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# TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS <br> HILLS AT HARRIS CREEK ROLESVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA 

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## 1. Development Overview

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was conducted for the proposed Hills at Harris Creek development in accordance with the Town of Rolesville (Town) Land Development Ordinance (LDO) and North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) capacity analysis guidelines. The proposed development is to be located north of Mitchell Mill Road, west of Manly Farm Road, and east of Gro Peg Lane in Rolesville, North Carolina. This TIA is an update to the approved TIA that was sealed on May 19, 2022. This updated study reflects changes to the proposed land use types and densities and a change to the site access at the westernmost driveway from full-movement to right-in/right-out. No other scope changes were made from the previous TIA.

The proposed development is anticipated to be completed in 2027 and is expected to consist of 155 single-family homes, 115 townhomes, and a $12,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. day care center. Site access is proposed via one (1) full-movement and one (1) right-in/right-out (RIRO) driveway connection along Mitchell Mill Road.

The study analyzes traffic conditions during the weekday AM and PM peak hours for the following scenarios:

- 2022 Existing Traffic Conditions
- 2027 No-Build Traffic Conditions
- 2027 Build Traffic Conditions


## 2. Existing Traffic Conditions

The study area for the TIA was determined through coordination with NCDOT and the Town and consists of the following existing intersections:

- US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road
- US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location
- Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

Existing peak hour traffic volumes were determined based on traffic counts conducted at the study intersection listed above, in November of 2021 during typical weekday AM (7:00 AM - 9:00 AM) and PM (4:00 PM - 6:00 PM) peak periods, while schools were in session for in-person learning.

Previously collected counts from the year 2021 were projected to the 2022 existing analysis year using a compounded annual growth rate of $2 \%$. Weekday AM and PM traffic volumes were balanced between study intersections, where appropriate.

## 3. Site Trip Generation

The proposed development is assumed to consist of 155 single-family homes, 115 townhomes, and a 12,000 sq. ft. day care center. Average weekday daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trips for the proposed development were estimated using methodology contained within the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition. Table E-1 provides a summary of the trip generation potential for the site.

Table E-1: Site Trip Generation

| Land Use (ITE Code) | I ntensity | Daily Traffic (vpd) | Weekday AM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Single-Family Home (210) | 155 DU | 1,510 | 28 | 83 | 111 | 95 | 55 | 150 |
| Single-Family Attached Housing (220) | 115 DU | 812 | 14 | 45 | 59 | 44 | 26 | 70 |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Day CareCenter } \\ (565) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 12 KSF | 572 | 70 | 62 | 132 | 63 | 70 | 133 |
| Total Trips |  | 2,894 | 112 | 190 | 302 | 202 | 151 | 353 |
| Pass-By Trips: Day CareCenter (44\% PM) |  |  | - | - | - | -30 | -30 | -60 |
| Total Primary Trips |  |  | 112 | 190 | 302 | 172 | 121 | 293 |

## 4. Future Traffic Conditions

Through coordination with NCDOT and the Town, it was determined that an annual growth rate of $2 \%$ would be used to generate 2027 projected weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes. The following adjacent developments were identified to be considered under future conditions:

- Cobblestone Crossing Mixed-Use
- Young Street PUD
- Wheeler Tract
- Louisbury Road Assemblage
- Kalas / Watkins Family Property


## 5. Capacity Analysis Summary

The analysis considered weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic for 2022 existing, 2027 no-build, and 2027 build conditions. Refer to Section 7 of the TIA for the capacity analysis summary performed at each study intersection.

## 6. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, specific geometric and traffic control improvements have been identified at study intersections. The improvements are summarized below and are illustrated in Figure E-1.

## Recommended Improvements by Developer

Required Frontage Improvements per Rolesville Community Transportation Plan

- Widen one-half section of Mitchell Mill Road along the site frontage to this roadway's ultimate section (4-lane median divided).

US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road

- Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and theTown.

US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location

- Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and theTown.


## Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

- Construct a southbound (Jonesville Road) left-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.
- It should be noted that this improvement was also identified by the 5109 Mitchell Mill Road TIA.
- Construct a westbound (Mitchell Mill Road) right-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.
- Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and theTown.


## Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 1

- Construct the southbound approach (Site Access 1) as a right-in/right-out with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Provide stop-control for the southbound approach (Site Access 1).
- Construct a concrete median on Mitchell Mill Road that restricts access to right-in/right-out.


## Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 2

- Construct the southbound approach (Site Access 2) with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Provide stop-control for the southbound approach (Site Access 2).
- Construct an eastbound (Mitchell Mill Road) left-turn lane with at least 150 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.
- Construct a westbound (Mitchell Mill Road) right-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.

**Refer to Section 9 of the report for more information
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# TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS HILLS AT HARRIS CREEK ROLESVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA 

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The contents of this report present the findings of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) conducted for the proposed Hills at Harris Creek development in Rolesville, North Carolina. The proposed development, anticipated to be completed in 2027, is located north of Mitchell Mill Road, west of Manly Farm Road, and east of Gro Peg Lane in Rolesville, North Carolina. The purpose of this study is to determine the potential impacts to the surrounding transportation system created by traffic generated by the proposed development, as well as recommend improvements to mitigate the impacts.

This TIA is an update to the approved TIA that was sealed on May 19, 2022. This updated study reflects changes to the proposed land use types and densities and a change to the site access at the westernmost driveway from full-movement to right-in/right-out. No other scope changes were made from the previous TIA.

The proposed development is expected to consist of 155 single-family homes, 115 townhomes, and a $12,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. day care center.

The study analyzes traffic conditions during the weekday AM and PM peak hours for the following scenarios:

- 2022 Existing Traffic Conditions
- 2027 No-Build Traffic Conditions
- 2027 Build Traffic Conditions


### 1.1. Site Location and Study Area

The proposed development is located north of Mitchell Mill Road, west of Manly Farm Road, and east of Gro Peg Lane in Rolesville, North Carolina. Refer to Figure 1 for the site location map. The study area for the TIA was determined through coordination with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) and the Town of Rolesville (Town) and consists of the following existing intersections:

- US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road
- US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location
- Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

Refer to Appendix A for the approved scoping documentation.

### 1.2. Proposed Land Use and Site Access

The site is to be located north of Mitchell Mill Road, west of Manly Farm Road, and east of Gro Peg Lane. The proposed development, anticipated to be completed in 2027, is assumed to consist of the following uses:

- 155 single-family homes
- 115 townhomes
- $12,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. day care center

Site access is proposed via one (1) full-movement and one (1) right-in/right-out (RIRO) driveway connection along Mitchell Mill Road. Refer to Figure 2 for a copy of the preliminary site plan.

### 1.3. Adjacent Land Uses

The proposed development is located in an area consisting primarily of undeveloped land and residential development.

### 1.4. Existing Roadways

Existing lane configurations (number of traffic lanes on each intersection approach), storage capacities, and other intersection and roadway information within the study area are shown in Figure 3. Table 1 provides a summary of this information, as well.

Table 1: Existing Roadway Inventory

| Road Name | Route <br> Number | Typical <br> Cross- <br> Section | Speed Limit | Maintained <br> By | 2019 AADT <br> (vpd) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 401 Bypass |  | 4-lane <br> divided | 55 mph | NCDOT | 17,500 |
| Jonesville Road | SR 2226 | 2-lane <br> undivided | $35 \mathrm{mph} /$ <br> 45 mph | NCDOT | $2,210^{*}$ |
| Mitchell Mill <br> Road | SR 2224 | 2-lane <br> undivided | 45 mph | NCDOT | 4,000 |
| Peebles Road | SR 2929 | 2-lane <br> undivided | 45 mph | NCDOT | $1,700^{*}$ |

*ADT based on 2022 existing traffic volumes and assuming the weekday PM peak hour volume is $10 \%$ of the average daily traffic.


## LEGEND

- = I Proposed Site Location
$\bigcirc$ Study Intersection
= = I Study Area

|  | Hills at Harris Creek <br> Rolesville, NC | Site Location Map |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Ramey kemp associates |  |  |  |

## EXHIBIT ONE: CONCEPT PLAN (SKETCH PLAN)





|  | Hills at Harris Creek <br> Rolesville, NC | 2022 Existing <br> Ramey kemp associates | Lane Configurations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 3 |  |

## 2. 2022 EXISTING PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS

### 2.1. 2022 Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Existing peak hour traffic volumes were determined based on previously collected traffic counts conducted at the study intersections listed below, in November of 2021 during typical weekday AM (7:00 AM - 9:00 AM) and PM (4:00 PM - 6:00 PM) peak periods, while schools were in session for in-person learning:

- US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road
- US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location
- Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

Previously collected counts from the year 2021 were projected to the 2022 existing analysis year using a compounded annual growth rate of $2 \%$. Weekday AM and PM traffic volumes were balanced between study intersections, where appropriate. Refer to Figure 4 for 2022 existing weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes. A copy of the count data is located in Appendix B of this report.

