing at the gate is not anticipated to be an issue.

## LOADING RAMPS

One service dock is anticipated to be provided on site. The location is on the south side of the site along Haynie Avenue. This location is highlighted on the site plan in the Appendix. It should be noted that the site is anticipated to be served by design vehicles comparable to an SU-30 (single unit 2-axle or similar) and that large trailer trucks with three or more axles are not expected to be attempting to access the site. If larger trucks were to access the site and were not able to dock, on-street parking would occur along Hillcrest Avenue. When trucks are loading and unloading they will be instructed to strictly use Hillcrest Avenue when attempting to access the site. This way, residential areas will not be impacted. These directions are in agreement with designated truck routes outlined by The City and can be seen in Exhibit A.

## PEDESTRIAN INTERACTION

Currently, a pedestrian crossing is provided along the east leg of the Daniel Avenue and Snider Plaza intersection. The site plan proposes to add another crossing along the west leg of this intersection as well as at the stop control of the intersection of Haynie Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue. Appropriate signage is recommended to be installed so drivers are aware of the pedestrian crossing. With driver awareness addressed, and the overall busy nature of the area, drivers are anticipated to travel at safe operating speeds in a way that pedestrians will be able to cross in a safe manner.

In addition to signage, accessibility of pedestrian crossings should be reviewed and upgraded where necessary to ensure compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. With pedestrian activity anticipated to increase at the signalized intersection of Hillcrest Avenue and Daniel Avenue, it is also recommended that all pedestrian crossings and the corresponding pedestrian equipment be reviewed for compliance with the ADA and Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) standards.

Additional consideration should be given to the removal of the on-street parking provided in the channelized eastbound right-turn lane at the Daniel Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue intersection due to driver expectancy considerations as well as sight distance concerns for pedestrians.

## VALET OPERATION

A turning simulation was carried out to check the feasibility of westbound left-turns entering the valet area of the site. The analysis was carried out using a design vehicle that simulates a large passenger car. Exhibit 12 provides the simulated turning movement analyzed.

Exhibit 12. AutoTURN Simulation


Based upon the analysis, the valet lane is planned to have a length of about 66 feet, which will easily accommodate for two vehicles. It is recommended that the valet lane be constructed so it cut further into the site, by about three feet, while not impacting the location of the proposed building. With this adjustment, the analysis shows that a larger passenger vehicle can turn left into the valet lane travelling westbound on Daniel Avenue and make another left to exit back onto Daniel travelling westbound, once again, to access the parking garage. Users traveling eastbound on Daniel Avenue and southbound on Snider Plaza are anticipated to have no issues accessing the valet lane. It is to be stressed that as time goes on, users will become more accustom to the valet operations.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

## Traffic Impact Analysis

Intersection Capacity Analysis
Based on the results of the intersection analysis, it is recommended to implement signal timing improvements to the traffic signal at Daniel Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue based on field conditions observed within the first few weeks of the opening of the Park Plaza redevelopment.

For analysis purposes, signal timings were altered slightly to maximize intersection efficiency and improve overall level of service. This was accomplished by extending green time for the northbound/southbound movements in the AM peak hour and the eastbound/westbound movements in the PM peak hour.

## Roadway Capacity Analysis

Based upon the results of the roadway capacity analysis, Daniel Avenue, west of Hillcrest Avenue, operates in a tolerable condition in the Build Out (2018) scenario. The westbound direction during the PM peak hour approaches capacity and should be monitored.

## Other Considerations

## Neighborhood Impacts

The Park Plaza redevelopment impact on the surrounding neighborhoods is expected to be minimal. 75\% of traffic is anticipated to access the site via Hillcrest Avenue and Daniel Avenue with the other $25 \%$ circulating through the neighborhood streets to the west. This $25 \%$ is expected to have the impact on the neighborhood. This additional traffic is only anticipated to add a total of 72 vehicles in the AM peak hour and 90 vehicles in the PM peak hour at the intersection of Daniel Avenue and Dickens Avenue (split between four movements). An additional 30 vehicles in the AM peak hour and 39 vehicles in the PM peak hour (split between three movements) at the Haynie Avenue and Dickens Avenue intersection are projected as well. Of this $25 \%$, the majority is anticipated to be current residents attempting to access the shopping center or restaurants. Due to this, and the minimal affect at the two intersections along Dickens Avenue, the neighborhood impact is not anticipated to be an observable issue.

## Parking

Based upon the two parking requirement analyses, the anticipated supply of 714 spaces, well exceeds requirements set forth by both The City and ULI. In addition, it is anticipated that the garage will be reserved specifically for Park Plaza visitors. For this reason, the traffic impacts of potential shared parking demand from Snider Plaza visitors was not analyzed.

With the proposed location of the North Garage access driveway, the on-street parking provided along Daniel Avenue to the north may need to be removed.

## Truck Traffic and Loading Zones

One service dock is anticipated to be provided on site. The location is on the south side of the site along Haynie Avenue. Truck traffic will be directed along Hillcrest Avenue when attempting to access the site. These directions are in agreement with designated truck routes outlined by The City. It is also to be stressed that trucks serving the development are anticipated to be comparable to an SU-30 (single unit 2axle or similar) and that large trailer trucks with three or more axles are not expected to be attempting to access the site.

## Pedestrian Crossing

Three pedestrian crossings are indicated on the current site plan. Two will be provided at the Daniel Avenue and Snider Plaza intersection, one on the east and one on the west legs. The third is to be provided at the stop control at the intersection of Haynie Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue. Appropriate signage is recommended to be installed to make drivers well aware of these pedestrian crossings. In addition to signage, accessibility of pedestrian crossings should be reviewed and upgraded where necessary to ensure compliance with the ADA standards. Furthermore, at the signalized intersection of Daniel Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue, pedestrian equipment should be reviewed as well for compliance with ADA and PROWAG standards.

Additional consideration should be given to the removal of the on-street parking provided in the channelized eastbound right-turn lane at the Daniel Avenue and Hillcrest Avenue intersection due to driver expectancy considerations as well as sight distance concerns for pedestrians.

## Valet Drop-off

A turning simulation was carried out to check the feasibility of westbound left-turns entering the valet area of the site. The analysis was carried out using a design vehicle that simulates a large passenger car. From the simulation, it is recommended that the valet lane be constructed so it cut further into the site, by about three feet, while not impacting the location of the proposed building. With this change, it is projected that users should be able to make a left-turn into the valet area travelling westbound on Daniel Avenue and that the valet can exit turning left to access the parking garage.

## APPENDIX

1. Raw Traffic Counts
2. Conceptual Site Plan
3. Left-Turn Analysis
4. Existing (2016) Traffic Analysis
5. Build Out (2018) Traffic Analysis
6. Improved Build Out (2018) Traffic Analysis
7. HWA Portal Capacity Analysis
8. Internal Capture Worksheets

# GRAM Traffic North Texas, Inc. <br> 1120 W Lovers Lane <br> Arlington, TX 76015 

File Name : DANIEL AVE @ DICKENS AVE
Site Code : 00000019
Start Date : 1/20/2016
Page No : 1
Groups Printed- Unshifted

|  | DICKENS AVE Southbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | DICKENS AVE Northbound |  |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 16 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| 07:15 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 25 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| 07:30 | 5 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 41 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| 07:45 | 17 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 48 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 25 | 14 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 |
| Total | 35 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 130 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 175 | 0 | 52 | 40 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 402 |
| 08:00 | 14 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 30 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 20 | 15 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
| 08:15 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 26 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| 08:30 | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 16 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| 08:45 | 9 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 23 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 81 |
| Total | 45 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 95 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 136 | 0 | 59 | 43 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 361 |

