# Traffic and Parking Impact Study Proposed CityGate Apartments and Event Center <br> Naperville, Illinois 



## 1. Introduction

This report summarizes the methodologies, results, and findings of a traffic and parking impact study conducted by Kenig, Lindgren, O’Hara, Aboona, Inc. (KLOA, Inc.) for the proposed apartment and Event Center development within the CityGate Centre which is located in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of IL Route 59 with Ferry Road in Naperville, Illinois. As proposed, the site which is currently vacant, will be developed with an apartment building containing approximately 285 units, an approximately 34,000 square-feet of Event Center (with a max capacity of 800 people), a parking garage with approximately 429 parking spaces for residents, and a surface parking lot containing approximately 416 parking spaces for guests of the apartment units and attendees of the Event Center. Access to the proposed residential parking garage will be provided via a full movement access drive off Westings Avenue and access to the surface parking lot will be provided via two full movement access drives off City Gate Lane and via a single access drive off Comfort Drive.

The purpose of this study was to examine background traffic conditions, assess the impact that the proposed development will have on traffic conditions in the area, determine if any roadway or access improvements are necessary to accommodate traffic generated by the proposed development and to evaluate the adequacy of the proposed parking supply in accommodating the projected parking demand of the proposed apartment development and Event Center.

Figure 1 shows the location of the site in relation to the area roadway system. Figure 2 shows an aerial view of the site area.

The sections of this report present the following:

- Existing roadway conditions
- A description of the proposed development
- Directional distribution of the development traffic
- Vehicle trip generation for the development
- Future traffic conditions including access to the development
- Traffic analyses for the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours
- Recommendations with respect to adequacy of the site access and adjacent roadway system
- Evaluation of the proposed parking supply

Traffic capacity analyses were conducted for the weekday morning and weekday evening for the following conditions:

1. Existing Condition - Analyzes the capacity of the existing roadway system using existing peak hour traffic volumes in the surrounding area.
2. Future Condition - The future projected traffic volumes include the existing traffic volumes increased by an ambient area growth factor (growth not attributable to any particular development), and the traffic estimated to be generated by the proposed subject development. Furthermore, the future traffic volumes were analyzed including the traffic projected to be generated by the proposed Sports Arena to be located on the north side of Ferry Road.
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## 2. Existing Conditions

Existing transportation conditions in the vicinity of the site were documented based on field visits conducted by KLOA, Inc. in order to obtain a database for projecting future conditions. The following provides a description of the geographical location of the site, physical characteristics of the area roadway system including lane usage and traffic control devices and existing peak hour traffic volumes.

## Site Location

The site, which is currently vacant, is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Westings Avenue with CityGate Lane within the CityGate Centre. Land uses in the vicinity of the include Calamos corporate headquarters to the south, Hotel Arista, Che Figata, Lavazza, Tap In Pub \& Carvery and Monarch Landing to the north and Dart Warehouse Corporation to the northeast.

## Existing Roadway System Characteristics

The characteristics of the existing roadways near the development are described below. Figure 3 illustrates the existing roadway characteristics.

IL Route 59 is a north-south Strategic Regional Arterial (SRA) that carries approximately 37,100 vehicles per day (IDOT AADT 2017) and provides access to the Ronald Reagan Memorial Tollway (Interstate 88) immediately south of the site. IL 59 is under the jurisdiction of the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) and is a posted Class II truck route. Adjacent to the site, IL 59 is a six-lane roadway with three lanes in each direction, a center median, and turn lanes at roadway intersections. The posted speed limit on IL 59 is 45 miles per hour (mph) and parking is not permitted on the roadway.

Ferry Road is a major arterial roadway that is oriented in the east-west direction and is under the jurisdiction of the DuPage County Division of Transportation (County Highway 3). In the vicinity of the site, Ferry Road carries approximately 15,100 vehicles per day (IDOT AADT 2016) and is a four-lane roadway with two lanes in each direction, a center median, and left-turn lanes at roadway intersections. The intersection of Ferry Road with IL 59 is under traffic signal control and there are crosswalks and pedestrian signals on all approaches of the intersection. The traffic signal is part of the six-signal system that extends from Ferry Road south to North Aurora Road. There is a continuous sidewalk along the south side of Ferry Road and a continuous multi-use path along the north side of the roadway, both of which connect with the Illinois Prairie Path approximately 1,000 feet to the west of IL 59. The posted speed limit on Ferry Road is 45 mph and parking is not permitted on the roadway.


Westings Avenue is a collector street that extends in an east-west orientation from IL 59 east approximately 2,000 feet to a cul-de-sac within the Westings Corporate Center. The street is under the jurisdiction of the City of Naperville and has a two-lane divided cross section with one approximately 20 -foot lane in each direction and a landscaped median. Its intersection with IL 59 is restricted to right turn movements only to and from Westings Avenue, with the Westings Avenue approach under stop control. There is a sidewalk along both sides of Westings Avenue between IL 59 and Comfort Drive, and along the south/west side only between Comfort Drive and the cul-desac. The posted speed limit on Westings Avenue is 30 mph and parking is not permitted on the street.

Comfort Drive is a collector street that extends from Ferry Road (opposite Corporate Lane) south to Westings Avenue. Its intersection with Ferry Road is under stop control on Comfort Drive and Corporate Lane. Its intersection with Westings Avenue is under multiway stop control. The street is under the jurisdiction of the City of Naperville and has one lane in each direction that widens to provide a separate left-turn lane at Westings Avenue and separate left- and right-turn lanes at Ferry Road. There is a sidewalk along the west side of Comfort Drive. The posted speed limit on Comfort Drive is 30 mph and parking is not permitted on the street.

CityGate Lane is a private drive that extends from Westings Avenue north through the CityGate Centre complex to Ferry Road (opposite Monarch Drive) and from Westings Avenue south to the Calamos Corporate Center complex. CityGate Lane has one travel lane in each direction with parallel parking permitted on both sides of several segments of the street. Its intersection with Ferry Road is under stop control on CityGate Lane and Monarch Drive. Its intersection with Westings Avenue is under stop control on CityGate Lane. There is also an internal intersection between the north-south and east-west sections of CityGate Lane in front of the Hotel Arista that is under stop control on the north-south segment of the street. There is a sidewalk along the west side of Comfort Drive. The posted speed limit on Comfort Drive is 30 mph .

## Existing Traffic Volumes

In order to determine current traffic conditions in the vicinity of the site, KLOA, Inc. conducted peak period traffic counts using Miovision Scout Video Collection Units on Thursday, February 7, 2019 during the weekday morning (6:30 A.M. to 9:00 A.M.) and weekday evening (4:00 P.M. to 6:30 P.M.) peak periods at the following intersections:

- Ferry Road with Comfort Drive/Corporate Lane
- Ferry Road with CityGate Lane
- Westings Avenue with CityGate Lane/Calamos Court
- Westings Avenue with IL Route 59

The results of the traffic counts showed that the weekday morning peak hour of traffic occurs from 7:30 A.M. to 8:30 A.M. and the weekday evening peak hour of traffic occurs from 4:30 P.M. to 5:30 P.M. Figure 4 illustrates the existing peak hour traffic volumes. Copies of the traffic count summary sheets are included in the Appendix.


## 3. Traffic Characteristics of the Proposed Development

In order to properly evaluate future traffic conditions in the surrounding area, it was necessary to determine the traffic characteristics of the proposed development, including the directional distribution and volumes of traffic that it will generate.

## Proposed Site and Development Plan

As proposed, the plans call developing the site with an apartment building containing approximately 285 units, approximately 34,000 square-feet of Event Center (with a capacity of approximately 800 people), an approximately 429-space parking garage for residents of the apartment units and an approximately 416-space surface parking lot for apartment guests and attendees for the Event Center of which 36 parking spaces will be utilized for apartment guests and the remaining spaces will be utilized for the Event Center.

Access to the residential parking garage will be provided via a full movement access drive off Westings Avenue approximately 600 feet east of City Gate Lane. This access drive will provide one inbound lane and one outbound lane. Outbound movements should be under stop-sign control. Additionally, it should be noted that the existing landscaped median on Westings Avenue will need to be modified/shortened to allow for eastbound left-turning movements onto the access drive.

Access to the guest parking lot will be provided via two full movement access drives off City Gate Lane. Additional access will be provided via a single access drive off Comfort Drive located approximately 300 feet south of Ferry Road. This access drive will be restricted to right-turning movements only due to the existing raised median along Comfort Drive. All three access drives will provide one inbound land and one outbound lane. Outbound movements from the access drives should be under stop-sign control.

A copy of the site plan sheets depicting the proposed development and pedestrian and vehicle access is included in the Appendix.

## Directional Distribution

The directions from which residents of the apartment development and attendees of the Event Center will approach and depart the site were estimated based on existing travel patterns, as determined from the traffic counts. Figure 5 illustrates the directional distribution of the apartment development-generated traffic and Figure 6 illustrates the directional distribution of the Event Center generated traffic.



## Estimated Site Traffic Generation

The volume of traffic generated for the apartment development were estimated using data published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition for Land-Use Code 221 (Multifamily Housing - Mid-Rise).

It should be noted that the ITE Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition does not have trip rates for a banquet facilities/Event Center. Based on information provided by the operator, the proposed Event Center will be available for use seven days a week and will be utilized for all types of events including corporate/social events, Expo/Trade Show events, all day events, and evening events such as galas, weddings and not-for profit fundraisers, corporate dinners and social events. This operation is similar to the existing operation of the banquet and meeting space located within Hotel Arista.

The volume of traffic generated for the proposed Event Center was estimated based on trip generation surveys previously conducted by KLOA, Inc. at similar type of land uses in the Chicagoland area and based on survey data by Hamilton Associates of four different sites in Vancouver, BC. (summaries of the trip generation data are included in the Appendix). The results of the trip generation surveys indicated that the average trip rate for a banquet facility was 0.25 trips per seat. As such, the proposed Event Center is projected to generate approximately 200 trips during the peak inbound and outbound activity at maximum capacity and this trip generation utilized for the purposes of this evaluation. However, it was assumed that approximately 10 percent of inbound trips would be made by vehicles dropping off/picking-up event attendees, resulting in outbound trips. Additionally, since corporate events typically end prior to the weekday evening peak hour, the outbound trip generation by the proposed Event Center was assumed to be reduced by 20 percent

It should be noted that the trip generation methodology for the Event Center is conservative as it assumes it will be operating at maximum occupancy and that the inbound trips and outbound trips will occur during the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours whereas these events will usually be held by multiple groups with events occurring at various times of the day. Additionally, the trip generation estimates do not include any internal capture of trips of event attendees who may also be staying at Hotel Arista or associated with any of the other office/commercial developments within City Gate Centre. Table 1 summarizes the estimated peak hour trips anticipated for the proposed apartments and Event Center.

Table 1
ESTIMATED SITE-GENERATED TRAFFIC VOLUMES

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE } \\ & \text { Land-Use } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Type/Size | Weekday Morning Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday Evening Peak Hour |  |  | Daily Two-Way Traffic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |  |
| 221 | Apartments (285 Units) | 25 | 72 | 97 | 75 | 48 | 123 | 1,574 |
| -- | Event Center (800 people) | $\underline{200}$ | $\underline{20}$ | $\underline{220}$ | $\underline{16}$ | $\underline{160}$ | $\underline{176}$ | -- |
|  | Total | 225 | 92 | 317 | 91 | 208 | 299 | -- |

## 4. Projected Traffic Conditions

The total projected traffic volumes include the existing traffic volumes, increase in background traffic due to growth, and the traffic estimated to be generated by the proposed subject development.