### 2.2. Analysis of $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ Existing Peak Hour Traffic Conditions

The 2022 existing weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes were analyzed to determine the current levels of service at the study intersections under existing roadway conditions. The results of the analysis are presented in Section 7 of this report.

-


## 3. 2027 NO-BUILD PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS

In order to account for the growth of traffic and subsequent traffic conditions at a future year, no-build traffic projections are needed. No-build traffic is the component of traffic due to the growth of the community and surrounding area that is anticipated to occur regardless of whether the proposed development is constructed. No-build traffic is comprised of existing traffic growth within the study area and additional traffic created as a result of adjacent approved developments.

### 3.1. Ambient Traffic Growth

Through coordination with NCDOT and the Town, it was determined that an annual growth rate of $2 \%$ would be used to generate 2027 projected weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes. Refer to Figure 5 for 2027 projected peak hour traffic.

### 3.2. Adjacent Development Traffic

Through coordination with NCDOT and the Town, the following adjacent developments were identified to be included as an approved adjacent development in this study:

- Cobblestone Crossing Mixed-Use
- Young Street PUD
- Wheeler Tract
- Louisbury Road Assemblage
- Kalas / Watkins Family Property

Table 2, on the following page, provides a summary of the adjacent developments.

Table 2: Adjacent Development Information

| Development <br> Name | Location | Build- <br> Out Year | Land Use / <br> Intensity | TIA <br> Performed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cobblestone <br> Crossing Mixed- <br> Use | Northwest quadrant <br> of the intersection of <br> Main Street and <br> Young Street | 2023 | 180 multi-family homes <br> 18,200 sq. ft. municipal <br> flex space <br> 50,000 sq. ft. general <br> retail | March 2021 <br> by RKA |
| Young Street <br> PUD | Along both sides of <br> US 401 Bypass west <br> of Young Street | 2025 | 96 single-family homes <br> 525 single-family homes <br> 122,800 sq. ft. general <br> retail | June 2019 <br> by Kimley <br> Horn |
| Wheeler Tract | Northeast quadrant <br> of the intersection of <br> Rolesville Road and <br> Mitchell Mill Road | 2026 | 233 single-family homes <br> 125 multi-family homes | June 2019 <br> by RKA |
| Louisbury Road |  |  |  |  |
| Assemblage | West of Louisbury <br> Road and south of <br> Stells Road | 2025 | 152 single-family homes | May 2020 <br> by RKA |
| Kalas / Watkins |  |  |  |  |
| Family Property | Along the west side <br> of Rolesville Road, <br> north of Mitchell Mill <br> Road | 2025 | 439 single-family homes <br> 96 multi-family homes | August 2019 <br> by Stantec |

Adjacent development trips are shown in Figure 6. Adjacent development information can be found in Appendix C.

### 3.3. Future Roadway Improvements

Based on coordination with the NCDOT and the Town, it was determined there were no future roadway improvements to consider under future conditions with this study. It should be noted that per the Rolesville Community Transportation Plan (dated May 2022), the ultimate cross-section of Jonesville Road is identified as a 2-lane roadway with a center two-way-left-turn-lane (TWLTL) and Mitchell Mill Road is identified as a 4-lane median-divided roadway.

### 3.4. 2027 No-Build Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

The 2027 no-build traffic volumes were determined by projecting the 2022 existing peak hour traffic to the year 2027 and adding the adjacent development trips. Refer to Figure 7 for an illustration of the 2027 no-build peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersections.

### 3.5. Analysis of 2027 No-Build Peak Hour Traffic Conditions

The 2027 no-build AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersections were analyzed with existing geometric roadway conditions and traffic control. The analysis results are presented in Section 7 of this report.




 vehicles per hour (vph) was analyzed for any movement with less than 4 vph .