*** BREAK ***

| 16:30 | 12 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 25 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 29 | 21 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:45 | 7 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 24 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 25 | 32 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| Total | 19 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 49 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 54 | 53 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 253 |
| 17:00 | 5 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 26 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 21 | 29 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |
| 17:15 | 18 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 26 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 21 | 30 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |
| 17:30 | 11 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 23 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 39 | 0 | 28 | 16 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| 17:45 | 11 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 21 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 34 | 0 | 16 | 21 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| Total | 45 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 96 | 0 | 54 | 4 | 154 | 0 | 86 | 96 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 515 |
| 18:00 | 7 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 30 | 24 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| 18:15 | 6 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 13 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| Grand Total | 157 | 417 | 0 | 0 | 574 | 403 | 0 | 191 | 4 | 598 | 0 | 295 | 270 | 0 | 565 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1739 |
| Apprch \% | 27.4 | 72.6 | 0 | 0 |  | 67.4 | 0 | 31.9 | 0.7 |  | 0 | 52.2 | 47.8 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Total \% | 9 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 23.2 | 0 | 11 | 0.2 | 34.4 | 0 | 17 | 15.5 | 0 | 32.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |


|  | DICKENS AVE Southbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | DICKENS AVE Northbound |  |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 to 11:45-Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:30 | 5 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 41 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| 07:45 | 17 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 48 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 25 | 14 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 |
| 08:00 | 14 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 30 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 20 | 15 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
| 08:15 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 26 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| Total Volume | 45 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 145 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 192 | 0 | 67 | 54 | 0 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 478 |
| \% App. Total | 27.3 | 72.7 | 0 | 0 |  | 75.5 | 0 | 24.5 | 0 |  | 0 | 55.4 | 44.6 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 662 | . 612 | . 000 | . 000 | . 625 | . 755 | . 000 | . 618 | . 000 | . 800 | . 000 | . 670 | . 900 | . 000 | . 776 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | 733 |

# GRAM Traffic North Texas, Inc. 

1120 W Lovers Lane
Arlington, TX 76015

File Name : DANIEL AVE @ DICKENS AVE
Site Code : 00000019
Start Date : 1/20/2016
Page No :2

|  | DICKENS AVE <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | DICKENS AVE Northbound |  |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 12:00 to 18:15-Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 16:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16:30 | 12 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 25 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 29 | 21 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 |
| 16:45 | 7 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 24 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 25 | 32 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| 17:00 | 5 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 26 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 21 | 29 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 |
| 17:15 | 18 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 26 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 21 | 30 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |
| Total Volume | 42 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 101 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 96 | 112 | 0 | 208 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 525 |
| \% App. Total | 25.5 | 74.5 | 0 | 0 |  | 66.4 | 0 | 33.6 | 0 |  | 0 | 46.2 | 53.8 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 583 | . 750 | . 000 | . 000 | .699 | . 971 | . 000 | . 850 | . 000 | . 927 | . 000 | . 828 | . 875 | . 000 | . 912 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 875 |

# GRAM Traffic North Texas, Inc. 

1120 W. Lovers Lane
Arlington, TX 76013

File Name: DANIEL AVE @ HILLCREST AVE
Site Code : 00000241
Start Date : 1/20/2016
Page No : 1
Groups Printed- Unshifted

|  | HILLCREST AVE Southbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | HILLCREST AVE Northbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 | 6 | 61 | 12 | 0 | 79 | 44 | 28 | 7 | 1 | 80 | 16 | 34 | 11 | 2 | 63 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 18 | 240 |
| 07:15 | 18 | 79 | 15 | 0 | 112 | 92 | 36 | 5 | 0 | 133 | 7 | 67 | 22 | 4 | 100 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 19 | 364 |
| 07:30 | 17 | 202 | 30 | 1 | 250 | 87 | 34 | 14 | 0 | 135 | 21 | 49 | 44 | 2 | 116 | 3 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 23 | 524 |
| 07:45 | 22 | 228 | 22 | 0 | 272 | 69 | 38 | 15 | 0 | 122 | 23 | 116 | 59 | 3 | 201 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 22 | 617 |
| Total | 63 | 570 | 79 | 1 | 713 | 292 | 136 | 41 | 1 | 470 | 67 | 266 | 136 | 11 | 480 | 9 | 41 | 31 | 1 | 82 | 1745 |
| 08:00 | 24 | 190 | 20 | 0 | 234 | 40 | 27 | 15 | , | 83 | 27 | 169 | 50 | 2 | 248 | 2 | 16 | 8 | 1 | 27 | 592 |
| 08:15 | 30 | 109 | 23 | 2 | 164 | 44 | 24 | 8 | 0 | 76 | 8 | 145 | 42 | 1 | 196 | 3 | 17 | 11 | 0 | 31 | 467 |
| 08:30 | 23 | 122 | 24 | 2 | 171 | 43 | 30 | 8 | 0 | 81 | 8 | 88 | 53 | 6 | 155 | 5 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 22 | 429 |
| 08:45 | 12 | 116 | 25 | 0 | 153 | 34 | 33 | 2 | 0 | 69 | 19 | 85 | 30 | 2 | 136 | 6 | 8 | 15 | 1 | 30 | 388 |
| Total | 89 | 537 | 92 | 4 | 722 | 161 | 114 | 33 | 1 | 309 | 62 | 487 | 175 | 11 | 735 | 16 | 52 | 40 | 2 | 110 | 1876 |

*** BREAK ***

| 16:30 | 22 | 130 | 23 | 0 | 175 | 40 | 26 | 16 | 0 | 82 | 17 | 129 | 48 | 3 | 197 | 4 | 21 | 12 | 2 | 39 | 493 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:45 | 18 | 154 | 19 | 2 | 193 | 44 | 31 | 13 | 0 | 88 | 22 | 130 | 42 | 1 | 195 | 7 | 15 | 8 | 0 | 30 | 506 |
| Total | 40 | 284 | 42 | 2 | 368 | 84 | 57 | 29 | 0 | 170 | 39 | 259 | 90 | 4 | 392 | 11 | 36 | 20 | 2 | 69 | 999 |
| 17:00 | 27 | 136 | 26 | 1 | 190 | 52 | 36 | 33 | 0 | 121 | 32 | 136 | 46 | 4 | 218 | 6 | 32 | 15 | 0 | 53 | 582 |
| 17:15 | 24 | 150 | 23 | 0 | 197 | 52 | 29 | 18 | 2 | 101 | 20 | 146 | 42 | 4 | 212 | 9 | 32 | 9 | 1 | 51 | 561 |
| 17:30 | 36 | 167 | 26 | 0 | 229 | 51 | 41 | 20 | 0 | 112 | 23 | 116 | 45 | 3 | 187 | 10 | 29 | 9 | 2 | 50 | 578 |
| 17:45 | 32 | 167 | 20 | 3 | 222 | 56 | 29 | 15 | 1 | 101 | 18 | 128 | 59 | 5 | 210 | 5 | 25 | 14 | 0 | 44 | 577 |
| Total | 119 | 620 | 95 | 4 | 838 | 211 | 135 | 86 | 3 | 435 | 93 | 526 | 192 | 16 | 827 | 30 | 118 | 47 | 3 | 198 | 2298 |
| 18:00 | 34 | 162 | 13 | 0 | 209 | 48 | 32 | 23 | 0 | 103 | 16 | 137 | 45 | 1 | 199 | 6 | 26 | 15 | 0 | 47 | 558 |
| 18:15 | 35 | 171 | 24 | 0 | 230 | 37 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 75 | 20 | 145 | 37 | 3 | 205 | 5 | 12 | 10 | 1 | 28 | 538 |
| Grand Total | 380 | 2344 | 345 | 11 | 3080 | 833 | 493 | 231 | 5 | 1562 | 297 | 1820 | 675 | 46 | 2838 | 77 | 285 | 163 | 9 | 534 | 8014 |
| Apprch \% | 12.3 | 76.1 | 11.2 | 0.4 |  | 53.3 | 31.6 | 14.8 | 0.3 |  | 10.5 | 64.1 | 23.8 | 1.6 |  | 14.4 | 53.4 | 30.5 | 1.7 |  |  |
| Total \% | 4.7 | 29.2 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 38.4 | 10.4 | 6.2 | 2.9 | 0.1 | 19.5 | 3.7 | 22.7 | 8.4 | 0.6 | 35.4 | 1 | 3.6 | 2 | 0.1 | 6.7 |  |


|  | HILLCREST AVE Southbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | HILLCREST AVE Northbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 to 11:45-Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:30 | 17 | 202 | 30 | 1 | 250 | 87 | 34 | 14 | 0 | 135 | 21 | 49 | 44 | 2 | 116 | 3 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 23 | 524 |
| 07:45 | 22 | 228 | 22 | 0 | 272 | 69 | 38 | 15 | 0 | 122 | 23 | 116 | 59 | 3 | 201 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 22 | 617 |
| 08:00 | 24 | 190 | 20 | 0 | 234 | 40 | 27 | 15 | 1 | 83 | 27 | 169 | 50 | 2 | 248 | 2 | 16 | 8 | 1 | 27 | 592 |
| 08:15 | 30 | 109 | 23 | 2 | 164 | 44 | 24 | 8 | 0 | 76 | 8 | 145 | 42 | 1 | 196 | 3 | 17 | 11 | 0 | 31 | 467 |
| Total Volume | 93 | 729 | 95 | 3 | 920 | 240 | 123 | 52 | 1 | 416 | 79 | 479 | 195 | 8 | 761 | 11 | 60 | 30 | 2 | 103 | 2200 |
| \% App. Total | 10.1 | 79.2 | 10.3 | 0.3 |  | 57.7 | 29.6 | 12.5 | 0.2 |  | 10.4 | 62.9 | 25.6 | 1.1 |  | 10.7 | 58.3 | 29.1 | 1.9 |  |  |
| PHF | . 775 | . 799 | 792 | . 375 | . 846 | . 690 | . 809 | . 867 | . 250 | . 770 | . 731 | . 709 | . 826 | . 667 | . 767 | . 917 | . 882 | . 682 | . 500 | 831 | 891 |