## Development Traffic Assignment

The estimated weekday morning and weekday evening peak hour traffic volumes that will be generated by the proposed development were assigned to the roadway system in accordance with the previously described directional distribution (Figure 5). The total new traffic assignment for the proposed apartment units is illustrated in Figure 7 and the total new traffic assignment for the proposed Event Center is illustrated in Figure 8.

## Background Traffic Conditions

The existing traffic volumes (Figure 4) were increased by a regional growth factor to account for the increase in existing traffic related to regional growth in the area (i.e., not attributable to any particular planned development). Based on ADT projections provided by the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) in a letter dated February 14, 2019, the existing traffic volumes are projected to increase by a compound annual growth rate of 0.7 percent per year. As such, traffic volumes were increased by four percent total over six years (buildout year plus five years) to project Year 2025 conditions. A copy of the CMAP 2050 projections letter is included in the Appendix. It should be noted that this background growth was only applied to the through volumes along Ferry Road and IL Route 59. The Year 2025 Background Traffic Volumes are illustrated in Figure 9.

## Total Projected Traffic Volumes

The development-generated traffic was added to the existing traffic volumes accounting for background growth to determine the Year 2025 total projected traffic volumes, as illustrated in Figure 10.

It should be noted that there are currently plans for a proposed Sports Arena that will be located on the north side of Ferry Road between Corporate Lane and Monarch Drive. As part of the Sports Arena, the intersection of Ferry Road with Comfort Drive/Corporate Lane will be signalized, and high visibility crosswalks will be added to the west and north legs of the intersection. The traffic estimated to be generated by the Sports Arena was added to the Year 2025 total projected traffic volumes determine the Year 2025 projected conditions with the development of the proposed Sports Arena as summarized in Figure 11.






## 5. Traffic Analysis and Recommendations

The following provides an evaluation conducted for the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours. The analysis includes conducting capacity analyses to determine how well the roadway system and access drives are projected to operate and whether any roadway improvements or modification are required.

## Traffic Analyses

Roadway and adjacent or nearby intersection analyses were performed for the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours for the existing (Year 2019), future projected (Year 2025) and future projected traffic volumes taking into consideration the development of the proposed Sports Arena.

The traffic analyses were performed using the methodologies outlined in the Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition and analyzed using the Synchro/SimTraffic 10 computer software. Synchro/SimTraffic 10 was utilized due to the proximity of the access roadways serving CityGate Centre to the signalized intersection of IL Route 59 with Ferry Road.

The analyses for the unsignalized intersections determine the average control delay to vehicles at an intersection. Control delay is the elapsed time from a vehicle joining the queue at a stop sign (includes the time required to decelerate to a stop) until its departure from the stop sign and resumption of free flow speed. The methodology analyzes each intersection approach controlled by a stop sign and considers traffic volumes on all approaches and lane characteristics.

The ability of an intersection to accommodate traffic flow is expressed in terms of level of service, which is assigned a letter from A to F based on the average control delay experienced by vehicles passing through the intersection. The Highway Capacity Manual definitions for levels of service and the corresponding control delay for signalized intersections and unsignalized intersections are included in the Appendix of this report.

Summaries of the traffic analysis results showing the level of service and overall intersection delay (measured in seconds) for the existing and Year 2025 total projected conditions are presented in Tables 2 through 4, respectively. A discussion of the intersections follows. Summary sheets for the capacity analyses are included in the Appendix.

Table 2
CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS UNSIGNALIZED - EXISTING CONDITIONS

| Intersection | Weekday Morning Peak Hour |  | Weekday Evening Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Ferry Road with Corporate Lane/Comfort Drive |  |  |  |  |
| - Northbound Left Turn | F | 99+ | F | 52.9 |
| - Northbound Through | -- | -- | E | 45.9 |
| - Northbound Right Turn | B | 13.3 | B | 10.9 |
| - Southbound Left Turn | -- | -- | E | 47.4 |
| - Southbound Through/Right Turn | B | 10.6 | B | 13.6 |
| - Eastbound Left Turn | A | 9.1 | B | 13.9 |
| - Westbound Left Turn | B | 12.1 | A | 8.7 |
| Ferry Road with CityGate Lane/Monarch Drive |  |  |  |  |
| - Northbound Left Turn | F | 99+ | F | 99+ |
| - Northbound Through/Right Turn | C | 15.5 | B | 11.6 |
| - Southbound Left Turn/Through | F | 79.2 | F | 71.2 |
| - Southbound Right Turn | B | 10.3 | B | 13.7 |
| - Eastbound Left Turn | A | 8.7 | B | 11.3 |
| - Westbound Left Turn | B | 14.2 | A | 8.5 |
| Westings Avenue with CityGate Lane/Calamos Court |  |  |  |  |
| - Northbound Left Turn/Through | B | 14.4 | B | 10.2 |
| - Northbound Through/Right Turn | A | 9.2 | A | 8.7 |
| - Southbound Left Turn/Through | C | 15.9 | B | 10.0 |
| - Southbound Right Turn | A | 8.3 | A | 8.6 |
| - Eastbound Left Turn | A | 7.4 | A | 7.4 |
| - Westbound Left Turn | A | 7.7 | A | 7.2 |
| Westings Avenue with IL Route 59 |  |  |  |  |
| - Westbound Right Turn | C | 15.7 | C | 18.2 |
| LOS = Level of Service Delay is measured in seconds. |  |  |  |  |

Table 3
CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - UNSIGNALIZED - PROJECTED CONDITIONS

| Intersection | Weekday Morning Peak Hour |  | Weekday Evening Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Ferry Road with Corporate Lane/Comfort Drive |  |  |  |  |
| - Northbound Left Turn | F | 99+ | F | 99+ |
| - Northbound Through | -- | -- | F | 58.8 |
| - Northbound Right Turn | B | 14.3 | B | 11.4 |
| - Southbound Left Turn | -- | -- | F | 62.2 |
| - Southbound Through/Right Turn | B | 10.9 | B | 14.0 |
| - Eastbound Left Turn | A | 9.2 | B | 14.4 |
| - Westbound Left Turn | B | 13.5 | A | 9.0 |
| Ferry Road with CityGate Lane/Monarch Drive |  |  |  |  |
| - Northbound Left Turn | F | 99+ | F | 99+ |
| - Northbound Through/Right Turn | C | 16.6 | B | 12.4 |
| - Southbound Left Turn/Through | F | 99+ | F | 99+ |
| - Southbound Right Turn | B | 10.6 | B | 14.7 |
| - Eastbound Left Turn | A | 9.0 | B | 12.1 |
| - Westbound Left Turn | C | 16.1 | A | 8.7 |
| Westings Avenue with CityGate Lane/Calamos Court |  |  |  |  |
| - Northbound Left Turn/Through | C | 19.3 | B | 11.3 |
| - Northbound Through/Right Turn | A | 9.3 | A | 8.9 |
| - Southbound Left Turn/Through | C | 20.2 | B | 12.1 |
| - Southbound Right Turn | A | 8.4 | A | 8.9 |
| - Eastbound Left Turn | A | 7.7 | A | 7.5 |
| - Westbound Left Turn | A | 7.7 | A | 7.3 |
| Westings Avenue with IL Route 59 |  |  |  |  |
| - Westbound Right Turn | C | 19.1 | D | 27.5 |
| Westings Avenue with Proposed Access Drive |  |  |  |  |
| - Southbound Approach | A | 9.9 | B | 10.4 |
| - Eastbound Left Turn | A | 7.4 | A | 7.4 |
| LOS = Level of Service Delay is measured in seconds. |  |  |  |  |

Table 4
CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - FERRY ROAD WITH CORPROATE LANE/COMFORT DRIVE - SIGNALIZIED


## Discussion and Recommendations

The following summarizes how the intersections are projected to operate and identify any roadway and traffic control improvements to accommodate the development traffic.

## Ferry Road with Comfort Drive/Corporate Lane

The results of the capacity analysis indicate that the northbound left turning movement currently operates at LOS F during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, the northbound through movement operates at LOS E during the weekday evening peak hour and the northbound rightturning movement operates at LOS B during the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hour. The southbound left turning movement currently operate at LOS E during the weekday evening peak hour and the southbound right-turning movement currently operate at LOS B during the weekday morning and evening peak hours.

Under Year 2025 conditions, taking into consideration the traffic only projected to be generated by the proposed subject development, northbound left turning movements are projected to continue operating at LOS F during the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours, the northbound through movement its projected to operate at LOS F during the weekday evening peak hour and the northbound right-turning movements are projected to continue operating at LOS B during the peak hours. The southbound left-turning movement is projected to operate a LOS F during the weekday evening peak hour and the southbound right-turning movements are projected to continue operating at LOS B during the peak hours. As discussed in the following section, when the projected traffic volumes are compared to the peak hour traffic signal warrant (Warrant 3) criteria published in the MUTCD, a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection during the weekday evening peak hour

When analyzed with the provision of a traffic signal at this intersection, this intersection overall is projected to operate at LOS A during the weekday morning peak hour and at LOS B during the weekday evening peak hour and all of the approaches are projected to operate at LOS D or better during the peak hours. Furthermore, the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues for the southbound, eastbound and westbound left-turning movements are projected to be contained within the existing left-turn lane storage provided. The $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues for the northbound approach are projected to be approximately 190 feet during the weekday evening peak hour which will extend beyond the approximately 140 feet of storage, however, this queue will not prohibit vehicles from accessing the northbound through and right-turn lanes given the existing width of the roadway. It should be noted that the turn lane storage lengths are not projected to change with the installation of the traffic signal.

Under Year 2025 conditions, taking into consideration the traffic estimated to be generated by the proposed Sports Arena and the provision of a traffic signal at this intersection, this intersection overall is projected to continue operating at LOS A during the weekday morning peak hour and at LOS B during the weekday evening peak hour and all of the approaches are projected to continue operating at LOS D or better during the peak hours. It should be noted that the northbound leftturning movement which is projected to operate on the threshold of LOS E/F and the northbound through movement is projected to operate at LOS E during the weekday evening peak hour.

Furthermore, the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues for the southbound, eastbound and westbound left-turning movements are projected to be contained within the existing left-turn lane storage provided. The $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues for the northbound approach are projected to be approximately 190 feet during the weekday evening peak hour which will extend beyond the approximately 140 feet of storage, however, this queue will not prohibit vehicles from accessing the northbound through and right-turn lanes given the existing width of the roadway. It should be noted that the turn lane storage lengths are not projected to change with the installation of the traffic signal.

As such, this intersection with the proposed improvements, is generally projected to operate at acceptable levels of service during the peak hours. However, this intersection should be monitored in the future to determine (should the projected traffic volumes be realized) whether additional green time be allocated to the northbound left-turning movements. As previously indicated, the results of the capacity analyses are conservative as it assumes maximum occupancy at the proposed Event Center. Overall, the traffic projected to be generated by the proposed development will have a limited impact on the operations of this intersection and no additional intersection improvements will be required.