## 4. SITE TRIP GENERATION AND DISTRIBUTION

### 4.1. Trip Generation

The proposed development is assumed to consist of 155 single-family homes, 115 townhomes, and a 12,000 sq. ft. day care center. Average weekday daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trips for the proposed development were estimated using methodology contained within the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition. Table 3 provides a summary of the trip generation potential for the site.

Table 3: Trip Generation Summary

| Land Use (ITE Code) | Intensity | Daily Traffic (vpd) | Weekday AM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Single-Family Home (210) | 155 DU | 1,510 | 28 | 83 | 111 | 95 | 55 | 150 |
| Single-Family Attached Housing (220) | 115 DU | 812 | 14 | 45 | 59 | 44 | 26 | 70 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Day Care Center } \\ & (565) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 12 KSF | 572 | 70 | 62 | 132 | 63 | 70 | 133 |
| Total Trips |  | 2,894 | 112 | 190 | 302 | 202 | 151 | 353 |
| Pass-By Trips: Day Care Center (44\% PM) |  |  | - | - | - | -30 | -30 | -60 |
| Total Primary Trips |  |  | 112 | 190 | 302 | 172 | 121 | 293 |

It is estimated that the proposed development will generate approximately 2,894 total site trips on the roadway network during a typical 24-hour weekday period. Of the daily traffic volume, it is anticipated that 302 trips (112 entering and 190 exiting) will occur during the weekday AM peak hour and 353 trips (202 entering and 151 exiting) will occur during the weekday PM peak hour.

Pass-by trips were also taken into consideration in this study. Pass-by trips are made by the traffic already using the adjacent roadway, entering the site as an intermediate stop on their way to another destination. Pass-by trips are expected to account for approximately 60 trips (30 entering and 30 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour. It should be noted that the
pass-by trips were balanced, as it is likely that these trips would enter and exit in the same hour.

The total primary site trips are the calculated site trips after the reduction for pass-by trips. There are anticipated to be approximately 302 primary site trips ( 112 entering and 190 exiting) during the weekday AM peak hour and 293 primary site trips (172 entering and 121 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour.

### 4.2. Site Trip Distribution and Assignment

Trip distribution percentages used in assigning site traffic for this development were estimated based on a combination of existing traffic patterns, population centers adjacent to the study area, and engineering judgment.

It is estimated that site trips will be regionally distributed as follows:

- $30 \%$ to/from the west via US 401 Bypass
- $15 \%$ to/from the east via US 401 Bypass
- $10 \%$ to/from the south via Peebles Road
- $35 \%$ to/from the west via Mitchell Mill Road
- $10 \%$ to/from the east via Mitchell Mill Road

The residential site trip distribution is shown in Figure 8a and the day care center site trip distribution is shown in Figure 8b. Refer to Figures 9a and 9b for the residential site trip assignment and day care center site trip assignment, respectively.

The pass-by site trips were distributed based on existing traffic patterns with consideration given to the proposed driveway access and site layout. Refer to Figure 10 for the pass-by site trip distribution. Pass-by site trips are shown in Figure 11.

The total site trips were determined by adding the primary site trips and the pass-by site trips. Refer to Figure 12 for the total peak hour site trips at the study intersections.





|  | Hills at Harris Creek <br> Rolesville, NC | Day Care Center <br> Same Trip Assignment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 9 b |

LEGEND
Unsignalized Intersection

- Left-Over Intersection
Right-In/Right-Out Intersection
$\mathrm{X} \% \rightarrow$ Weekday PM Pass-By Trip Distribution



Mitchell Mill
Road
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## 5. 2027 BUILD TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

### 5.1. 2027 Build Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

To estimate traffic conditions with the site fully built-out, the total site trips were added to the 2027 no-build traffic volumes to determine the 2027 build traffic volumes. Refer to Figure 13 for an illustration of the 2027 build peak hour traffic volumes with the proposed site fully developed.

### 5.2. Analysis of $\mathbf{2 0 2 7}$ Build Peak Hour Traffic Conditions

Study intersections were analyzed with the 2027 build traffic volumes using the same methodology previously discussed for existing and no-build traffic conditions. Intersections were analyzed with improvements necessary to accommodate future traffic volumes. The results of the capacity analysis for each intersection are presented in Section 7 of this report.