# GRAM Traffic North Texas, Inc. 

1120 W. Lovers Lane
Arlington, TX 76013

File Name : DANIEL AVE @ HILLCREST AVE
Site Code : 00000241
Start Date : 1/20/2016
Page No : 2

|  | HILLCREST AVE Southbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | HILLCREST AVE Northbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 12:00 to 18:15-Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 17:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17:00 | 27 | 136 | 26 | 1 | 190 | 52 | 36 | 33 | 0 | 121 | 32 | 136 | 46 | 4 | 218 | 6 | 32 | 15 | 0 | 53 | 582 |
| 17:15 | 24 | 150 | 23 | 0 | 197 | 52 | 29 | 18 | 2 | 101 | 20 | 146 | 42 | 4 | 212 | 9 | 32 | 9 | 1 | 51 | 561 |
| 17:30 | 36 | 167 | 26 | 0 | 229 | 51 | 41 | 20 | 0 | 112 | 23 | 116 | 45 | 3 | 187 | 10 | 29 | 9 | 2 | 50 | 578 |
| 17:45 | 32 | 167 | 20 | 3 | 222 | 56 | 29 | 15 | 1 | 101 | 18 | 128 | 59 | 5 | 210 | 5 | 25 | 14 | 0 | 44 | 577 |
| Total Volume | 119 | 620 | 95 | 4 | 838 | 211 | 135 | 86 | 3 | 435 | 93 | 526 | 192 | 16 | 827 | 30 | 118 | 47 | 3 | 198 | 2298 |
| \% App. Total | 14.2 | 74 | 11.3 | 0.5 |  | 48.5 | 31 | 19.8 | 0.7 |  | 11.2 | 63.6 | 23.2 | 1.9 |  | 15.2 | 59.6 | 23.7 | 1.5 |  |  |
| PHF | . 826 | . 928 | . 913 | . 333 | . 915 | . 942 | . 823 | . 652 | . 375 | . 899 | . 727 | . 901 | . 814 | . 800 | . 948 | . 750 | . 922 | . 783 | . 375 | . 934 | . 987 |

File Name: DANIEL AVE @ SNYDER PLAZA
Start Date: 1/20/2016
Start Time: 7:00:00 AM
Site Code: 00000054

|  | SNYDER PLAZA <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE <br> Westbound |  |  |  | SNYDER PLAZA <br> Northbound |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turns | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds |
| 07:00 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:15 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 39 | 27 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:30 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 52 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:45 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 56 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 41 | 41 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 42 | 34 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:30 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 26 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:45 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30 | 14 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 32 | 34 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:45 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 25 | 0 | 28 | 36 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 24 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00 | 19 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 35 | 47 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 29 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:15 | 19 | 0 | 10 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 41 | 34 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 28 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:30 | 17 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 36 | 43 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 28 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45 | 19 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 28 | 0 | 29 | 35 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 24 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 33 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:15 | 14 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 22 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 |

# GRAM Traffic North Texas, Inc. <br> 1120 W Lovers Lane 

Arlington, TX 76015

|  | ```File Name : DANIEL AVE @ SNYDER Site Code :00000054 Start Date :1/20/2016 Groups Printed- Cars Page No :1``` |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PLAZA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SNYDER PLAZA Southbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | SNYDER PLAZA Northbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Apo. Toal | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Toal | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Ape. Toal | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Toal |  |
| 07:00 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 17 | 10 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 45 |
| 07:15 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 39 | 27 | 4 | 70 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 102 |
| 07:30 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 52 | 12 | 2 | 66 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 111 |
| 07:45 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 56 | 25 | 1 | 82 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 126 |
| Total | 23 | 0 | 13 | 9 | 45 | 0 | 164 | 74 | 7 | 245 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 17 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 384 |
| 08:00 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 41 | 41 | 1 | 83 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 126 |
| 08:15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 0 | 42 | 34 | 1 | 77 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 120 |
| 08:30 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 26 | 17 | 0 | 43 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 82 |
| 08:45 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 1 | 57 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 21 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 97 |
| Total | 27 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 50 | 0 | 144 | 113 | 3 | 260 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 21 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 425 |


| 16:30 | 14 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 25 | 0 | 32 | 34 | 2 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 128 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:45 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 39 | 0 | 28 | 36 | 2 | 66 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 142 |
| Total | 23 | 0 | 12 | 29 | 64 | 0 | 60 | 70 | 4 | 134 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 270 |
| 17:00 | 19 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 39 | 0 | 35 | 47 | 5 | 87 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 172 |
| 17:15 | 19 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 35 | 0 | 41 | 34 | 7 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 157 |
| 17:30 | 17 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 36 | 43 | 4 | 83 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 152 |
| 17:45 | 19 | 0 | 7 | 28 | 54 | 0 | 29 | 35 | 2 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 155 |
| Total | 74 | 0 | 30 | 54 | 158 | 0 | 141 | 159 | 18 | 318 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 41 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 636 |
| 18:00 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 33 | 28 | 3 | 64 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 115 |
| 18:15 | 14 |  | 6 | 6 | 26 | 0 | 22 | 28 | 3 | 53 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 100 |
| Grand Total | 171 | 0 | 72 | 118 | 361 | 0 | 564 | 472 | 38 | 1074 | 6 | 22 | 17 | 0 | 45 | 115 | 335 | 0 | 0 | 450 | 1930 |
| Apprch \% | 47.4 | 0 | 19.9 | 32.7 |  | 0 | 52.5 | 43.9 | 3.5 |  | 13.3 | 48.9 | 37.8 | 0 |  | 25.6 | 74.4 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 8.9 | 0 | 3.7 | 6.1 | 18.7 | 0 | 29.2 | 24.5 | 2 | 55.6 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0 | 2.3 | 6 | 17.4 | 0 | 0 | 23.3 |  |


|  | SNYDER PLAZA Southbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | SNYDER PLAZA Northbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 to 11:45-Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:30 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 52 | 12 | 2 | 66 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 111 |
| 07:45 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 56 | 25 | 1 | 82 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 126 |
| 08:00 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 41 | 41 | 1 | 83 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 126 |
| 08:15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 0 | 42 | 34 | 1 | 77 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 120 |
| Total Volume | 26 | 0 | 13 | 16 | 55 | 0 | 191 | 112 | 5 | 308 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 17 | 25 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 483 |
| \% App. Total | 47.3 | 0 | 23.6 | 29.1 |  | 0 | 62 | 36.4 | 1.6 |  | 11.8 | 47.1 | 41.2 | 0 |  | 24.3 | 75.7 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 722 | . 000 | . 542 | . 667 | . 809 | . 000 | . 853 | . 683 | . 625 | . 928 | . 250 | . 667 | . 875 | . 000 | . 708 | . 625 | . 929 | . 000 | . 000 | . 831 | 958 |