## Ferry Road with CityGate Lane/Monarch Drive

The results of the capacity analysis indicate that the northbound and southbound left-turning movements from CityGate Lane and Monarch Drive onto Ferry Road currently operate at LOS F during the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours. Furthermore, the northbound and southbound right-turning movements currently operate at LOS C or better during the peak hours.

Under Year 2025 conditions, taking into consideration the traffic only projected to be generated by the proposed subject development, the northbound and southbound left-turning movements are projected to continue operating at LOS F during the peak hours and the northbound and southbound right-turning movements are projected to operate at LOS C or better during the peak hours with increase in delay of approximately one second or less. Furthermore, eastbound and westbound left-turning movements from Ferry Road onto CityGate Lane/Monarch Drive are projected to operate at LOS C or better during the peak hours with increases in delay of approximately two seconds or less.

It should be noted that the increases in delay experienced at this intersection are primarily attributed to the existing traffic and background growth as the proposed development is only projected to increase the traffic traversing this intersection by approximately eight percent of which the majority of the new development's trips will be made in the eastbound and westbound directions along Ferry Road. Due to the location of the proposed residential access drive off Westings Avenue, it is anticipated that outbound vehicles from the residential parking garage that are destined to the west on Ferry Road will find it more convenient to utilize the intersection of Ferry Road with Comfort Drive, particularly with the provision of a traffic signal at this intersection, rather than utilizing the unsignalized intersection of Ferry Road with CityGate Lane. Therefore, no apartment generated traffic projected to make a northbound left-turn from CityGate Lane onto Ferry Road.

Additionally, the provision of a traffic signal at the intersection of Ferry Road with Comfort Drive/Corporate Lane may draw vehicles that currently perform northbound left-turning movements at this intersection (particularly vehicles who utilize CityGate Lane to travel from Calamos Court to Ferry Road) and the projected Event Center generated vehicles egressing the proposed garage may opt to utilize the proposed traffic signal at Ferry Road with Comfort Drive, reducing the overall northbound left-turning movements from CityGate Lane onto Ferry Road. Furthermore, the provision of this signal at this intersection in combination with the existing traffic signal at the intersection of IL Route 59 with Ferry Road will create additional gaps in the Ferry Road traffic stream which will likely reduce the delays experienced by existing northbound and southbound traffic. When a traffic signal is provided at the intersection of Ferry Road with Comfort Drive, in order to help encourage attendees of the proposed Event Center to utilize the proposed traffic signal at Ferry Road with Comfort Drive, wayfinding signage should be provided directing vehicles to this traffic signal.

## Westings Avenue with CityGate Lane/Calamos Court

The results of the capacity analysis indicate that the northbound and southbound approaches currently operate at LOS C or better during the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours. Under Year 2025 projected conditions, the northbound and southbound approaches are projected to continue operating at LOS C or better during the peak hours with increases in delay of approximately five seconds or less. Additionally, the eastbound and westbound left-turning movements are projected to continue operating at LOS A during the peak hours with increases in delay of less than one second and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues of one to two vehicles. As such, the traffic projected to be generated by the proposed development will have a limited impact on the operations of this intersection and no roadway or traffic control improvements will be required.

## Westings Avenue with IL Route 59

The results of the capacity analysis indicate that the westbound approach currently operates at LOS C during the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours. Under Year 2025 conditions, the westbound approach is projected to operate at LOS C during the weekday morning peak hour and at LOS D during the weekday evening peak hour with increases in delay of approximately four and nine seconds, respectively and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues of two to three vehicles. As such, the traffic projected to be generated by the proposed development will have a limited impact on the operations of this intersection and no roadway or traffic control improvements will be required.

## Westings Avenue with Proposed Access Drive

The results of the capacity analyses indicate that outbound movements from the access drive onto Westings Avenue are projected to operate at LOS A during the weekday morning peak hour and at LOS B during the weekday evening peak hours. Furthermore, eastbound left-turning movements form Westings Avenue onto the access drive are projected to operate at LOS A during both peak hours with $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues of one to two vehicles.

As previously indicated, the existing landscaped median along Westings Avenue in the vicinity of the site will be modified/shortened by approximately 25 feet to allow for eastbound left-turn movements onto the access drive. However, the median will not need to be modified to provide an exclusive left-turn lane based on the following:

- The results of the capacity analyses indicated eastbound left-turns onto the access drive are projected to operate an acceptable level of service with limited delays and queueing.
- A review of the simulation showed that eastbound left-turning vehicles are projected to wait for an opposing vehicle one time during the weekday morning peak hour and one time during the weekday evening peak hour. Both instances resulted in a queue of just one vehicle (vehicle waiting to turn)
- The eastbound left-turning movements onto the access drive are only opposed by 61 vehicles during the weekday morning peak hour and 72 vehicles during the weekday evening peak hour equating to approximately one vehicle per minute.
- The analysis of the proposed access drive utilizing the Highway Capacity Software (HCS) 7 indicated that the eastbound left-turning movement is projected to operate queue free for approximately over 95 percent of the peak hour.

Should an eastbound left-turning vehicle need to stop within the roadway to wait for a westbound vehicle, this vehicle can stack within the median break which will not obstruct eastbound through movements.

As such, this access drive will be adequate in accommodating the traffic projected to be generated by the proposed development and left-turns from Westings Avenue can be accommodated by the existing roadway network.

## Traffic Signal Warrant Evaluation

The existing and projected weekday morning and weekday evening peak hour were compared to the peak hour traffic signal warrant (Warrant 3) criteria published in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) to determine if a traffic signal is warranted during either peak hour. It should be noted that since Ferry Road has a posted speed limit of 45 miles per hour. The traffic signal warrant criteria reflecting the 70 percent factor was utilized. Additionally, the minor approach right-turning movements were reduced based on Pagones Theorem to account for rightturn on red maneuvers. Table 5 summarizes the traffic signal warrant evaluation for existing and projected conditions.

As can be seen from Table 5, when the existing traffic volumes are compared to the peak hour traffic signal warrant (Warrant 3) criteria published in the MUTCD, taking into consideration a reduction in the right-turning movements based on Pagones Theorem, a traffic signal is not warranted at this intersection during either peak hour. However, a traffic signal is warranted under projected conditions during the weekday evening peak hour.

Table 5
PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT - FERRY ROAD WITH COMFORT DRIVE

|  | Time Period | Major Approach Total Volume | Minor Approach Volume |  | Peak Hour Warrant Met? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Northbound | Southbound |  |
|  | Weekday Morning Peak Hour | 1851 | 12 | 5 | No |
|  | Weekday Evening Peak Hour | 1618 | 75 | 28 | No |
|  | Weekday Morning Peak Hour | 2011 | 61 | 5 | No |
|  | Weekday Evening Peak Hour | 1764 | 162 | 28 | Yes <br> (NB Approach) |

Note: Northbound right turns reduced by 75 percent and southbound right turns reduced by 60 percent

## 6. Parking Evaluation

The following provides an evaluation of the proposed residential parking garage, proposed guest parking lot and existing parking locations serving City Gate Center in accommodating the parking projected to be generated by the proposed development.

## Evaluation of the Residential Parking Supply

For multiple family dwelling uses, the City of Naperville requires two parking spaces per dwelling unit and 0.25 parking guest parking spaces per unit, thereby requiring 642 parking spaces.

As previously indicated, the proposed development will provide a residential parking garage containing approximately 429 parking spaces. Additionally, a surface guest parking lot will be developed providing 36 parking spaces for a total of 465 parking spaces provided. With the proposed 285 units, the resulting parking ratio will be 1.63 parking spaces per unit. With a total of 371 bedrooms proposed, the resulting parking ratio will be 1.25 parking spaces per bedroom. The total 465 parking spaces, when compared to the City code of 633 parking spaces results in a deficit of 168 parking spaces.

However, the proposed parking ratio of 1.63 parking spaces per unit will be adequate based on parking occupancy surveys of an existing, similar residential development in Vernon Hills, published parking demand data by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), census tract information, and similar developments in the area that have been approved and are operating with similar parking ratios as the proposed CityGate Apartment development. A description of each of the supporting methodologies follows.

## Parking Occupancy of AMLI - Vernon Hills Development

A parking occupancy survey was conducted at the existing AMLI Museum Gardens luxury apartment development located at 1175 Museum Boulevard in Vernon Hills, Illinois. The apartment development, which was constructed in 2004, contains 294-units ( 576 bedrooms) and provides a total of approximately 599 parking spaces (mixture of 189 parking garage spaces, 56 parking spaces in detached garages throughout the campus, and 354 surface parking spaces around the perimeter. The results of the parking occupancy survey indicated that the apartment development experienced a peak parking occupancy of 397 spaces at 10:00 P.M. which is a parking ratio of 1.45 spaces per occupied unit and 0.74 parking spaces per occupied bedroom. This parking ratio is inclusive of all resident and guest parking. It should be noted that at the time the parking occupancy surveys were conducted that the apartment units were 93 percent occupied (273 occupied units and approximately 536 occupied bedrooms).

## Parking Based on ITE Parking Demand Data

In reviewing the survey data published in the ITE Parking Generation Manual, $5^{\text {th }}$ Edition for Land Use Code 221 (Mid-Rise Apartments), the following was determined:

- The average peak parking demand ratio is 1.31 spaces per dwelling unit
- $\quad$ The $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile peak parking demand ratio is 1.47 spaces per dwelling unit
- The average peak parking demand ratio is 0.75 spaces per bedroom
- The $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile peak parking demand ratio is 0.87 spaces per bedroom

As can be seen, the average and $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile parking supply ratios, which account for both resident and guest parking, provided by the proposed apartment building are greater than the average and $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile parking demands per dwelling unit and bedroom based on information published in the ITE Parking Generation Manual, $5^{\text {th }}$ Edition.

## Parking Based on U.S. Census Bureau Information

U.S. Census Bureau information reported between 2013 and 2017 shows that renter occupied households within the subject area in the area of the subject development, approximately 70 percent of renter occupied residences have zero or one vehicle available, 28 percent of renter occupied residences have two vehicles available and two percent of renter occupied residences have three vehicles available. This survey includes multi-family developments as well as singlefamily homes, both with one to several bedrooms in each unit.

It should be noted that these percentages are consistent with the characteristics of the proposed development which will provide 199 studio/one-bedroom units (approximately 70 percent of the total) and 86 two-bedroom units (approximately 30 percent of the total). Applying these percentage to the proposed 285-unit development assumes approximately 378 parking spaces will be required. With 465 parking spaces provided, there will be a surplus of 87 parking spaces to be utilized by residents and guests. Therefore, based on census data of the immediate area, the proposed 465 parking spaces are adequate to accommodate the residential peak parking demand.

## Comparison of Parking Ratios of Similar Apartment Developments

A comparison of parking ratios of similar apartment developments in the Chicagoland area is summarized in Table 5. Table 5 shows the number of units, bedrooms and parking spaces as well as the parking space per unit ratio, as well as the parking space per bedroom ratio. It should be noted that these apartments do have access to nearby bus routes but are not within walking distance of railway stations. As shown in Table 2, the proposed apartment development parking ratio is similar to the average of the other similar developments. The proposed development is providing 1.63 parking spaces per unit and 1.25 spaces per bedroom. The ten other similar developments are providing parking at an average ratio of 1.65 spaces per unit and 1.14 spaces per bedroom. Based on the above, the proposed 465 parking spaces are adequate to accommodate residential peak parking demands.