Road

$$
\begin{aligned}
8 / 20 \boldsymbol{a} \\
279 / 496 \\
2 / 14 \\
\rightarrow
\end{aligned}
$$

Note: Based on NCDOT Congestion Management guidelines, a volume of 4 vehicles per hour (vph) was analyzed for any movement with less than 4 vph .

|  | Hills at Harris Creek <br> Rolesville, NC | 2027 Build <br> Peak Hour Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 13 |  |

## 6. TRAFFIC ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Study intersections were analyzed using the methodology outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition published by the Transportation Research Board. Capacity and level of service are the design criteria for this traffic study. A computer software package, Synchro (Version 11), was used to complete the analyses for most of the study area intersections. Please note that the unsignalized capacity analysis does not provide an overall level of service for an intersection; only delay for an approach with a conflicting movement.

The HCM defines capacity as "the maximum hourly rate at which persons or vehicles can reasonably be expected to traverse a point or uniform section of a lane or roadway during a given time period under prevailing roadway, traffic, and control conditions." Level of service (LOS) is a term used to represent different driving conditions and is defined as a "qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, and their perception by motorists and/or passengers." Level of service varies from Level "A" representing free flow, to Level "F" where breakdown conditions are evident. Refer to Table 4 for HCM levels of service and related average control delay per vehicle for both signalized and unsignalized intersections. Control delay as defined by the HCM includes "initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay". An average control delay of 50 seconds at a signalized intersection results in LOS "D" operation at the intersection.

## Table 4: Highway Capacity Manual - Levels-of-Service and Delay

| UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION |  | SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEVEL <br> OF <br> SERVICE | AVERAGE <br> CONTROL DELAY <br> PER VEHICLE <br> (SECONDS) | LEVEL OF <br> SERVICE | AVERAGE <br> CONTROL DELAY <br> PER VEHICLE <br> (SECONDS) |
| A | $0-10$ | A | $0-10$ |
| B | $10-15$ | B | $10-20$ |
| C | $15-25$ | C | $20-35$ |
| D | $25-35$ | D | $35-55$ |
| E | $35-50$ | E | $55-80$ |
| F | $>50$ | F | $>80$ |

### 6.1. Adjustments to Analysis Guidelines

Capacity analysis at all study intersections was completed according to Town LDO and NCDOT Congestions Management Guidelines.

## 7. CAPACITY ANALYSIS

### 7.1. US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road

The existing unsignalized intersection of US 401 Bypass Road and Jonesville Road was analyzed under 2022 existing, 2027 no-build, and 2027 build traffic conditions with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in Table 5. Refer to Table 5 for a summary of the analysis results. Refer to Appendix D for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

Table 5: Analysis Summary of US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | LANE CONFIGURATIONS | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall } \\ & \text { (seconds) } \end{aligned}$ | Approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall } \\ & \text { (seconds) } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2022 Existing | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { NB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ 1 \mathrm{LT} \\ 1 \mathrm{RT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -- \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-- \\ & \mathrm{E}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EB** }^{*} \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \mathrm{LT} \\ 2 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ 1 \mathrm{RT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{F}^{1} \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{E}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{B}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| 2027 No-Build | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { NB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ 1 \mathrm{LT} \\ 1 \mathrm{RT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & --\mathrm{D}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{2} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-- \\ & \mathrm{F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{E}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB** } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \mathrm{LT} \\ 2 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ 1 \mathrm{RT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{F}^{1} \\ & - \\ & \mathrm{F}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E}^{1} \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{B}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| 2027 Build | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EB } \\ W B^{*} \\ N B \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ 1 \mathrm{LT} \\ 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & --\mathrm{D}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-- \\ & \mathrm{F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~F}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EB** }^{*} \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \mathrm{LT} \\ 2 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ 1 \mathrm{RT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{F}^{1} \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{F}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{E}^{1} \\ -- \\ \mathrm{B}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | N/A |

*Synchro analyzed the WB left-turns as SB through movements due to the nature of the superstreet and synchro limitations.
**Synchro analyzed the EB left-turns as NB through movements due to the nature of the superstreet and synchro limitations.

1. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2. Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of 2022 existing traffic conditions indicates that the major-street left-turn movements and minor-street approaches are expected to operate at LOS D or better with the exception of the eastbound left-turn movement during the weekday AM peak hour (LOS F),
the westbound left-turn movement during the weekday PM peak hour (LOS E), and the southbound minor-street approach during the weekday AM peak hour (LOS E).

Under 2027 no-build and 2027 build traffic conditions, the major-street left-turn movements are expected to operate at LOS E/F during the weekday AM and PM peak hours with the exception of the westbound left-turn movement during the weekday AM peak hour (LOS D) under 2027 no-build and 2027 build traffic conditions. The minor-street approaches are expected to operate at LOS E/F during the weekday AM and PM peak hours with the exception of the northbound approach during the weekday AM peak hour (LOS B/C) and the southbound approach during the weekday PM peak hour (LOS B) under 2027 no-build and 2027 build traffic conditions. It should be noted that the proposed development is expected to account for approximately $5 \%$ of the total traffic at this intersection during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The proposed development is expected to account for approximately $36 \%$ and $28 \%$ of the overall northbound approach traffic at this intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Due to the poor levels-of-service expected at this intersection, a traffic signal was considered under 2027 build traffic conditions to achieve acceptable levels of service. Weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes were utilized in evaluating the potential need for signalization based on the guidelines contained within the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and within the Guidelines for Signalization of Intersections with Two or Three Approaches Final Report, published by ITRE. Based on a review of signal warrants at this intersection, the peak hour warrant (warrant 3) from the MUTCD is expected to be met for both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under 2027 no-build and build traffic conditions. It is not expected that this intersection would satisfy the MUTCD 8-hour (warrant 1) or 4-hour (warrant 2) warrants, which NCDOT favors for installation of a traffic signal. These longer period warrants are not typically met for residential areas due to the distinct peak traffic periods for these types of development. Based on a review of ITRE 95th percentile queue length calculations, the northbound right-turn movement demand is expected to exceed capacity during the weekday PM peak hour under 2027 no-build and 2027 build traffic
conditions. Refer to Appendix J for a copy of the MUTCD warrants and the ITRE 95 th percentile queue length calculations.

Based on the Town's LDO, improvements must be identified to maintain no-build levels-ofservice under build traffic conditions or to limit the degradation to less than a five percent increase in total delay on any approach for those operating at failing levels-of-service under no-build traffic conditions. Therefore, additional turn-lanes were considered for the northbound right-turn and westbound left-turn movements at this intersection to achieve acceptable operation per the Town's LDO. However, additional turn-lanes are not a realistic or practical improvement at an unsignalized intersection operating with superstreet configurations.

Based on the Town's LDO, it is recommended that this intersection be monitored for signalization and a full signal warrant analysis be conducted prior to the full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by the Town and NCDOT. With signalization, it is expected that this intersection will operate at acceptable levels-of-service during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

### 7.2. US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location

The existing unsignalized intersection of US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location was analyzed under 2022 existing, 2027 no-build, and 2027 build traffic conditions with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in Table 6. Refer to Table 6 for a summary of the analysis results. Refer to Appendix E for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

Table 6: Analysis Summary of US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{0} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | LANE CONFIGURATIONS | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall } \\ & \text { (seconds) } \end{aligned}$ | Approach | Overall (seconds) |
| 2022 Existing | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EB }^{*} \\ & \text { WB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1 \mathrm{UT} \\ & 2 \mathrm{TH} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{C}^{1}$ | N/A | B1 | N/A |
| 2027 No-Build | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{EB}^{*} \\ & \text { WB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1 \text { UT } \\ & 2 \mathrm{TH} \end{aligned}$ | E1 | N/A | B1 | N/A |
| 2027 Build | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{*} \\ & \text { WB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{UT} \\ & 2 \mathrm{TH} \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{F}^{1}$ | N/A | B1 | N/A |

*Synchro analyzed the EB u-turn as a NB left-turn movement due to the nature of the superstreet and synchro limitations.

1. Level of service for major-street u-turn movement.

Capacity analysis of 2022 existing and 2027 no-build traffic conditions indicates that the major-street u-turn movement is expected to operate at LOS C or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the weekday AM peak hour under 2027 nobuild conditions (LOS E).