# GRAM Traffic North Texas, Inc. 

1120 W Lovers Lane
Arlington, TX 76015

File Name : DANIEL AVE @ SNYDER PLAZA
Site Code : 00000054
Start Date : 1/20/2016
Page No : 2

|  | SNYDER PLAZA Southbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | SNYDER PLAZA Northbound |  |  |  |  | DANIEL AVE Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 12:00 to 18:15-Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 17:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17:00 | 19 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 39 | 0 | 35 | 47 | 5 | 87 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 172 |
| 17:15 | 19 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 35 | 0 | 41 | 34 | 7 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 157 |
| 17:30 | 17 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 36 | 43 | 4 | 83 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 152 |
| 17:45 | 19 | 0 | 7 | 28 | 54 | 0 | 29 | 35 | 2 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 155 |
| Total Volume | 74 | 0 | 30 | 54 | 158 | 0 | 141 | 159 | 18 | 318 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 41 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 636 |
| \% App. Total | 46.8 | 0 | 19 | 34.2 |  | 0 | 44.3 | 50 | 5.7 |  | 0 | 30 | 70 | 0 |  | 27.3 | 72.7 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 974 | . 000 | . 750 | . 482 | . 731 | . 000 | . 860 | . 846 | . 643 | . 914 | . 000 | . 375 | . 583 | . 000 | . 625 | . 788 | . 940 | . 000 | . 000 | . 893 | 924 |

# GRAM Traffic North Texas, Inc. <br> 1120 W Lovers Lane 

Arlington, TX 76015
File Name : HAYNIE AVE @ DICKENS AVE
Site Code : 120
Start Date : 1/20/2016
Page No : 1
Groups Printed- Unshifted

|  | DICKENS AVE Southbound |  |  |  |  | HAYNIE AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | DICKENS AVE Northbound |  |  |  |  | HAYNIE AVE Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 | 0 | 12 | 9 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 42 |
| 07:15 | 1 | 19 | 16 | 1 | 37 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 71 |
| 07:30 | 0 | 39 | 33 | 1 | 73 | 0 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 22 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 122 |
| 07:45 | 2 | 39 | 57 | 2 | 100 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 35 | 6 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 39 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 187 |
| Total | 3 | 109 | 115 | 4 | 231 | 1 | 74 | 6 | 1 | 82 | 10 | 65 | 1 | 0 | 76 | 15 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 33 | 422 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 34 | 32 | 1 | 67 | 0 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 21 | 9 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 135 |
| 08:15 | 0 | 13 | 25 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 72 |
| 08:30 | 1 | 19 | 10 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 74 |
| 08:45 | 2 | 20 | 16 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 68 |
| Total | 3 | 86 | 83 | 1 | 173 | 0 | 41 | 8 | 0 | 49 | 10 | 77 | 2 | 0 | 89 | 22 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 38 | 349 |


| 16:30 | 2 | 33 | 17 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 35 | 1 | 0 | 36 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 108 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:45 | 2 | 32 | 20 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 115 |
| Total | 4 | 65 | 37 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 63 | 2 | 0 | 65 | 33 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 223 |
| 17:00 | 2 | 31 | 16 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 23 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 31 | 119 |
| 17:15 | 5 | 45 | 22 | 0 | 72 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 30 | 2 | 0 | 32 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 130 |
| 17:30 | 1 | 32 | 20 | 1 | 54 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 28 | 2 | 0 | 30 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 118 |
| 17:45 | 2 | 34 | 15 | 2 | 53 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 13 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 27 | 115 |
| Total | 10 | 142 | 73 | 3 | 228 | 4 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 30 | 1 | 118 | 4 | 2 | 125 | 67 | 23 | 3 | 6 | 99 | 482 |
| 18:00 | 3 | 26 | 15 | 1 | 45 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 17 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 26 | 114 |
| 18:15 | 0 | 30 | 11 | 0 | 41 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 28 | 1 | 1 | 31 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 91 |
| Grand Total | 23 | 458 | 334 | 9 | 824 | 8 | 151 | 27 | 3 | 189 | 24 | 383 | 10 | 3 | 420 | 162 | 64 | 13 | 9 | 248 | 1681 |
| Apprch \% | 2.8 | 55.6 | 40.5 | 1.1 |  | 4.2 | 79.9 | 14.3 | 1.6 |  | 5.7 | 91.2 | 2.4 | 0.7 |  | 65.3 | 25.8 | 5.2 | 3.6 |  |  |
| Total \% | 1.4 | 27.2 | 19.9 | 0.5 | 49 | 0.5 | 9 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 11.2 | 1.4 | 22.8 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 25 | 9.6 | 3.8 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 14.8 |  |


|  | DICKENS AVE Southbound |  |  |  |  | HAYNIE AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | DICKENS AVE Northbound |  |  |  |  | HAYNIE AVE Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 to 11:45-Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:30 | 0 | 39 | 33 | 1 | 73 | 0 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 22 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 122 |
| 07:45 | 2 | 39 | 57 | 2 | 100 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 35 | 6 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 39 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 187 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 34 | 32 | 1 | 67 | 0 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 21 | 9 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 135 |
| 08:15 | 0 | 13 | 25 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 72 |
| Total Volume | 2 | 125 | 147 | 4 | 278 | 1 | 75 | 10 | 0 | 86 | 17 | 86 | 1 | 0 | 104 | 23 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 48 | 516 |
| \% App. Total | 0.7 | 45 | 52.9 | 1.4 |  | 1.2 | 87.2 | 11.6 | 0 |  | 16.3 | 82.7 | 1 | 0 |  | 47.9 | 35.4 | 14.6 | 2.1 |  |  |
| PHF | . 250 | . 801 | . 645 | . 500 | . 695 | . 250 | . 568 | . 417 | . 000 | . 614 | . 472 | . 672 | . 250 | . 000 | . 667 | . 639 | . 607 | . 438 | . 250 | . 800 | 690 |

# GRAM Traffic North Texas, Inc. 

1120 W Lovers Lane
Arlington, TX 76015

File Name : HAYNIE AVE @ DICKENS AVE
Site Code : 120
Start Date : 1/20/2016
Page No :2

|  | DICKENS AVE Southbound |  |  |  |  | HAYNIE AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | DICKENS AVE Northbound |  |  |  |  | HAYNIE AVE Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | p. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | op. Tot | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 12:00 to 17:45-Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour | on | ire Int | ersec | on B | gins at | 16:45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16:45 | 2 | 32 | 20 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 115 |
| 17:00 | 2 | 31 | 16 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 23 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 31 | 119 |
| 17:15 | 5 | 45 | 22 | 0 | 72 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 30 | 2 | 0 | 32 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 130 |
| 17:30 | 1 | 32 | 20 | 1 | 54 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 28 | 2 | 0 | 30 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 118 |
| Total Volume | 10 | 140 | 78 | 1 | 229 | 2 | 19 | 10 | 1 | 32 | 1 | 120 | 5 | 0 | 126 | 72 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 95 | 482 |
| \% App. Total | 4.4 | 61.1 | 34.1 | 0.4 |  | 6.2 | 59.4 | 31.2 | 3.1 |  | 0.8 | 95.2 | 4 | 0 |  | 75.8 | 21.1 | 2.1 | 1.1 |  |  |
| PHF | . 500 | . 778 | . 886 | . 250 | . 795 | . 500 | . 475 | . 500 | . 250 | . 667 | . 250 | . 882 | . 625 | . 000 | . 900 | . 783 | . 714 | . 500 | . 250 | . 766 | . 927 |