Table 5
COMPARISON OF PARKING RATIOS AT SIMILAR DEVELOPMENTS

| Development Name | Number of Units | Number of Bedrooms | Number of Parking Spaces | Spaces/Unit | Spaces/ Bedroom |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AMLI - <br> Deerfield | 240 | 329 | 396 | 1.65 | 1.2 |
| 8700 Waukegan - <br> Morton Grove | 184 | 258 | 276 | 1.50 | 1.1 |
| Tapestry Glenview | 290 | 403 | 490 | 1.69 | 1.2 |
| Northshore 770 Northbrook | 347 | 545 | 571 | 1.65 | 1.0 |
| Woodview Deerfield | 248 | 369 | 412 | 1.49 | 1.1 |
| Mellody Farms Vernon Hills | 260 | 388 | 485 | 1.76 | 1.2 |
| IL 62/Plum Grove Road - Schaumburg | 372 | -- | 635 | 1.71 | -- |
| Cedarlake Plainfield | 284 | -- | 443 | 1.56 | -- |
| 404 Social Lincolnshire | 302 | 458 | 534 | 1.77 | 1.2 |
| The Elaine Northbrook | 338 | -- | 580 | 1.72 | -- |
|  |  |  | Average: | 1.65 | 1.14 |
| Proposed Apartment Development | 281 | 371 | 464 | 1.63 | 1.25 |

## Evaluation of Guest Parking Supply

It should be noted that all of the above parking demand comparison methodologies include the parking demand for both resident and guest parking. However, information regarding the separate parking demands for resident versus guest parking is not available. As can be seen from the above methodologies, the proposed development will have a projected peak parking demand of 419 spaces ( $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile parking demand based on information published by ITE).

This peak parking demand can be accommodated by the proposed 429 parking spaces within the parking garage with a surplus of 10 parking spaces. However, in order to ensure adequate guest parking is provided and to increase the overall parking supply, the proposed development will provide an additional 36 parking spaces within the proposed 416 space surface parking lot located to the northeast of the proposed apartment building. In the unlikely event additional guest parking is required, arrangements could be made for that to be accommodated within the proposed residential parking garage which is projected to have a surplus of up to 21 additional parking spaces during times of peak resident parking demand.

As such, the 36 apartment guest parking spaces that will be located within the proposed surface parking lot will be adequate in providing separate resident and guest parking locations and will overall increase the number of parking spaces provided by the proposed development.

## Evaluation of Event Center Parking Supply

As previously indicated, the proposed Event Center will be available for use seven days a week and will be utilized for all types of events including corporate/social events, Expo/Trade Show events, all day events, evening events such as galas, weddings and not-for profit fundraisers, corporate dinners and social events. For meeting space, the City of Naperville require ten parking spaces per 1,000 square-feet of growth floor area, thereby requiring 340 parking spaces.

Parking for the proposed Event Center will be accommodated within the proposed 416 -space surface parking lot. As previously indicated, 36 of the parking spaces will be reserved for guest parking for the proposed apartment units, resulting in 380 parking spaces for use of the proposed Event Center which is 40 spaces greater than the City of Naperville requirement.

As such, the proposed surface parking lot will be adequate in accommodating the parking estimated to be generated by the proposed Event Center and will provide sufficient parking for both apartment guest parking and attendees of the Event Center. It should be noted that as part of the proposed development, approximately eight on-street parking spaces will be eliminated along the south side of City Gate Lane to accommodate a proposed drop-off/pick-up/valet loading zone as well as the loading bays for the proposed apartment units and Event Center.

## Parking Occupancy Surveys

In order to determine the existing parking demand of the City Gate Centre, parking occupancy surveys were conducted hourly at the existing parking locations (as previously described) on Wednesday, May 8, 2019 between 7:00 A.M. and 9:00 P.M. and on Saturday, May 11, 2019 between 11:00 A.M. and 10:00 P.M. These days were chosen to encompass a weekday in which events were occurring at the hotel between 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. and a Saturday in which a wedding that utilized several of the different hotel spaces occurred between 5:00 P.M. and 11:00 P.M. The results of the parking occupancy surveys are summarized in Tables $\mathbf{6}$ through 9.

As can be seen from Tables 6 and 7, the parking spaces serving the City Gate Centre had the following peak parking demands:

- The peak parking demand on the weekday was 951 parking spaces (52 percent occupied) occurring at 12:00 Noon resulting in a surplus of 894 spaces.
- The peak parking demand on Saturday was 297 spaces (16 percent occupied) occurring at 7:00 P.M. resulting in a surplus of 1,518 parking spaces.
- Looking specifically at the 2191 City Gate Lane parking garage, the peak parking demand on the weekday was 580 parking spaces ( 55 percent occupied) occurring at 1:00 P.M. resulting in a surplus of 471 spaces.
- Looking specifically at the 2191 City Gate Lane parking garage, the peak parking demand on Saturday was 191 spaces (18 percent occupied) occurring at 3:00 P.M. resulting in a surplus of 860 parking spaces.

As such, the existing parking locations within the City Gate Center have sufficient capacity to accommodate its existing parking demand.
Table 6
PARKING OCCUPANCY SURVEYS - WEEKDAY

| Time | 2191 City Gate <br> Lane Garage | On-Street <br> Parking | 2135 City Gate Lane <br> Surface Parking Lot | 2035 Calamos <br> Court Garage | Calamos Court <br> East Surface Lot | Calamos Court <br> West Surface Lot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 7

| Time | 2191 City Gate <br> Lane Garage | On-Street Parking | 2135 City Gate Lane Surface Parking Lot | 2035 Calamos Court Garage | Calamos Court East Surface Lot | Calamos Court West Surface Lot | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11:00 A.M. | 157 | 25 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 193 |
| 12:00 P.M. | 158 | 32 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 202 |
| 1:00 P.M. | 165 | 31 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 206 |
| 2:00 P.M. | 181 | 26 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 224 |
| 3:00 P.M. | 191 | 31 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 237 |
| 4:00 P.M. | 186 | 41 | 8 | 23 | 3 | 0 | 261 |
| 5:00 P.M. | 181 | 46 | 9 | 34 | 4 | 0 | 274 |
| 6:00 P.M. | 173 | 58 | 15 | 37 | 11 | 0 | 294 |
| 7:00 P.M. | 149 | 72 | 14 | 38 | 24 | 0 | 297 |
| 8:00 P.M. | 148 | 63 | 12 | 39 | 23 | 0 | 285 |
| 9:00 P.M. | 137 | 49 | 11 | 32 | 17 | 0 | 246 |
| 10:00 P.M. | 123 | 42 | 10 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 198 |
| Inventory | 1051 | 77 | 34 | 613 | 33 | 37 | 1,845 |

Table 8

| Time | 2191 City Gate Lane Garage | On-Street Parking | 2135 City Gate Lane Surface Parking Lot | 2035 Calamos <br> Court Garage | Calamos Court East Surface Lot | Calamos Court West Surface Lot | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7:00 A.M. | 18\% | 56\% | 15\% | 3\% | 3\% | 0\% | 14\% |
| 8:00 A.M. | 33\% | 65\% | 26\% | 6\% | 6\% | 0\% | 28\% |
| 9:00 A.M. | 49\% | 71\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 46\% |
| 10:00 A.M. | 52\% | 79\% | 88\% | 9\% | 9\% | 0\% | 49\% |
| 11:00 A.M. | 53\% | 77\% | 94\% | 3\% | 3\% | 0\% | 51\% |
| 12:00 P.M. | 54\% | 74\% | 94\% | 12\% | 12\% | 0\% | 52\% |
| 1:00 P.M. | 55\% | 95\% | 94\% | 15\% | 15\% | 3\% | 51\% |
| 2:00 P.M. | 51\% | 88\% | 91\% | 18\% | 18\% | 0\% | 49\% |
| 3:00 P.M. | 46\% | 87\% | 88\% | 6\% | 6\% | 0\% | 46\% |
| 4:00 P.M. | 43\% | 77\% | 79\% | 21\% | 21\% | 0\% | 41\% |
| 5:00 P.M. | 33\% | 64\% | 26\% | 36\% | 36\% | 0\% | 28\% |
| 6:00 P.M. | 24\% | 55\% | 26\% | 52\% | 52\% | 0\% | 21\% |
| 7:00 P.M. | 15\% | 56\% | 21\% | 27\% | 27\% | 0\% | 13\% |
| 8:00 P.M. | 14\% | 57\% | 21\% | 42\% | 42\% | 0\% | 13\% |
| 9:00 P.M. | 11\% | 58\% | 15\% | 12\% | 12\% | 0\% | 11\% |

Table 9

| PARKING OCCUPANCY PERCENTAGES - SATURDAY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | 2191 City Gate <br> Lane Garage | On-Street <br> Parking | 2135 City Gate Lane <br> Surface Parking Lot | 2035 Calamos <br> Court Garage | Calamos Court <br> East Surface Lot | Calamos Court <br> West Surface Lot | Total |

## 7. Conclusion

Based on the preceding analyses and recommendations, the following conclusions have been made:

- A traffic signal is warranted at the intersection of Ferry Road with Comfort Drive/Corporate Lane during the weekday evening peak hour under Year 2025 projected conditions.
- The traffic that will be generated by the proposed development can be accommodated by the area roadway system with the provision of a traffic signal at the intersection of Ferry Road with Comfort Drive/Corporate Lane.
- The proposed traffic signal should be monitored in the future to determine if additional green time should be allocated to the northbound left-turning movement.
- The proposed residential site access will be adequate in accommodating the projected traffic volumes entering and exiting the proposed development. The existing landscaped median along Westings Avenue in the vicinity of the site will need to be modified to allow for eastbound left-turn movements onto the access drive or the access drive will need to be modified to align with the existing median break along the roadway
- The proposed residential parking ratio of 1.63 parking spaces per apartment unit will be adequate based on the following:
o Parking occupancy surveys of an existing, similar residential development in Vernon Hills.
o Published parking demand data by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in the Parking Generation Manual $5^{\text {th }}$ Edition.
o Census tract information regarding the number of vehicles available per renter occupied household within the vicinity of the site.
o The parking supplies provided at similar developments in the area that have been approved and are operating with similar parking ratios as the proposed CityGate Apartment development.
- The proposed 416 space surface parking lot will be adequate in accommodating the parking for guests of the proposed apartment development as well as attendees of the proposed Event Center


## Appendix

Traffic Count Summary Sheets Site Plan CMAP 2050 Projections Letter Level of Service Criteria Capacity Analysis Summary Sheets