Under 2027 build traffic conditions, the major-street u-turn movement is expected to operate at LOS F during the weekday AM peak hour and at LOS B during the weekday PM peak hour. It should be noted that the proposed development is expected to account for approximately $3 \%$ of the total traffic at this intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The proposed development is expected to account for approximately $36 \%$ and $33 \%$ of the overall northbound approach traffic at this intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Due to the poor levels-of-service expected at this intersection, a traffic signal was considered under 2027 build traffic conditions to achieve acceptable levels of service. Weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes were utilized in evaluating the potential need for signalization based on the guidelines contained within the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and within the Guidelines for Signalization of Intersections with Two or Three Approaches Final Report, published by ITRE. Based on a review of signal warrants at this intersection, the peak hour warrant (warrant 3) from the MUTCD is expected to be met for the weekday AM peak hour under 2027 no-build and 2027 build traffic conditions. It is not expected that this intersection would satisfy the MUTCD 8-hour (warrant 1) or 4-hour (warrant 2) warrants, which NCDOT favors for installation of a traffic signal. These longer period warrants are not typically met for residential areas due to the distinct peak traffic periods for these types of development. Based on a review of ITRE 95th percentile queue length calculations, the eastbound u-turn movement demand is expected to exceed capacity during the weekday AM peak hour under 2027 no-build and 2027 build traffic conditions. Refer to Appendix J for a copy of the MUTCD warrants and the ITRE 95th percentile queue length calculations.

Based on the Town's LDO, improvements must be identified to maintain no-build levels-ofservice under build traffic conditions or to limit the degradation to less than a five percent increase in total delay on any approach for those operating at failing levels-of-service under no-build traffic conditions. Therefore, additional turn-lanes were considered for the eastbound u-turn movement at this intersection to achieve acceptable operation per the Town's LDO. However, additional turn-lanes are not a realistic or practical improvement at an unsignalized intersection operating with superstreet configurations.

Based on the Town's LDO, it is recommended that this intersection be monitored for signalization and a full signal warrant analysis be conducted prior to the full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by the Town and NCDOT. With signalization, it is expected that this intersection will operate at acceptable levels-of-service during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

### 7.3. Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

The existing unsignalized intersection of Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road was analyzed under 2022 existing, 2027 no-build, and 2027 build traffic conditions with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in Table 7. Refer to Table 7 for a summary of the analysis results. Refer to Appendix F for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

Table 7: Analysis Summary of Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | LANE CONFIGURATIONS | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | Overall (seconds) | Approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall } \\ & \text { (seconds) } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2022 Existing | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { NB } \\ \text { SB } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & \text { 1 LT-TH-RT } \\ & \text { 1 LT-TH-RT } \\ & \text { 1 LT-TH-RT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B } \\ (13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~A}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~A}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~A}^{1} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B } \\ (11) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2027 No-Build | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} F \\ (51) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } \\ (19) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2027 Build | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { NB } \\ \text { SB } \end{gathered}$ | 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} F \\ (142) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{E}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } \\ (53) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2027 Build Improved | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { NB } \\ \text { SB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1 LT-TH-RT } \\ \text { 1 LT-TH, } 1 \text { RT } \\ 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ \mathbf{1} \text { LT, } 1 \text { TH-RT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{F} \\ (103) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{D}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } \\ (61) \end{gathered}$ |

Improvements by the developer are shown in bold.

1. Level of service for all-way stop controlled approach.

Capacity analysis of 2022 existing and 2027 no-build traffic conditions indicates that the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS C or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the weekday AM peak hour under 2027 no-build traffic conditions (LOSF). Under 2027 build traffic conditions, this intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS F during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. It should be noted that the
proposed development is expected to account for approximately $19 \%$ and $20 \%$ of the total traffic at this intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively. The proposed development is expected to account for approximately $13 \%$ and $11 \%$ of the overall eastbound approach traffic and $21 \%$ and $23 \%$ of the overall westbound approach at this intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Turn lanes were considered at this intersection in order to mitigate the proportional impact that the proposed site traffic is expected to have at this intersection and to improve overall operations. An exclusive left-turn lane on the southbound approach (Jonesville Road) and right-turn lane on the westbound approach (Mitchell Mill Road) are recommended by the developer. It should be noted that an exclusive southbound left-turn lane was also identified in the 5109 Mitchell Mill Road TIA. With these improvements, the intersection is expected to continue operating at an overall LOS F during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

It should be noted that the overall intersection delay is expected to increase during the weekday PM peak hour as a result of the recommended improvements to the southbound and westbound approaches. This increase in delay is attributable to minor increases in delays for all approaches caused by adding additional lanes to an all-way stop-controlled intersection. No feasible improvements other than signalization would be expected to decrease delays further at this intersection.