# GRAM Traffic North Texas, Inc. 

1120 W. Lovers Lane
Arlington, TX 76013

File Name : HAYNIE AVE @ HILLCREST AVE
Site Code : 211
Start Date : 1/20/2016
Page No : 1
Groups Printed- Unshifted

|  | HILLCREST AVE Southbound |  |  |  |  | HAYNIE AVE <br> Westbound |  |  |  |  | HILLCREST AVE <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  | HAYNIE AVE Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 | 0 | 108 | 6 | 3 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 178 |
| 07:15 | 0 | 170 | 12 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 286 |
| 07:30 | 0 | 277 | 15 | 3 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 423 |
| 07:45 | 0 | 277 | 24 | 0 | 301 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 194 | 0 | 1 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 518 |
| Total | 0 | 832 | 57 | 6 | 895 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 465 | 0 | 1 | 494 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 1405 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 213 | 14 | 0 | 227 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 245 | 0 | 0 | 255 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 487 |
| 08:15 | 0 | 156 | 7 | 2 | 165 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 192 | 0 | 2 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 367 |
| 08:30 | 0 | 164 | 12 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 140 | 0 | 1 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 326 |
| 08:45 | 0 | 161 | 7 | 1 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 326 |
| Total | 0 | 694 | 40 | 3 | 737 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 726 | 0 | 3 | 750 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 3 | 19 | 1506 |


| 16:30 | 0 | 172 | 6 | 5 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 190 | 0 | 2 | 192 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 378 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:45 | 0 | 196 | 9 | 0 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 192 | 0 | 2 | 197 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 406 |
| Total | 0 | 368 | 15 | 5 | 388 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 382 | 0 | 4 | 389 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 784 |
| 17:00 | 0 | 199 | 7 | 1 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 215 | 0 | 0 | 218 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 433 |
| 17:15 | 0 | 211 | 4 | 2 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 211 | 0 | 4 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 444 |
| 17:30 | 0 | 216 | 11 | 2 | 229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 424 |
| 17:45 | 0 | 217 | 4 | 4 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 196 | 0 | 6 | 204 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 437 |
| Total | 0 | 843 | 26 | 9 | 878 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 808 | 0 | 10 | 830 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 29 | 1738 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 224 | 3 | 1 | 228 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 199 | 0 | 3 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 441 |
| 18:15 | 0 | 214 | 1 | 0 | 215 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 201 | 0 | 1 | 204 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 423 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 3175 | 142 | 24 | 3341 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 69 | 2781 | 0 | 22 | 2872 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 3 | 81 | 6297 |
| Apprch \% | 0 | 95 | 4.3 | 0.7 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |  | 2.4 | 96.8 | 0 | 0.8 |  | 0 | 0 | 96.3 | 3.7 |  |  |
| Total \% | 0 | 50.4 | 2.3 | 0.4 | 53.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.1 | 44.2 | 0 | 0.3 | 45.6 | 0 | 0 | 1.2 | 0 | 1.3 |  |


|  | HILLCREST AVE Southbound |  |  |  |  | HAYNIE AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | HILLCREST AVE Northbound |  |  |  |  | HAYNIE AVE Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |

Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 to 11:45-Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:30

| 07:30 | 0 | 277 | 15 | 3 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 423 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07:45 | 0 | 277 | 24 | 0 | 301 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 194 | 0 | 1 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 518 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 213 | 14 | 0 | 227 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 245 | 0 | 0 | 255 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 487 |
| 08:15 | 0 | 156 | 7 | 2 | 165 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 192 | 0 | 2 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 367 |
| Total Volume | 0 | 923 | 60 | 5 | 988 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 748 | 0 | 3 | 789 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 1795 |
| \% App. Total | 0 | 93.4 | 6.1 | 0.5 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4.8 | 94.8 | 0 | 0.4 |  | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 000 | . 833 | . 625 | . 417 | . 821 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | 679 | . 763 | . 000 | . 375 | . 774 | . 000 | 000 | . 563 | 000 | 563 | 866 |

# GRAM Traffic North Texas, Inc. 

1120 W. Lovers Lane
Arlington, TX 76013

File Name : HAYNIE AVE @ HILLCREST AVE
Site Code : 211
Start Date : 1/20/2016
Page No : 2

|  | HILLCREST AVE <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  | HAYNIE AVE Westbound |  |  |  |  | HILLCREST AVE Northbound |  |  |  |  | HAYNIE AVE Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 12:00 to 17:45-Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 17:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17:00 | 0 | 199 | 7 | 1 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 215 | 0 | 0 | 218 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 433 |
| 17:15 | 0 | 211 | 4 | 2 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 211 | 0 | 4 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 444 |
| 17:30 | 0 | 216 | 11 | 2 | 229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 424 |
| 17:45 | 0 | 217 | 4 | 4 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 196 | 0 | 6 | 204 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 437 |
| Total Volume | 0 | 843 | 26 | 9 | 878 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 808 | 0 | 10 | 830 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 29 | 1738 |
| \% App. Total | 0 | 96 | 3 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |  | 1.4 | 97.3 | 0 | 1.2 |  | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 000 | . 971 | . 591 | . 563 | . 959 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 250 | 250 | . 500 | . 940 | . 000 | . 417 | . 939 | . 000 | . 000 | . 906 | . 000 | . 906 | . 979 |

Kimley»>Horn
Automatic Traffic Counts Average Daily Traffic (24-Hour Count)

Project No. : 61292200.000 Station No. :
Counter No. :

City/State: University Park, TX
Date: January 20, 2016
Day of Week: Wednesday
Site: Daniel Ave west of Hillcrest Ave


| Time | Peak | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Time | Peak | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24:00 |  | 6 |  |  |  | 12:00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0:15 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 12:15 |  | 55 |  | 100 |  |
| 0:30 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 12:30 |  | 39 |  | 85 |  |
| 0:45 |  | 5 |  | 3 |  | 12:45 |  | 41 |  | 80 |  |
| 1:00 |  | 6 | 19 | 2 | 7 | 13:00 |  | 57 | 192 | 68 | 333 |
| 1:15 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 13:15 |  | 48 |  | 70 |  |
| 1:30 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 13:30 |  | 75 |  | 62 |  |
| 1:45 |  | 2 |  | 5 |  | 13:45 |  | 63 |  | 68 |  |
| 2:00 |  | 0 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 14:00 |  | 59 | 245 | 60 | 260 |
| 2:15 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 14:15 |  | 50 |  | 50 |  |
| 2:30 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  | 14:30 |  | 68 |  | 57 |  |
| 2:45 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | 14:45 |  | 72 |  | 61 |  |
| 3:00 |  | 0 | 5 | 1 | 10 | 15:00 |  | 68 | 258 | 52 | 220 |
| 3:15 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 15:15 |  | 61 |  | 55 |  |
| 3:30 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  | 15:30 |  | 61 |  | 74 |  |
| 3:45 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 15:45 |  | 77 |  | 82 |  |
| 4:00 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16:00 |  | 89 | 288 | 88 | 299 |
| 4:15 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 16:15 |  | 74 |  | 76 |  |
| 4:30 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 16:30 |  | 67 |  | 91 |  |
| 4:45 |  | 0 |  | 4 |  | 16:45 |  | 64 |  | 78 |  |
| 5:00 |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 17:00 |  | 72 | 277 | 71 | 316 |
| 5:15 |  | 1 |  | 6 |  | 17:15 |  | 97 |  | 76 |  |
| 5:30 |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 17:30 |  | 86 |  | 102 |  |
| 5:45 |  | 6 |  | 6 |  | 17:45 |  | 78 |  | 68 |  |
| 6:00 |  | 10 | 20 | 6 | 21 | 18:00 |  | 84 | 345 | 83 | 329 |
| 6:15 |  | 4 |  | 10 |  | 18:15 |  | 98 |  | 90 |  |
| 6:30 |  | 4 |  | 12 |  | 18:30 |  | 64 |  | 67 |  |
| 6:45 |  | 23 |  | 18 |  | 18:45 |  | 102 |  | 49 |  |
| 7:00 |  | 21 | 52 | 30 | 70 | 19:00 |  | 68 | 332 | 42 | 248 |
| 7:15 |  | 18 |  | 53 |  | 19:15 |  | 88 |  | 44 |  |
| 7:30 |  | 35 |  | 62 |  | 19:30 |  | 57 |  | 46 |  |
| 7:45 |  | 41 |  | 100 |  | 19:45 |  | 66 |  | 30 |  |
| 8:00 |  | 47 | 141 | 84 | 299 | 20:00 |  | 51 | 262 | 40 | 160 |
| 8:15 |  | 59 |  | 90 |  | 20:15 |  | 45 |  | 32 |  |
| 8:30 |  | 45 |  | 60 |  | 20:30 |  | 22 |  | 23 |  |
| 8:45 |  | 50 |  | 55 |  | 20:45 |  | 48 |  | 28 |  |
| 9:00 |  | 41 | 195 | 62 | 267 | 21:00 |  | 16 | 131 | 22 | 105 |
| 9:15 |  | 52 |  | 69 |  | 21:15 |  | 39 |  | 18 |  |
| 9:30 |  | 44 |  | 62 |  | 21:30 |  | 18 |  | 18 |  |
| 9:45 |  | 45 |  | 74 |  | 21:45 |  | 21 |  | 17 |  |
| 10:00 |  | 50 | 191 | 66 | 271 | 22:00 |  | 9 | 87 | 13 | 66 |
| 10:15 |  | 31 |  | 66 |  | 22:15 |  | 9 |  | 15 |  |
| 10:30 |  | 50 |  | 52 |  | 22:30 |  | 25 |  | 5 |  |
| 10:45 |  | 37 |  | 48 |  | 22:45 |  | 32 |  | 5 |  |
| 11:00 |  | 48 | 166 | 68 | 234 | 23:00 |  | 11 | 77 | 8 | 33 |
| 11:15 |  | 50 |  | 73 |  | 23:15 |  | 8 |  | 4 |  |
| 11:30 |  | 33 |  | 56 |  | 23:30 |  | 7 |  | 3 |  |
| 11:45 |  | 46 |  | 78 |  | 23:45 |  | 7 |  | 4 |  |
| 12:00 |  | 35 | 164 | 84 | 291 | 24:00 |  | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| AM Peak Hour |  | 7:30-8:30 |  | Directional Volumes |  |  |  |  | 3,480 |  | 3,877 |
| $\% \text { of ADT }$ |  | 7.1\% |  |  |  |  |  | 24-Hour Volume |  |  | 7,357 |
| PM Peak Hour \% of ADT |  | 17:15-18:15$9.4 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