## Traffic Count Summary Sheets



| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 6.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | - | 0.7 | - | 0.0 | 0.4 | 50.0 | - | 0.5 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 7.5 | - | 7.2 | 0.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | , | - | - |


| Start Time | Ferry Road <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Ferry Road <br> Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Comfort Drive <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Corproate Lane <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. <br> Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. <br> Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. <br> Total |  |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 9 | 313 | 9 | 0 | 331 | 0 | 15 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 488 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 12 | 283 | 9 | 0 | 304 | 0 | 18 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 492 |
| 8:00 AM | 1 | 18 | 302 | 8 | 0 | 329 | 0 | 19 | 132 | 2 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 492 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 14 | 223 | 6 | 0 | 243 | 0 | 19 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 399 |
| Total | 1 | 53 | 1121 | 32 | 0 | 1207 | 0 | 71 | 561 | 2 | 0 | 634 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 1871 |
| Approach \% | 0.1 | 4.4 | 92.9 | 2.7 | - | - | 0.0 | 11.2 | 88.5 | 0.3 | - | - | 0.0 | 47.4 | 0.0 | 52.6 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | - | - | - |
| Total \% | 0.1 | 2.8 | 59.9 | 1.7 | - | 64.5 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 30.0 | 0.1 | - | 33.9 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.5 | - | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | - | 0.6 | - |
| PHF | 0.250 | 0.736 | 0.895 | 0.889 | - | 0.912 | 0.000 | 0.934 | 0.866 | 0.250 | - | 0.881 | 0.000 | 0.750 | 0.000 | 0.625 | - | 0.792 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.688 | - | 0.688 | 0.951 |
| Lights | 1 | 50 | 1103 | 32 | - | 1186 | 0 | 71 | 548 | 2 | - | 621 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 10 | - | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | - | 9 | 1833 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 94.3 | 98.4 | 100.0 | - | 98.3 | - | 100.0 | 97.7 | 100.0 | - | 97.9 | - | 77.8 | - | 100.0 | - | 89.5 | - | - | - | 81.8 | - | 81.8 | 98.0 |
| Buses | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | - | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 4 |
| \% Buses | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | - | 0.3 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | - | 11 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | - | 13 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 26 |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \% Single-Unit } \\ \text { Trucks } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.9 | - | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | - | 2.1 | - | 22.2 | - | 0.0 | - | 10.5 | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 1.4 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | $\checkmark$ | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | $\cdots$ | 2 | 8 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 | - | 0.5 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | 18.2 | - | 18.2 | 0.4 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\cdots$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Bicycles on } \\ \text { Road } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

$\qquad$

|  |  | \％ | \％ | $\stackrel{\sim}{4}$ | ¢ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{array}\right\|$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \stackrel{g}{\circ} \\ \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  | ¢ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{9}{7}$ | へ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | ＇ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | － | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  | $\dot{8} \mid$ |  | 응 | $\sim$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\sim$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | ＇ |
|  | 莒 | － | － |  | － | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ． |  |  | － |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\mathrm{H}}{\overline{0}} \\ & \frac{\square}{\bar{x}} \end{aligned}$ | へ | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{ \pm}{\sim}$ | 7 | ¢ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \dot{0} \\ \dot{a} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{n}$ |  | 8 |  | － | $0$ | $\sim$ | $\underset{m}{\mathrm{~m}}$ | $\sim$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | $\underset{\underset{F}{2}}{\stackrel{2}{5}}$ | － | － |  | $\bigcirc$ | － | $0 .$ | $0 .$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  | $0$ | ， | $\bigcirc$ | ＇ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
|  |  | $\sim$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\sim$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \mathbf{m} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\underset{0}{7}$ |  | $\sim$ |  | － | $0$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | $\underset{\substack{\text { E } \\ \hline}}{ }$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $0$ | $0 .$ | $8$ | － |  | － |  | － | ＇ | $\bigcirc$ | ， | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
|  | 운휸 | $\stackrel{\circ}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | \％ | \％ | $\stackrel{\sim}{0}$ |  | $\stackrel{+}{\sim}$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | ． |

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data（4：30 PM）


[^0] R


| $\%$ Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | - | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | - | 0.8 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 |  | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Bicycles on } \\ \text { Road } \end{gathered}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 1 | . | - | - | - | . | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |


| Start Time | Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (7:30 AM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | City Gate Lane Northbound | Monarch Drive Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | $\begin{aligned} & \text { App. } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | $\begin{aligned} & \text { App. } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 4 | 309 | 19 | 0 | 332 | 0 | 15 | 121 | 5 | 0 | 141 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 488 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 7 | 301 | 46 | 0 | 354 | 0 | 28 | 141 | 7 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 545 |
| 8:00 AM | 1 | 7 | 310 | 36 | 0 | 354 | 1 | 19 | 112 | 7 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 515 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 11 | 236 | 36 | 0 | 283 | 0 | 17 | 114 | 4 | 0 | 135 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 439 |
| Total | 1 | 29 | 1156 | 137 | 0 | 1323 | 1 | 79 | 488 | 23 | 0 | 591 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 14 | 1987 |
| Approach \% | 0.1 | 2.2 | 87.4 | 10.4 | - | - | 0.2 | 13.4 | 82.6 | 3.9 | - | - | 0.0 | 52.5 | 0.0 | 47.5 | - | - | 0.0 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 57.1 | - | - | - |
| Total \% | 0.1 | 1.5 | 58.2 | 6.9 | - | 66.6 | 0.1 | 4.0 | 24.6 | 1.2 | - | 29.7 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 1.4 | - | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | - | 0.7 | - |
| PHF | 0.250 | 0.659 | 0.932 | 0.745 | - | 0.934 | 0.250 | 0.705 | 0.865 | 0.821 | - | 0.839 | 0.000 | 0.705 | 0.000 | 0.875 | - | 0.819 | 0.000 | 0.750 | 0.000 | 0.667 | - | 0.700 | 0.911 |
| Lights | 1 | 28 | 1133 | 136 | - | 1298 | 1 | 79 | 474 | 21 | - | 575 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 28 | - | 59 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | - | 11 | 1943 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 96.6 | 98.0 | 99.3 | - | 98.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 97.1 | 91.3 | $\checkmark$ | 97.3 | - | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | - | 66.7 | - | 87.5 | - | 78.6 | 97.8 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | - | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 5 |
| \% Buses | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | - | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | - | 13 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | - | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 | 29 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Single-Unit } \\ \text { Trucks } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.7 | - | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 8.7 | - | 2.4 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 33.3 | - | 0.0 | - | 14.3 | 1.5 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | - | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 10 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | - | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | - | 0.3 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 12.5 | - | 7.1 | 0.5 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Bicycles on } \\ \text { Road } \end{gathered}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | . | - | 100.0 | - | - |


| Start Time | Ferry Road <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Ferry Road <br> Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | City Gate Lane Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Monarch Drive Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. <br> Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. <br> Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. <br> Total |  |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 3 | 99 | 5 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 1 | 298 | 4 | 0 | 303 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 12 | 496 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 117 | 14 | 0 | 135 | 0 | 5 | 239 | 4 | 0 | 248 | 0 | 25 | 1 | 38 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 452 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 2 | 109 | 9 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 3 | 290 | 3 | 0 | 296 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 526 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 121 | 10 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 6 | 263 | 1 | 0 | 270 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 459 |
| Total | 0 | 9 | 446 | 38 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 15 | 1090 | 12 | 0 | 1117 | 0 | 149 | 1 | 134 | 0 | 284 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 39 | 1933 |
| Approach \% | 0.0 | 1.8 | 90.5 | 7.7 | - | - | 0.0 | 1.3 | 97.6 | 1.1 | - | - | 0.0 | 52.5 | 0.4 | 47.2 | - | - | 0.0 | 28.2 | 0.0 | 71.8 | - | - | - |
| Total \% | 0.0 | 0.5 | 23.1 | 2.0 | - | 25.5 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 56.4 | 0.6 | - | 57.8 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.1 | 6.9 | - | 14.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.4 | - | 2.0 | - |
| PHF | 0.000 | 0.563 | 0.921 | 0.679 | - | 0.913 | 0.000 | 0.625 | 0.914 | 0.750 | - | 0.922 | 0.000 | 0.665 | 0.250 | 0.838 | - | 0.740 | 0.000 | 0.550 | 0.000 | 0.583 | - | 0.696 | 0.919 |
| Lights | 0 | 9 | 435 | 38 | - | 482 | 0 | 15 | 1073 | 12 | - | 1100 | 0 | 149 | 1 | 133 | - | 283 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 28 | - | 39 | 1904 |
| \% Lights | - | 100.0 | 97.5 | 100.0 | - | 97.8 | - | 100.0 | 98.4 | 100.0 | - | 98.5 | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.3 | - | 99.6 | - | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | 98.5 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | - | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | - | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 6 |
| \% Buses | - | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | - | 0.6 | - | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | - | 0.3 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | - | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | - | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 10 |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \% Single-Unit } \\ \text { Trucks } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | - | 0.6 | - | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | - | 0.5 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | - | 0.4 | . | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | - | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | - | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 13 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | - | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | - | 1.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | - | 0.7 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\cdots$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Bicycles on } \\ \text { Road } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |



| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { \% Articulated } \\ \text { Trucks } \end{array}$ | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.2 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | - | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |


|  | Westings Avenue Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westings Avenue <br> Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Calamos Court Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | City Gate Lane Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | $\begin{aligned} & \text { App. } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Int. Total |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 27 | 21 | 12 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 76 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 41 | 29 | 15 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 111 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 30 | 29 | 15 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 100 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 24 | 14 | 25 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 89 |
| Total | 0 | 122 | 93 | 67 | 0 | 282 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 35 | 376 |
| Approach \% | 0.0 | 43.3 | 33.0 | 23.8 | - | - | 0.0 | 94.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 66.7 | - | - | 2.9 | 11.4 | 74.3 | 11.4 | - | - | - |
| Total \% | 0.0 | 32.4 | 24.7 | 17.8 | - | 75.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.8 | - | 13.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 1.6 | - | 2.4 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 6.9 | 1.1 | - | 9.3 | - |
| PHF | 0.000 | 0.744 | 0.802 | 0.670 | - | 0.829 | 0.000 | 0.734 | 0.000 | 0.375 | - | 0.781 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.375 | 0.750 | - | 0.563 | 0.250 | 0.500 | 0.813 | 0.500 | - | 0.795 | 0.847 |
| Lights | 0 | 121 | 93 | 66 | - | 280 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 3 | - | 50 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | - | 8 | 1 | 4 | 25 | 4 | - | 34 | 372 |
| \% Lights | - | 99.2 | 100.0 | 98.5 | - | 99.3 | - | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | - | - | 100.0 | 83.3 | - | 88.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 96.2 | 100.0 | - | 97.1 | 98.9 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 |
| \% Buses | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | - | 0.4 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\checkmark$ | 1 | 3 |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \% Single-Unit } \\ \text { Trucks } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.4 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 16.7 | - | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | - | 2.9 | 0.8 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\cdots$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Bicycles on } \\ \text { Road } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Start Time | Westings Avenue Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westings Avenue Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Calamos Court <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | City Gate Lane Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. <br> Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | $\begin{aligned} & \text { App. } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. |  |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 43 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 53 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 9 | 17 | 0 | 43 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 19 | 0 | 25 | 82 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 25 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 66 |
| Total | 1 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 29 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 47 | 13 | 73 | 0 | 133 | 1 | 9 | 11 | 35 | 0 | 56 | 244 |
| Approach \% | 3.4 | 55.2 | 24.1 | 17.2 | - | - | 0.0 | 11.5 | 80.8 | 7.7 | - | - | 0.0 | 35.3 | 9.8 | 54.9 | - | - | 1.8 | 16.1 | 19.6 | 62.5 | - | - | - |
| Total \% | 0.4 | 6.6 | 2.9 | 2.0 | - | 11.9 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 8.6 | 0.8 | - | 10.7 | 0.0 | 19.3 | 5.3 | 29.9 | - | 54.5 | 0.4 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 14.3 | - | 23.0 | - |
| PHF | 0.250 | 0.571 | 0.875 | 0.625 | - | 0.659 | 0.000 | 0.375 | 0.583 | 0.250 | - | 0.542 | 0.000 | 0.691 | 0.361 | 0.730 | - | 0.773 | 0.250 | 0.750 | 0.550 | 0.461 | - | 0.560 | 0.744 |
| Lights | 1 | 14 | 7 | 5 | - | 27 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 2 | - | 26 | 0 | 47 | 13 | 73 | - | 133 | 1 | 9 | 11 | 35 | - | 56 | 242 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 87.5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | 93.1 | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | 99.2 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| \% Buses | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 2 |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \% Single-Unit } \\ \text { Trucks } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 6.9 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | . | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | . | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | . | 0.0 | . | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
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## Turning Movement Data




| Start Time | Westings Avenue Westbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U-Turn | Left | Right | Peds | App. Total |
| 6:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 6:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 6 |
| *** BREAK *** | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 29 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 19 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 70 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 41 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 76 |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 6:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 0 | 171 | 1 | 171 |
| Approach \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | - | 1.2 |
| Lights | 0 | 0 | 171 | - | 171 |
| \% Lights | - | - | 100.0 | - | 100.0 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| \% Buses | - | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | - | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | - | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |


Count Name: IL Route 59 with Right-In/Right-
Out
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
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| Start Time | Westings Avenue Westbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { IL } 59 \\ \text { Northbound } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U-Turn | Left | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 351 | 59 | 0 | 410 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 373 | 83 | 0 | 456 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 345 | 76 | 0 | 421 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 369 | 60 | 0 | 429 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1438 | 278 | 0 | 1716 |
| Approach \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 83.8 | 16.2 | - | - |
| Total \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | 0.0 | 48.5 | 9.4 | - | 57.9 |
| PHF | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.500 |  | 0.500 | 0.000 | 0.964 | 0.837 |  | 0.941 |
| Lights | 0 | 0 | 4 | . | 4 | 0 | 1304 | 276 | - | 1580 |
| \% Lights | - | - | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | - | 90.7 | 99.3 | - | 92.1 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |  | 7 |
| \% Buses | . | . | 0.0 | . | 0.0 | . | 0.5 | 0.0 | - | 0.4 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 32 | 2 | - | 34 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks |  |  | 0.0 | - | 0.0 |  | 2.2 | 0.7 | - | 2.0 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 95 | 0 | - | 95 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | - | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 6.6 | 0.0 | . | 5.5 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | - | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 |
| Pedestrians | . | . | - | 1 | . | . | . | - | 0 | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | . | - |

Count Name: IL Route 59 with Right-In/Right-
Out
Site Code:
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| Start Time | Westings Avenue Westbound |  |  |  |  | Movement Peak Hour Data (4:30 PM) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | U-Turn | Left | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 305 | 1 | 0 | 306 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 303 | 6 | 0 | 309 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 345 | 10 | 0 | 355 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 311 | 11 | 0 | 322 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 1264 | 28 | 0 | 1292 |
| Approach \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 97.8 | 2.2 | - | - |
| Total \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | 0.0 | 40.9 | 0.9 | - | 41.8 |
| PHF | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.652 | - | 0.652 | 0.000 | 0.916 | 0.636 | - | 0.910 |
| Lights | 0 | 0 | 107 | - | 107 | 0 | 1176 | 26 | - | 1202 |
| \% Lights | - | - | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | - | 93.0 | 92.9 | - | 93.0 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | - | 5 |
| \% Buses | . | . | 0.0 | . | 0.0 | . | 0.4 | 0.0 | - | 0.4 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 29 | 2 | - | 31 |
| $\%$ Single-Unit Trucks | - | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 2.3 | 7.1 | - | 2.4 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 | - | 54 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | . | . | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 4.3 | 0.0 | - | 4.2 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | - | . | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 |
| Pedestrians | - | . | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | . | - | . | - | . | - | . | . | . |

Site Plan


## CMAP 2050 Projections Letter

# Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning 

Chicago, Illinois 60606
3124540400
www.cmap.illinois.gov
February 14, 2019

Brendan S. May
Consultant
Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara and Aboona, Inc.
9575 West Higgins Road
Suite 400
Rosemont, IL 60018

## Subject: Ferry Road @ IL 59 <br> IDOT

Dear Mr. May:
In response to a request made on your behalf and dated February 13, 2019, we have developed year 2050 average daily traffic (ADT) projections for the subject location.

| ROAD SEGMENT | Current Volume | Year 2050 ADT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Ferry Rd east of IL 59 | 15,100 | 19,100 |
| IL 59 south of Ferry Rd | 37,100 | 46,900 |

Traffic projections are developed using existing ADT data provided in the request letter and the results from the October 2018 CMAP Travel Demand Analysis. The regional travel model uses CMAP 2050 socioeconomic projections and assumes the implementation of the ON TO 2050 Comprehensive Regional Plan for the Northeastern Illinois area. The provision of this data in support of your request does not constitute a CMAP endorsement of the proposed development or any subsequent developments.

If you have any questions, please call me at (312) 386-8806.

Sincerely,


Jose Rodriguez, PTP, AICP
Senior Planner, Research \& Analysis
cc: Quigley (IDOT)
S:\AdminGroups\ResearchAnalysis\2019_ForecastsTraffic\Napervilleldu-08-19\du-08-19.docx

## Level of Service Criteria

| Signalized Intersections |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level of Service | Interpretation | Average Control Delay (seconds per vehicle) |
| A | Favorable progression. Most vehicles arrive during the green indication and travel through the intersection without stopping. | $\leq 10$ |
| B | Good progression, with more vehicles stopping than for Level of Service A. | $>10-20$ |
| C | Individual cycle failures (i.e., one or more queued vehicles are not able to depart as a result of insufficient capacity during the cycle) may begin to appear. Number of vehicles stopping is significant, although many vehicles still pass through the intersection without stopping. | >20-35 |
| D | The volume-to-capacity ratio is high and either progression is ineffective or the cycle length is too long. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable. | >35-55 |
| E | Progression is unfavorable. The volume-to-capacity ratio is high and the cycle length is long. Individual cycle failures are frequent. | >55-80 |
| F | The volume-to-capacity ratio is very high, progression is very poor, and the cycle length is long. Most cycles fail to clear the queue. | $>80.0$ |
| Unsignalized Intersections |  |  |
| Level of Service Average Total De |  | ay (SEC/VEH) |
| A 0 |  | 10 |
| B $\quad>10-15$ |  |  |
| C $\quad>15-25$ |  |  |
| D $\quad>25-35$ |  |  |
|  | E $>35-50$ |  |
|  | F ( $>50$ |  |

## Capacity Analysis Summary Sheets





| Major/Minor | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  | Minor1 |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 603 | 0 | 0 | 1214 | 0 | 0 | 1762 | 2064 | 607 | 1457 | 2080 | 302 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1311 | 1311 | - | 752 | 752 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 451 | 753 | - | 705 | 1328 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.22 | - | - | 4.1 | - | - | 7.94 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 7.26 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.94 | 5.5 | - | 6.5 | 5.5 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.94 | 5.5 | - | 6.5 | 5.5 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.26 | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | 3.72 | 4 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.48 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 944 | - | - | 582 | - | - | 43 | 55 | 444 | 92 | 54 | 649 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 141 | 231 | - | 373 | 421 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 508 | 420 | - | 398 | 226 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 944 | - | - | 582 | - | - | 36 | 45 | 444 | 76 | 44 | 649 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | 36 | 45 | - | 76 | 44 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - |  | 133 | 217 | - | 351 | 367 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - |  | 435 | 366 | - | 363 | 212 | - |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.4 |  |  | 1.3 |  |  | 72.9 |  |  | 10.6 |  |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvm |  | NBLn1 NBLn2 NBLn3 |  |  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR SBLn1 SBLn2 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 36 | 45 | 444 | 944 | - | - | 582 | - |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.263 | 0.023 | 0.024 | 0.06 | - | - | 0.128 | - | - | - | 0.018 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 137.5 | 86.9 | 13.3 | 9.1 | - | - | 12.1 | - | - | 0 | 10.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | F | F | B | A | - | - | B | - | - | A | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | - | - | 0.4 | - | - | - | 0.1 |






| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh | 16.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\cdots$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 的 $\hat{}$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 9 | 454 | 38 | 15 | 1105 | 12 | 149 | 1 | 134 | 11 | 0 | 28 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 9 | 454 | 38 | 15 | 1105 | 12 | 149 | 1 | 134 | 11 | 0 | 28 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | － | － | None | － | － | None | － | － | None | － | － | None |
| Storage Length | 220 | － | － | 200 | － | － | 0 | － | － | － | － | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | \＃ | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 10 | 493 | 41 | 16 | 1201 | 13 | 162 | 1 | 146 | 12 | 0 | 30 |










| Major/Minor | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  | Minor1 |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 634 | 0 | 0 | 1552 | 0 | 0 | - 2047 | 2376 | 776 | 1588 | 2460 | 317 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - |  | 1522 | 1522 |  | 842 | 842 |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 525 | 854 | - | 746 | 1618 |  |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.16 | - | - | 4.1 | - | - | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 8.16 | 6.5 | 7.16 |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.5 | 5.5 | - | 7.16 | 5.5 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.5 | 5.5 | - | 7.16 | 5.5 | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.23 | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | 3.5 | 4 | 3.3 | 3.83 | 4 | 3.43 |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 938 | - | - | 433 | - | - | -33 | 35 | 345 | 53 | 31 | 647 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | - | - | 126 | 182 |  | 267 | 383 |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 509 | 378 | - | 309 | 164 | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 938 | - | - | 433 | - | - | - 26 | 25 | 345 | 37 | 22 | 647 |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | - 26 | 25 | - | 37 | 22 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | - |  |  | - | - |  | 122 | 176 | - | 258 | 286 |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - |  | 375 | 282 | - | 268 | 158 | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.2 |  |  | 2.4 |  |  | 294.9 |  |  | 58.5 |  |  |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 26 | 345 | 938 | - | - | 433 | - | - | 37 | 647 |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 1.437 | 0.102 | 0.035 | - | - | - 0.254 | - | - | 0.178 | 0.014 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 556.8 | 16.6 | 9 | - | - | 16.1 | - |  | 122.3 | 10.6 |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | F | C | A | - | - | C | - |  | F | B |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%otile Q(veh) |  | 4.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 0.6 | 0 |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sim$ Volume exceeds capacity |  | \$: Delay exceeds 300s |  |  |  | +: Computation Not Defined |  |  |  | *: All major volume in platoon |  |  |  |








| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | 1 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 16 | 108 | 52 | 9 | 58 | 14 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 16 | 108 | 52 | 9 | 58 | 14 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 17 | 114 | 55 | 9 | 61 | 15 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 64 | 0 | - | 0 | 208 | 60 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 60 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 148 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1538 | - | - | - | 780 | 1005 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 963 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 880 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1538 | - | - | - | 771 | 1005 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 771 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 951 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 880 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 1 |  | 0 |  | 9.9 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | A |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT WBR SBLn1 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1538 | - | - | - | 808 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.011 | - | - | - | 0.094 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.4 | 0 | - | - | 9.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | - | - | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | - | - | - | 0.3 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh | 34.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\cdots$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 車 $\hat{p}$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 9 | 481 | 56 | 17 | 1229 | 12 | 173 | 1 | 167 | 11 | 0 | 28 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 9 | 481 | 56 | 17 | 1229 | 12 | 173 | 1 | 167 | 11 | 0 | 28 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | － | － | None | － | － | None | － | － | None | － | － | None |
| Storage Length | 220 | － | － | 200 | － | － | 0 | － | － | － | － | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | \＃ | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 10 | 523 | 61 | 18 | 1336 | 13 | 188 | 1 | 182 | 12 | 0 | 30 |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { Intersection }}{\text { Int Delay，s／veh }} 21.7$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  | ＊ | 郎 |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 13 | 638 | 8 | 28 | 1062 | 1 | 132 | 2 | 95 | 2 | 0 | 64 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 13 | 638 | 8 | 28 | 1062 | 1 | 132 | 2 | 95 | 2 | 0 | 64 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | － | － | None | － | － | None | － | － | None | － | － | None |
| Storage Length | 150 | － | － | 230 | － | － | 140 | － | 140 | 100 | － | － |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | \＃ | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 54 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Mvmt Flow | 14 | 665 | 8 | 29 | 1106 | 1 | 138 | 2 | 99 | 2 | 0 | 67 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 24 | 41 | 5 | 3 | 51 | 2 | 47 | 13 | 73 | 67 | 11 | 51 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 24 | 41 | 5 | 3 | 51 | 2 | 47 | 13 | 73 | 67 | 11 | 51 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50 | - | - | 90 |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 32 | 55 | 7 | 4 | 69 | 3 | 64 | 18 | 99 | 91 | 15 | 69 |  |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{A}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | r |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 49 | 132 | 46 | 26 | 38 | 10 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 49 | 132 | 46 | 26 | 38 | 10 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 52 | 139 | 48 | 27 | 40 | 11 |



|  | 4 |  | \% | 7 |  | 4 |  | 4 | 7 |  | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 瑯 |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 瑯 |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | F | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 54 | 1172 | 50 | 119 | 614 | 2 | 52 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 54 | 1172 | 50 | 119 | 614 | 2 | 52 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 2000 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 11 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (ft) | 150 |  | 0 | 230 |  | 0 | 140 |  | 140 | 100 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 175 |  |  | 170 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 0.994 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.850 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1646 | 3521 | 0 | 1745 | 3539 | 0 | 1480 | 2000 | 1615 | 1900 | 1369 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.406 |  |  | 0.162 |  |  | 0.784 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 703 | 3521 | 0 | 298 | 3539 | 0 | 1221 | 2000 | 1615 | 1900 | 1369 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 8 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 182 |  | 361 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 689 |  |  | 575 |  |  | 501 |  |  | 334 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 10.4 |  |  | 8.7 |  |  | 11.4 |  |  | 7.6 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 6\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0\% | 22\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 18\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 57 | 1287 | 0 | 125 | 648 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt |  | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 3.0 | 15.0 |  | 3.0 | 15.0 |  | 3.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 3.0 | 8.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 7.0 | 22.0 |  | 8.0 | 22.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 7.0 | 69.0 |  | 10.0 | 72.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 7.0\% | 69.0\% |  | 10.0\% | 72.0\% |  | 7.0\% | 14.0\% | 14.0\% | 7.0\% | 14.0\% |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 4.5 |  | 3.5 | 4.5 |  | 3.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 0.0 | 1.5 |  | 0.0 | 1.5 |  | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 3.5 | 6.0 |  | 3.5 | 6.0 |  | 3.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None | C-Min |  | None | C-Min |  | None | None | None | None | None |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 79.4 | 71.4 |  | 82.1 | 75.4 |  | 10.9 |  | 9.4 |  | 8.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.79 | 0.71 |  | 0.82 | 0.75 |  | 0.11 |  | 0.09 |  | 0.08 |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \% | 7 | $4$ |  | 4 | 4 | \% |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| v/c Ratio | 0.09 | 0.51 |  | 0.37 | 0.24 |  | 0.36 |  | 0.11 |  | 0.03 |  |
| Control Delay | 2.7 | 8.3 |  | 5.3 | 5.4 |  | 46.2 |  | 0.7 |  | 0.1 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 2.7 | 8.3 |  | 5.3 | 5.4 |  | 46.2 |  | 0.7 |  | 0.1 |  |
| LOS | A | A |  | A | A |  | D |  | A |  | A |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 8.0 |  |  | 5.4 |  |  | 28.8 |  |  | 0.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 5 | 178 |  | 11 | 68 |  | 33 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 17 | 286 |  | 31 | 107 |  | 66 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 609 |  |  | 495 |  |  | 421 |  |  | 254 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 150 |  |  | 230 |  |  | 140 |  | 140 |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 609 | 2517 |  | 341 | 2670 |  | 154 |  | 316 |  | 441 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.09 | 0.51 |  | 0.37 | 0.24 |  | 0.36 |  | 0.11 |  | 0.03 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Other
Cycle Length: 100
Actuated Cycle Length: 100
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.51
Intersection Signal Delay: 7.9 Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 63.5\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 2: Comfort Drive/Corporate Lane \& Ferry Road


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  | 4 |  | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | F | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 13 | 638 | 8 | 28 | 1062 | 1 | 132 | 2 | 95 | 2 | 0 | 64 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 13 | 638 | 8 | 28 | 1062 | 1 | 132 | 2 | 95 | 2 | 0 | 64 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 2000 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 11 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (ft) | 150 |  | 0 | 230 |  | 0 | 140 |  | 140 | 100 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 175 |  |  | 170 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 0.998 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.850 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1133 | 3568 | 0 | 1745 | 3574 | 0 | 1805 | 2000 | 1615 | 1805 | 1524 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.230 |  |  | 0.376 |  |  | 0.713 |  |  | 0.757 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 274 | 3568 | 0 | 691 | 3574 | 0 | 1355 | 2000 | 1615 | 1438 | 1524 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 99 |  | 288 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 689 |  |  | 575 |  |  | 501 |  |  | 334 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 10.4 |  |  | 8.7 |  |  | 11.4 |  |  | 7.6 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 54\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 6\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 14 | 673 | 0 | 29 | 1107 | 0 | 138 | 2 | 99 | 2 | 67 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 3.0 | 15.0 |  | 3.0 | 15.0 |  | 3.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 3.0 | 8.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 7.0 | 22.0 |  | 7.0 | 22.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 26.0 | 95.0 |  | 7.0 | 76.0 |  | 13.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 12.0 | 35.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 17.3\% | 63.3\% |  | 4.7\% | 50.7\% |  | 8.7\% | 24.0\% | 24.0\% | 8.0\% | 23.3\% |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 4.5 |  | 3.5 | 4.5 |  | 3.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 0.0 | 1.5 |  | 0.0 | 1.5 |  | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 3.5 | 6.0 |  | 3.5 | 6.0 |  | 3.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lag | Lead | Lead | Lag | Lead |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None | C-Min |  | None | C-Min |  | None | None | None | None | None |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 119.2 | 113.0 |  | 120.0 | 114.9 |  | 21.7 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 14.4 | 8.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.79 | 0.75 |  | 0.80 | 0.77 |  | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.05 |  |


|  | * | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | $4$ | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| v/c Ratio | 0.06 | 0.25 |  | 0.05 | 0.40 |  | 0.61 | 0.01 | 0.37 | 0.01 | 0.19 |  |
| Control Delay | 3.8 | 6.7 |  | 3.6 | 7.4 |  | 72.1 | 60.5 | 15.1 | 54.0 | 1.2 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 3.8 | 6.7 |  | 3.6 | 7.4 |  | 72.1 | 60.5 | 15.1 | 54.0 | 1.2 |  |
| LOS | A | A |  | A | A |  | E | E | B | D | A |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 6.6 |  |  | 7.3 |  |  | 48.4 |  |  | 2.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | D |  |  | A |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 2 | 102 |  | 5 | 144 |  | 128 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 8 | 149 |  | 13 | 277 |  | 194 | 11 | 59 | 10 | 0 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 609 |  |  | 495 |  |  | 421 |  |  | 254 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 150 |  |  | 230 |  |  | 140 |  | 140 | 100 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 350 | 2687 |  | 595 | 2737 |  | 235 | 400 | 402 | 182 | 526 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.04 | 0.25 |  | 0.05 | 0.40 |  | 0.59 | 0.01 | 0.25 | 0.01 | 0.13 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Area Type
Other

Cycle Length: 150
Actuated Cycle Length: 150
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 55
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.61
Intersection Signal Delay: 11.5
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 53.4\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 2: Comfort Drive/Corporate Lane \& Ferry Road


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ | $V$ | $\frac{1}{1}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 瑯 |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 瑯 |  | ${ }^{4}$ | 4 | F' | ${ }^{*}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 69 | 1172 | 50 | 119 | 614 | 7 | 52 | 0 | 34 | 10 | 0 | 31 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 69 | 1172 | 50 | 119 | 614 | 7 | 52 | 0 | 34 | 10 | 0 | 31 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 2000 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 11 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (ft) | 150 |  | 0 | 230 |  | 0 | 140 |  | 140 | 100 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 175 |  |  | 170 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 0.994 |  |  | 0.998 |  |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.850 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1646 | 3521 | 0 | 1745 | 3533 | 0 | 1480 | 2000 | 1615 | 1805 | 1369 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.404 |  |  | 0.157 |  |  | 0.456 |  |  | 0.757 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 700 | 3521 | 0 | 288 | 3533 | 0 | 710 | 2000 | 1615 | 1438 | 1369 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 175 |  | 354 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( ft ) |  | 689 |  |  | 575 |  |  | 501 |  |  | 334 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 10.4 |  |  | 8.7 |  |  | 11.4 |  |  | 7.6 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 6\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0\% | 22\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 18\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 73 | 1287 | 0 | 125 | 653 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 36 | 11 | 33 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt |  | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 3.0 | 15.0 |  | 3.0 | 15.0 |  | 3.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 3.0 | 8.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 7.0 | 22.0 |  | 8.0 | 22.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 7.0 | 69.0 |  | 10.0 | 72.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 7.0\% | 69.0\% |  | 10.0\% | 72.0\% |  | 7.0\% | 14.0\% | 14.0\% | 7.0\% | 14.0\% |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 4.5 |  | 3.5 | 4.5 |  | 3.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 0.0 | 1.5 |  | 0.0 | 1.5 |  | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 3.5 | 6.0 |  | 3.5 | 6.0 |  | 3.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None | C-Min |  | None | C-Min |  | None | None | None | None | None |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 75.7 | 68.8 |  | 80.2 | 73.7 |  | 13.0 |  | 10.8 | 10.2 | 8.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.76 | 0.69 |  | 0.80 | 0.74 |  | 0.13 |  | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.08 |  |


|  | * | $\rightarrow$ | \% | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ | ( | $\dagger$ | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| v/c Ratio | 0.13 | 0.53 |  | 0.39 | 0.25 |  | 0.41 |  | 0.11 | 0.07 | 0.08 |  |
| Control Delay | 3.6 | 9.8 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  | 47.1 |  | 0.7 | 35.6 | 0.4 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 3.6 | 9.8 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  | 47.1 |  | 0.7 | 35.6 | 0.4 |  |
| LOS | A | A |  | A | A |  | D |  | A | D | A |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 9.5 |  |  | 6.2 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 9.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 10 | 228 |  | 17 | 81 |  | 30 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 20 | 286 |  | 31 | 107 |  | 66 |  | 0 | 22 | 0 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 609 |  |  | 495 |  |  | 421 |  |  | 254 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 150 |  |  | 230 |  |  | 140 |  | 140 | 100 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 571 | 2425 |  | 325 | 2604 |  | 133 |  | 330 | 161 | 435 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.13 | 0.53 |  | 0.38 | 0.25 |  | 0.41 |  | 0.11 | 0.07 | 0.08 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Area Type:

Other
Cycle Length: 100
Actuated Cycle Length: 100
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.53
Intersection Signal Delay: 9.1
Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 63.5\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 2: Comfort Drive/Corporate Lane \& Ferry Road


|  | 4 |  |  | 1 |  | 4 |  | $\dagger$ | 7 | $\downarrow$ | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 性 |  | ${ }_{1}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | F | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 173 | 638 | 8 | 28 | 1062 | 36 | 132 | 2 | 110 | 42 | 0 | 169 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 173 | 638 | 8 | 28 | 1062 | 36 | 132 | 2 | 110 | 42 | 0 | 169 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 2000 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 11 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (ft) | 150 |  | 0 | 230 |  | 0 | 140 |  | 140 | 100 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 175 |  |  | 170 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 0.998 |  |  | 0.995 |  |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.850 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1133 | 3568 | 0 | 1745 | 3558 | 0 | 1805 | 2000 | 1615 | 1805 | 1524 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.183 |  |  | 0.396 |  |  | 0.333 |  |  | 0.757 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 218 | 3568 | 0 | 727 | 3558 | 0 | 633 | 2000 | 1615 | 1438 | 1524 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 115 |  | 271 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 689 |  |  | 575 |  |  | 501 |  |  | 334 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 10.4 |  |  | 8.7 |  |  | 11.4 |  |  | 7.6 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 54\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 6\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 180 | 673 | 0 | 29 | 1144 | 0 | 138 | 2 | 115 | 44 | 176 | 0 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 3.0 | 15.0 |  | 3.0 | 15.0 |  | 3.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 3.0 | 8.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 7.0 | 22.0 |  | 7.0 | 22.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 26.0 | 95.0 |  | 7.0 | 76.0 |  | 13.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 12.0 | 35.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 17.3\% | 63.3\% |  | 4.7\% | 50.7\% |  | 8.7\% | 24.0\% | 24.0\% | 8.0\% | 23.3\% |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 4.5 |  | 3.5 | 4.5 |  | 3.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 0.0 | 1.5 |  | 0.0 | 1.5 |  | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 3.5 | 6.0 |  | 3.5 | 6.0 |  | 3.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lag | Lead | Lead | Lag | Lead |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None | C-Min |  | None | C-Min |  | None | None | None | None | None |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 117.0 | 108.6 |  | 103.3 | 94.7 |  | 24.1 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 20.3 | 8.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.78 | 0.72 |  | 0.69 | 0.63 |  | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.14 | 0.05 |  |



Area Type
Other

Cycle Length: 150
Actuated Cycle Length: 150
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.71
Intersection Signal Delay: 18.3
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 74.5\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 2: Comfort Drive/Corporate Lane \& Ferry Road


TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL (TWSC) Analysis

|  | TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL (TWSC) Analysis__ |
| :--- | :--- |
| File Name: | AMPR.xtw |
| Analyst: | BSM |
| Agency: | KLOA, Inc. |
| Date Performed: | 6/20/2019 |
| Time Analyzed: | AM Peak Hour |
| Jurisdiction: | Napervilie |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 |
| Project Description: | $19-032$ |
| Units: | U.S. Customary |
| Intersection Name: | Westings with Access |
| Major Street Direction: | East-West |
| East/west Street Name: | Westings Avenue |
| North/South Street Name: | Proposed Access Drive |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs): | 0.25 |

Major Street:
Vehicle volumes and Adjustments




Step 1: MOVEMENT PRIORITIES $\qquad$
Major Street:
Approach

Movement
10

| EastBound |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| 1 | 2 |
| $L$ | $T$ |

## $4 U$

U

| WestBound |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| 4 | 5 |
| $L$ | $T$ |

Step 2: MOVEMENT DEMAND VOLUMES AND FLOW RATES $\qquad$
Major Street:

| Movement |  | EastBound 3 |  |  |  | WestBound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 |  |  |  | 4 U |  | 5 | 6 |
|  | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Volume, V_x |  | 16 | 10 |  |  |  | 52 | 9 |
| Flow Rate, v_x |  | 17 | 11 |  |  |  | 55 | 9 |
| Minor Street: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  |  | und |  |  |  | und |  |
| Movement |  |  | 8 | 9 |  | 10 |  | 12 |
|  |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Volume, V_x |  |  |  |  |  | 58 |  | 14 |
| Flow Rate, v_x |  |  |  |  |  | 61 |  | 15 |


| Major Street: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach |  | EastBound |  |  |  | WestBound |  |  |
| Movement | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U |  | 5 | 6 |
|  | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Flow Rate, v_x Conflicting Flow, v_c,x |  | 17 | 11 |  |  |  | 55 | 9 |
|  |  | 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Street: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  | NorthBound |  |  |  | SouthBound |  |  |
| Movement |  |  | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Flow Rate, v -x Conflicting $\mathrm{Flow}, \mathrm{v}$-c, x |  |  |  |  |  | 61 207 |  | 15 59 |




| Major-Street Left-Turn Movements | 1 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow, v_c,x | 64 |  |
| Potential Capacity, c_p,x | 15 |  |
| Pedestrian Impedance Factor, p_p,x |  |  |
| Movement Capacity, c_m,x | 15 |  |
| Probability of Queue-free State, p_0,j |  |  |
| Major L-Shared Probability Queue-free State, p*_0,j |  |  |
| Minor-Street Right-Turn Movements | 9 | 12 |
| Conflicting Flow, v_c, ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | 59 |
| Potential Capacity, c_p,x |  | 1012 |
| Pedestrian Impedance Factor, p_p,x |  | 1.000 |
| Movement Capacity, c_m,x |  | 1012 |
| Probability of Queue-free State, p_0,j |  | 0.985 |
| Major-Street U-Turn Movements | 10 | 4 U |

Conflicting Flow, v_c,x
Potential Capacity, c_p,x
Capacity adjustment Factor, f_x
Movement Capacity, c_m,x
Shared L/U Capacity, c_SH
Probability of Queue-free State, p_0,j

| Minor-Street Through Movements | 8 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow, v_c, ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  |
| Potential Capacity, c_p,x |  |  |
| Pedestrian Impedance Factor, p - $\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{x}$ |  |  |
| Capacity Adjustment Factor, f_x |  |  |
| Movement Capacity, c_m,x |  |  |
| Probability of Queue-free State, p_0,j |  |  |
| Minor-Street Left-Turn Movements | 7 | 10 |
| Conflicting Flow, v_c,x |  | 207 |
| Potential Capacity, c_p,x |  | 786 |
| Pedestrian Impedance Factor, p_p,x |  | 1.000 |
| Major L, Minor T Adjusted Impedance Factor, p" |  |  |
| Major L, Minor T Impedance Factor, $\mathrm{p}^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Capacity Adjustment Factor, f_x |  | 0.988 |
| Movement Capacity, c_m,x |  | 777 |




| CONTROL DELAY TO RANK 1 MOVEMENTS Approach Movement | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Major Street Through Lanes, N | 1 | 1 |
| Proportion of Rank 1 vehicles not blocked, p*_0,j | 0.988 |  |
| Delay to Major Left-turning Vehicles, d_MLT | 7.3 |  |
| Major Street Through Vehicles in Shared Lane, v_il | 114 |  |
| Major Street Turning Vehicles in Shared Lane, v_il | 17 |  |
| Saturation Flow Rate for Major Street Through, s_il | 1800 | 1800 |

Steps 12 - 13: APPROACH/INTERSECTION CONTROL DELAY and 95\% QUEUE LENGTHS


This TWSC text report was created in HCS $^{\text {m }}$ TWSC Version 7.8 on 7/30/2019 3:06:05 PM

|  | TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL (TWSC) Analysis__ |
| :--- | :--- |
| File Name: | PMPR.xtw |
| Analyst: | BSM |
| Agency: | KLOA, Inc. |
| Date Performed: | C/20/2019 |
| Time Analyzed: | PM Peak Hour |
| Jurisdiction: | Napervilie |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 |
| Project Description: | 19-032 |
| Units: | U.S. Customary |
| Intersection Name: | Westings with Access |
| Major Street Direction: | East-West |
| East/west Street Name: | Westings Avenue |
| North/South Street Name: | Proposed Access Drive |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs): | 0.25 |





Step 1: MOVEMENT PRIORITIES $\qquad$
Major Street:

| Approach |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Priority | $1 U$ |
| Movement | $U$ |


| EastBound |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| 1 | 2 |
| $L$ | $T$ |

U
R

Step 2: MOVEMENT DEMAND VOLUMES AND FLOW RATES $\qquad$
Major Street:


Flow Rate, v_x

Step 3: CONFLICTING FLOW RATES
Major Street:

| Approach |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Movement | $1 U$ |
|  |  |


| Flow Rate, v_x | 52 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow, v_c,x | 76 |

Minor Street:


Step 4: CRITICAL HEADWAYS and FOLLOW-UP HEADWAYS

| CRITICAL HEADWAYS Approach Movement | EB |  | WB |  | NorthBound |  |  | SouthBound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{U}^{1 U}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & \mathrm{~L} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \mathrm{U} \\ & \mathrm{U} \end{aligned}$ | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & \mathrm{~L} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & \mathrm{~T} \end{aligned}$ | 9 | ${ }_{L}^{10}$ | ${ }_{\mathrm{T}}^{11}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & \mathrm{R} \end{aligned}$ |
| t_c, base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Stage |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| Stage I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stage II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| t_c, HV |  | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |
| P_HV |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |
| t_c, G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 |  | 0.1 |
| G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| t_3, LT |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.7 |  | 0.0 |
| t-c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Stage |  | 4.10 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.40 |  | 6.20 |
| Stage I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stage II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FOLLOW-UP HEADWAYS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  |  |  |  |  | NorthBound |  |  | SouthBound |  |
| Movement | 10 | 1 | 4 U | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | U | L | U | , | L | T | R |  | T | R |
| t_f, base |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| t-f, HV |  | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.9 |  | 0.9 |
| P_HV |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |
| t_f |  | 2.20 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.50 |  | 3.30 |




Steps 12 - 13: APPROACH/INTERSECTION CONTROL DELAY and 95\% QUEUE LENGTHS
 Intersction Delay
3.0

This TWSC text report was created in HCS $^{\text {m }}$ TWSC Version 7.8 on 7/30/2019 3:06:46 PM


[^0]:    Kenig Lindgren O＇Hara Aboona，Inc．
    9575 W ．Higgins Rd．，Suite 400