CONCEPTUAL BASEMENT PLAN - LVL 1


CONCEPTUAL BASEMENT PLAN - LVL 2-4



CONCEPTUAL PARKING LEVEL 2 ,

## Left-Turn Warrant - Parking Garage @ Daniel Avenue (AM Peak) <br> Figure 2-5. Guideline for determining the need for a major-road left-turn bay at a two-way stop-controlled intersection.

2-lane roadway (English)
INPUT

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed, mph: | 30 |
| Percent of left-turns in advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right), \%:$ | $36 \%$ |
| Advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$, veh/h: | 317 |
| Opposing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{O}}\right)$, veh/h: | 176 |

OUTPUT

| Variable |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Limiting advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$, veh/h: | 329 |  |
| Guidance for determining the need for a major-road left-turn bay: |  |  |
| Left-turn treatment NOT warranted. |  |  |



CALIBRATION CONSTANTS
CALIBRATION CONSTANTS

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Average time for making left-turn, s: | 3.0 |
| Critical headway, s: | 5.0 |
| Average time for left-turn vehicle to clear the advancing lane, s: | 1.9 |

## Left-Turn Warrant - Parking Garage @ Daniel Avenue (PM Peak)

Figure 2-5. Guideline for determining the need for a major-road left-turn bay at a two-way stop-controlled intersection.
2-lane roadway (English)

OUTPUT

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Limiting advancing volume $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$, veh/h: | 309 |
| Guidance for determining the need for a major-road left-turn bay: |  |
| Left-turn treatment NOT warranted. |  |



CALIBRATION CONSTANTS

| Variable | Value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Average time for making left-turn, s: | 3.0 |
| Critical headway, $\mathrm{s}:$ | 5.0 |
| Average time for left-turn vehicle to clear the advancing lane, $\mathrm{s}:$ | 1.9 |

EXISTING (2016) TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | F |  | \% | F |  | 7 | 虾 |  |  | * ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 11 | 60 | 30 | 240 | 123 | 52 | 79 | 479 | 195 | 93 | 729 | 95 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 11 | 60 | 30 | 240 | 123 | 52 | 79 | 479 | 195 | 93 | 729 | 95 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |  | 0.95 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  |  | 0.98 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1769 |  | 1770 | 1780 |  | 1770 | 3386 |  |  | 3467 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.63 | 1.00 |  | 0.54 | 1.00 |  | 0.28 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.69 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1182 | 1769 |  | 1012 | 1780 |  | 518 | 3386 |  |  | 2393 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 12 | 67 | 34 | 270 | 138 | 58 | 89 | 538 | 219 | 104 | 819 | 107 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 12 | 81 | 0 | 270 | 179 | 0 | 89 | 708 | 0 | 0 | 1020 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 16.5 | 16.5 |  | 30.5 | 30.5 |  | 35.5 | 35.5 |  |  | 50.5 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 16.5 | 16.5 |  | 30.5 | 30.5 |  | 35.5 | 35.5 |  |  | 50.5 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.18 | 0.18 |  | 0.34 | 0.34 |  | 0.39 | 0.39 |  |  | 0.56 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 216 | 324 |  | 422 | 603 |  | 204 | 1335 |  |  | 1468 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.05 |  | c0.07 | 0.10 |  |  | 0.21 |  |  | c0.08 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.01 |  |  | c0.15 |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  | c0.31 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.06 | 0.25 |  | 0.64 | 0.30 |  | 0.44 | 0.53 |  |  | 0.70 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 30.3 | 31.4 |  | 23.8 | 21.9 |  | 19.9 | 20.9 |  |  | 14.2 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.5 | 1.8 |  | 7.3 | 1.3 |  | 6.7 | 1.5 |  |  | 2.7 |  |
| Delay (s) | 30.8 | 33.3 |  | 31.1 | 23.1 |  | 26.6 | 22.4 |  |  | 17.0 |  |
| Level of Service | C | C |  | C | C |  | C | C |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 33.0 |  |  | 27.7 |  |  | 22.8 |  |  | 17.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 21.8 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | C |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.74 |  | 18.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 90.0 | Sum of lost time (s) | D |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $76.6 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |




|  | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Movement | SBR |
| Lante Configurations |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 13 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 13 |
| Sign Control |  |
| Grade |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 14 |
| Pedestrians |  |
| Lane Width (tt) |  |
| Walking Speed (tt/s) |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |
| Median type |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |
| Upstream signal (tt) |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.94 |
| vC, conflicting volume | 258 |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 178 |
| tC, single (s) | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |
| tF (s) | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 98 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 813 |
| Direction, Lane \# |  |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $>$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 23 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 75 | 10 | 17 | 86 | 1 | 2 | 125 | 147 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 23 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 75 | 10 | 17 | 86 | 1 | 2 | 125 | 147 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 33 | 25 | 10 | 1 | 109 | 14 | 25 | 125 | 1 | 3 | 181 | 213 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 68 | 124 | 151 | 397 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 33 | 1 | 25 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 10 | 14 | 1 | 213 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.04 | -0.03 | 0.06 | -0.29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 5.4 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.10 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 588 | 616 | 683 | 795 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.0 | 9.4 | 9.2 | 11.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 9.0 | 9.4 | 9.2 | 11.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection Summary

| Delay | 10.3 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Level of Service | B |  | ICU Level of Service |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $32.8 \%$ | A |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | F |  | * | $\uparrow$ |  | * | 个 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  |  | ${ }^{\text {4 }}$ ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 30 | 118 | 47 | 211 | 135 | 86 | 93 | 526 | 192 | 119 | 620 | 95 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 30 | 118 | 47 | 211 | 135 | 86 | 93 | 526 | 192 | 119 | 620 | 95 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |  | 0.95 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.94 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  |  | 0.98 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1784 |  | 1770 | 1754 |  | 1770 | 3397 |  |  | 3454 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.62 | 1.00 |  | 0.39 | 1.00 |  | 0.34 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.68 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1153 | 1784 |  | 724 | 1754 |  | 624 | 3397 |  |  | 2361 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 30 | 119 | 47 | 213 | 136 | 87 | 94 | 531 | 194 | 120 | 626 | 96 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 30 | 152 | 0 | 213 | 200 | 0 | 94 | 688 | 0 | 0 | 832 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 16.5 | 16.5 |  | 30.5 | 30.5 |  | 56.0 | 45.5 |  |  | 56.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 16.5 | 16.5 |  | 30.5 | 30.5 |  | 56.0 | 45.5 |  |  | 56.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.16 | 0.16 |  | 0.30 | 0.30 |  | 0.56 | 0.46 |  |  | 0.56 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 190 | 294 |  | 320 | 534 |  | 469 | 1545 |  |  | 1436 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.09 |  | c0.06 | 0.11 |  | 0.02 | 0.20 |  |  | c0.06 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.03 |  |  | c0.14 |  |  | 0.09 |  |  |  | c0.26 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.16 | 0.52 |  | 0.67 | 0.37 |  | 0.20 | 0.45 |  |  | 0.58 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 35.8 | 38.1 |  | 27.9 | 27.3 |  | 10.2 | 18.6 |  |  | 14.3 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 1.8 | 6.4 |  | 10.5 | 2.0 |  | 1.0 | 0.9 |  |  | 1.7 |  |
| Delay (s) | 37.6 | 44.5 |  | 38.4 | 29.3 |  | 11.2 | 19.6 |  |  | 16.0 |  |
| Level of Service | D | D |  | D | C |  | B | B |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 43.4 |  |  | 33.7 |  |  | 18.6 |  |  | 16.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 22.7 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | C |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.63 |  | 18.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 100.0 | Sum of lost time (s) | D |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $80.1 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |



|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $\checkmark$ | $\longleftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ | 14 | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBU | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | F |  |  | ¢ |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 41 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 141 | 159 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 60 | 74 | 0 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 41 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 141 | 159 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 60 | 74 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 45 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 173 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 80 | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  | 247 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.93 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.93 | 0.93 |  | 0.00 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| vC , conflicting volume | 326 |  |  | 118 |  |  | 480 | 534 | 118 | 0 | 457 | 448 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 242 |  |  | 118 |  |  | 408 | 465 | 118 | 0 | 382 | 372 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 6.5 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 |
| p0 queue free \% | 96 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 | 99 | 99 | 0 | 84 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1236 |  |  | 1470 |  |  | 483 | 445 | 934 | 0 | 515 | 502 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 163 | 326 | 11 | 113 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 45 | 0 | 0 | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 173 | 8 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1236 | 1700 | 719 | 580 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.02 | 0.19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 3 | 0 | 1 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 2.4 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 12.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 2.4 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 12.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 51.1\% |  | CU Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Movement | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 30 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 30 |
| Sign Control |  |
| Grade |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 33 |
| Pedestrians |  |
| Lane Width (tt) |  |
| Walking Speed (tt/s) |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |
| Median type |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |
| Upstream signal (tt) |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.93 |
| vC, conflicting volume | 240 |
| vC , stage 1 conf vol |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 149 |
| tC, single (s) | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |
| tF (s) | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 96 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 837 |
| Direction, Lane \# |  |




## BUILD OUT (2018) TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  | * $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 36 | 78 | 32 | 255 | 164 | 55 | 118 | 508 | 207 | 99 | 807 | 135 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 36 | 78 | 32 | 255 | 164 | 55 | 118 | 508 | 207 | 99 | 807 | 135 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |  | 0.95 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  |  | 0.98 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1782 |  | 1770 | 1792 |  | 1770 | 3385 |  |  | 3454 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.61 | 1.00 |  | 0.50 | 1.00 |  | 0.23 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.66 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1129 | 1782 |  | 935 | 1792 |  | 437 | 3385 |  |  | 2303 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 40 | 88 | 36 | 287 | 184 | 62 | 133 | 571 | 233 | 111 | 907 | 152 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 40 | 108 | 0 | 287 | 233 | 0 | 133 | 755 | 0 | 0 | 1157 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 16.5 | 16.5 |  | 30.5 | 30.5 |  | 35.5 | 35.5 |  |  | 50.5 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 16.5 | 16.5 |  | 30.5 | 30.5 |  | 35.5 | 35.5 |  |  | 50.5 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.18 | 0.18 |  | 0.34 | 0.34 |  | 0.39 | 0.39 |  |  | 0.56 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 206 | 326 |  | 405 | 607 |  | 172 | 1335 |  |  | 1426 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.06 |  | c0.07 | 0.13 |  |  | 0.22 |  |  | c0.09 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.04 |  |  | c0.17 |  |  | 0.30 |  |  |  | c0.36 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.19 | 0.33 |  | 0.71 | 0.38 |  | 0.77 | 0.57 |  |  | 0.81 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 31.1 | 31.9 |  | 24.6 | 22.6 |  | 23.7 | 21.2 |  |  | 15.9 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 2.1 | 2.7 |  | 10.0 | 1.8 |  | 28.0 | 1.7 |  |  | 5.1 |  |
| Delay (s) | 33.2 | 34.6 |  | 34.6 | 24.4 |  | 51.7 | 23.0 |  |  | 21.0 |  |
| Level of Service | C | C |  | C | C |  | D | C |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 34.3 |  |  | 29.9 |  |  | 27.1 |  |  | 21.0 |  |

Approach LOS C C C

| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 25.5 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | C |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.85 |  | 18.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 90.0 | Sum of lost time (s) | E |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $85.3 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |




|  | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Movement | SBR |
| Lante Configurations |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 25 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 25 |
| Sign Control |  |
| Grade |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 26 |
| Pedestrians |  |
| Lane Width (tt) |  |
| Walking Speed (tt/s) |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |
| Median type |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |
| Upstream signal (tt) |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.89 |
| vC, conflicting volume | 379 |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 236 |
| tC, single (s) | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |
| tF (s) | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 96 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 712 |
| Direction, Lane \# |  |




|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $p$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 120 | 56 | 113 | 204 | 15 | 35 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 120 | 56 | 113 | 204 | 15 | 35 |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 130 | 61 | 123 | 222 | 16 | 38 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  | 633 |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume |  |  | 191 |  | 628 | 160 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol |  |  | 191 |  | 628 | 160 |  |
| tC, single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% |  |  | 91 |  | 96 | 96 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 1383 |  | 407 | 885 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 191 | 345 | 54 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 123 | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 61 | 0 | 38 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1383 | 656 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 7 | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 3.3 | 11.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  | A | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 3.3 | 11.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 40.0\% |  |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  | * | F |  | * | 性 |  |  | * ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 133 | 165 | 87 | 224 | 165 | 91 | 150 | 529 | 204 | 126 | 636 | 167 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 133 | 165 | 87 | 224 | 165 | 91 | 150 | 529 | 204 | 126 | 636 | 167 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |  | 0.95 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1766 |  | 1770 | 1763 |  | 1770 | 3391 |  |  | 3420 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.60 | 1.00 |  | 0.21 | 1.00 |  | 0.30 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.67 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1116 | 1766 |  | 385 | 1763 |  | 568 | 3391 |  |  | 2305 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 134 | 167 | 88 | 226 | 167 | 92 | 152 | 534 | 206 | 127 | 642 | 169 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 134 | 236 | 0 | 226 | 239 | 0 | 152 | 700 | 0 | 0 | 919 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 16.5 | 16.5 |  | 30.5 | 30.5 |  | 56.0 | 45.5 |  |  | 56.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 16.5 | 16.5 |  | 30.5 | 30.5 |  | 56.0 | 45.5 |  |  | 56.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.16 | 0.16 |  | 0.30 | 0.30 |  | 0.56 | 0.46 |  |  | 0.56 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 184 | 291 |  | 249 | 537 |  | 444 | 1542 |  |  | 1407 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.13 |  | c0.09 | 0.14 |  | 0.04 | 0.21 |  |  | c0.07 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.12 |  |  | c0.19 |  |  | 0.16 |  |  |  | c0.30 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.73 | 0.81 |  | 0.91 | 0.44 |  | 0.34 | 0.45 |  |  | 0.65 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 39.6 | 40.2 |  | 29.7 | 27.9 |  | 10.6 | 18.7 |  |  | 15.3 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 22.2 | 21.2 |  | 37.4 | 2.7 |  | 2.1 | 1.0 |  |  | 2.4 |  |
| Delay (s) | 61.8 | 61.4 |  | 67.1 | 30.6 |  | 12.7 | 19.7 |  |  | 17.6 |  |
| Level of Service | E | E |  | E | C |  | B | B |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 61.5 |  |  | 47.6 |  |  | 18.5 |  |  | 17.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 29.6 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | C |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.77 |  | 18.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 100.0 | Sum of lost time (s) | E |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $89.1 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |




|  | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Movement | SBR |
| Lante Configurations |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 39 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 39 |
| Sign Control |  |
| Grade |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 42 |
| Pedestrians |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |
| Walking Speed (tt/s) |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |
| Median type |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |
| Upstream signal (tt) |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.88 |
| vC, conflicting volume | 405 |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 249 |
| tC, single (s) | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |
| tF (s) | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 94 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 691 |
| Direction, Lane \# |  |




|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $p$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 160 | 36 | 146 | 159 | 53 | 184 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 160 | 36 | 146 | 159 | 53 | 184 |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 174 | 39 | 159 | 173 | 58 | 200 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  | 633 |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume |  |  | 213 |  | 684 | 194 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol |  |  | 213 |  | 684 | 194 |  |
| tC, single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% |  |  | 88 |  | 84 | 76 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 1357 |  | 366 | 848 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 213 | 332 | 258 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 159 | 58 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 39 | 0 | 200 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1357 | 654 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.39 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 10 | 47 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 4.4 | 14.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  | A | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 4.4 | 14.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 6.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 51.3\% |  |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |




C Critical Lane Group



|  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Movement | SBR |
| Lafe Configurations |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 25 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 25 |
| Sign Control |  |
| Grade |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 26 |
| Pedestrians |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |
| Walking Speed (tt/s) |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |
| Median type |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |
| Upstream signal (tt) |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.90 |
| vC , conflicting volume | 379 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 255 |
| tC, single (s) | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |
| tF (s) | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 96 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 706 |
| Direction, Lane \# |  |






| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% |  |  |  | ${ }_{*}{ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 133 | 165 | 87 | 224 | 165 | 91 | 150 | 529 | 204 | 126 | 636 | 167 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 133 | 165 | 87 | 224 | 165 | 91 | 150 | 529 | 204 | 126 | 636 | 167 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |  | 0.95 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1766 |  | 1770 | 1763 |  | 1770 | 3391 |  |  | 3420 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.60 | 1.00 |  | 0.35 | 1.00 |  | 0.30 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.63 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1116 | 1766 |  | 661 | 1763 |  | 565 | 3391 |  |  | 2167 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 134 | 167 | 88 | 226 | 167 | 92 | 152 | 534 | 206 | 127 | 642 | 169 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 134 | 236 | 0 | 226 | 239 | 0 | 152 | 699 | 0 | 0 | 919 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 25.5 | 25.5 |  | 38.5 | 38.5 |  | 48.0 | 37.5 |  |  | 48.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 25.5 | 25.5 |  | 38.5 | 38.5 |  | 48.0 | 37.5 |  |  | 48.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.26 | 0.26 |  | 0.38 | 0.38 |  | 0.48 | 0.38 |  |  | 0.48 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 284 | 450 |  | 348 | 678 |  | 397 | 1271 |  |  | 1171 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.13 |  | c0.06 | 0.14 |  | 0.04 | 0.21 |  |  | c0.08 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.12 |  |  | c0.19 |  |  | 0.14 |  |  |  | c0.29 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.47 | 0.53 |  | 0.65 | 0.35 |  | 0.38 | 0.55 |  |  | 0.79 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 31.5 | 32.0 |  | 23.2 | 21.9 |  | 14.8 | 24.6 |  |  | 21.7 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 5.5 | 4.3 |  | 9.1 | 1.4 |  | 2.8 | 1.7 |  |  | 5.3 |  |
| Delay (s) | 37.1 | 36.4 |  | 32.2 | 23.3 |  | 17.6 | 26.3 |  |  | 27.0 |  |
| Level of Service | D | D |  | C | C |  | B | C |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 36.6 |  |  | 27.5 |  |  | 24.8 |  |  | 27.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 27.8 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | C |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.75 |  | 18.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 100.0 | Sum of lost time (s) | E |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $89.1 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |




|  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Movement | SBR |
| Lafe Configurations |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 39 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 39 |
| Sign Control |  |
| Grade |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 42 |
| Pedestrians |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |
| Walking Speed (tt/s) |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |
| Median type |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |
| Upstream signal (tt) |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.88 |
| vC , conflicting volume | 405 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 257 |
| tC, single (s) | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |
| tF (s) | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 94 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 688 |
| Direction, Lane \# |  |




|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $\dagger$ | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 160 | 36 | 146 | 159 | 53 | 184 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 160 | 36 | 146 | 159 | 53 | 184 |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 174 | 39 | 159 | 173 | 58 | 200 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  | 633 |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume |  |  | 213 |  | 684 | 194 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol |  |  | 213 |  | 684 | 194 |  |
| tC, single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% |  |  | 88 |  | 84 | 76 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 1357 |  | 366 | 848 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 213 | 332 | 258 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 159 | 58 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 39 | 0 | 200 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1357 | 654 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.39 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 10 | 47 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 4.4 | 14.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  | A | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 4.4 | 14.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 6.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 51.3\% |  |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |



Portal Capacity: Anticipated AM Arrival

## Total Office Parking Spaces

Peak Hour Factor
Peak Hour Demand
Total Retail/Restaurant Parking Spaces Peak Hour Factor
Peak Hour Demand
Subtotal
Peak Interval Factor
$r$
4

Peak Demand

| Average Entry/Exit Lane Capacity |
| :--- |
| Number of Entry or Exit Lanes |
| Theoretical Processing Capacity Capacity |
| Portal Utilization |
| 90\% Probability Design Queue (\# of vehicles) |
| Avg Delay (in seconds) |

Portal Capacity: Anticipated PM Arrival

## Total Office Parking Spaces

Peak Hour Factor
Peak Hour Demand

|  |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Retail/Restaurant Parking Spaces | 355 SP |
| Peak Hour Factor | $60 \%$ of facility capacity |
| Peak Hour Demand | 213 VPH |
| Subtotal | 285 VPH |
| Peak Interval Factor | $115 \%$ (peak 15 min. interval) |
|  |  |


| Average Entry/Exit Lane Capacity |
| :--- |
| Number of Entry or Exit Lanes |
| Theoretical Processing Capacity Capacity |
| Portal Utilization |
| $90 \%$ Probability Design Queue (\# of vehicles) |
| Avg Delay (in seconds) |

429 VPH
115\% (peak 15 min. interval)

| 359 SP |
| :--- |
| $70 \%$ of facility capacity |
| 251 VPH |
|  |
| 355 SP |
| $50 \%$ of facility capacity |
| 178 VPH |
| 429 VPH |
| $115 \%$ (peak 15 min. interval) |
| 493 Vehicles Per Hour (VPH) |

1,200 VPH
$41 \%$ of capacity

OS A (above average level of service)

| Portal Capacity: Anticipated AM Departure |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Office Parking Spaces | 359 SP |
| Peak Hour Factor | $15 \%$ of facility capacity |
| Peak Hour Demand | 54 VPH |
|  |  |
| Total Retail/Restaurant Parking Spaces | 355 SP |
| Peak Hour Factor | $60 \%$ of facility capacity |
| Peak Hour Demand | 213 VPH |
| Subtotal | 267 VPH |
| Peak Interval Factor | $\mathbf{1 1 5 \%}$ (peak 15 min. interval) |
|  |  |


| Average Entry/Exit Lane Capacity | 500 | VPH/LN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Entry or Exit Lanes | 2 |  |
| Theoretical Processing Capacity Capacity | 1,000 | VPH |
| Portal Utilization | 31\% | of capacity |
| 90\% Probability Design Queue (\# of vehicles) | 1 |  |
| Avg Delay (in seconds) | 7 |  |
| LOS |  | (above ave |



ITE MULTI-USE PROJECT INTERNAL CAPTURE WORKSHEET
(Source: Volume 1, ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, 2012)
Project Number: -
Project Name: Park Plaza
Scenario: AM Peak Hour Analysis Period: AM Peak


NET EXTERNAL TRIPS FOR MULTI-USE DEVELOPMENT

|  | Land Use |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | B | C | D | Total |
|  | 30 | 147 | 48 | 0 | 225 |
| Exit | 18 | 16 | 35 | 0 | 69 |
| Total | 48 | 163 | 83 | 0 | $\mathbf{2 9 4}$ |
| Single Use <br> Trip Gen Estimate | 71 |  |  |  |  |

Overall Internal Capture $=15.03 \%$

ITE MULTI-USE PROJECT INTERNAL CAPTURE WORKSHEET
(Source: Volume 1, ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, 2012)
Project Number: -
Project Name: Park Plaza
Scenario: PM Peak Hour Analysis Period: PM Peak


NET EXTERNAL TRIPS FOR MULTI-USE DEVELOPMENT

|  | Land Use |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | B | C | D | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 103 | 24 | 91 | 0 | 218 |
|  | 104 | 141 | 60 | 0 | 305 |
|  | 207 | 165 | 151 | 0 | $\mathbf{5 2 3}$ |

Overall Internal Capture $=15.51 \%$