Due to the poor levels-of-service expected at this intersection, a traffic signal was considered under 2027 build traffic conditions to achieve acceptable levels-of-service. The peak hour warrant (warrant 3) from the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) was considered. Based on a review of the peak hour signal warrant at this intersection, the intersection is expected to meet the peak hour warrant for the weekday AM peak hour under 2027 no-build traffic conditions and both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under 2027 build traffic conditions. It is not expected that this intersection would satisfy the MUTCD 8hour (warrant 1) or 4-hour (warrant 2) warrants, which NCDOT favors for installation of a traffic signal. These longer period warrants are not typically met for residential areas due to
the distinct peak traffic periods for these types of development. Refer to Appendix J for a copy of the MUTCD warrants.

Based on the Town's LDO, it is recommended that this intersection be monitored for signalization and a full signal warrant analysis be conducted prior to the full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by the Town and NCDOT. With signalization, it is expected that this intersection will operate at acceptable levels-of-service during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

### 7.4. Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 1

The proposed intersection of Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 1 was analyzed under 2027 build traffic conditions with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in Table 8. Refer to Table 8 for a summary of the analysis results. Refer to Appendix G for the synchro capacity analysis reports.

Table 8: Analysis Summary of Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 1

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | LANE CONFIGURATIONS | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | Overall (seconds) | Approach | Overall (seconds) |
| 2027 Build | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{EB} \\ \mathrm{WB} \\ \mathrm{SB} \end{gathered}$ | 1 TH 1 TH-RT 1 RT | $\begin{gathered} -- \\ \text {-- } \\ C^{2} \end{gathered}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & -- \\ & -- \\ & \text { B }^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

Improvements to lane configurations by the developer are shown in bold.

1. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2. Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of 2027 build traffic conditions indicates that the minor-street approach is expected to operate at LOS C or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

Based on the estimated low volume of right-turn movements into the proposed development at this intersection, an exclusive right-turn lane is not recommended.

### 7.5. Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 2

The proposed intersection of Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 2 was analyzed under 2027 build traffic conditions with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in Table 9. Refer to Table 9 for a summary of the analysis results. Refer to Appendix H for the synchro capacity analysis reports.

Table 9: Analysis Summary of Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 2

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | LANE CONFIGURATIONS | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | Overall (seconds) | Approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall } \\ & \text { (seconds) } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2027 Build | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { SB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \mathrm{LT}, 1 \mathrm{TH} \\ 1 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ 1 \mathrm{LT}-\mathrm{RT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{A}^{1} \\ -- \\ \mathrm{C}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | N/A | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{A}^{1} \\ -- \\ \mathrm{C}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | N/A |

Improvements to lane configurations by the developer are shown in bold.

1. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2. Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of 2027 build traffic conditions indicates that the major-street left-turn movement is expected to operate at LOS A during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The minor-street approach is expected to operate at LOS C during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

Right and left-turn lanes were considered based on the NCDOT Policy on Street and Driveway Access to North Carolina Highways. The policy states that turn lanes should be considered on roads that carry at least 4,000 vehicles per day. Mitchell Mill Road is expected to carry more than 4,000 vehicles per day. Based on previous coordination with NCDOT, an eastbound left turn lane and a westbound right turn lane is recommended to be constructed by the developer on Mitchell Mill Road at Site Access 2. Refer to Appendix I for a copy of the turn lane warrants.

## 8. CONCLUSIONS

This Traffic Impact Analysis was conducted to determine the potential traffic impacts of the proposed Hills at Harris Creek development located north of Mitchell Mill Road, west of Manly Farm Road, and east of Gro Peg Lane in Rolesville, North Carolina. The development is expected to consist of 155 single-family homes, 115 townhomes, and a $12,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. day care center and to be built-out in 2027. Site access is proposed via one (1) full-movement and one (1) right-in/right-out driveway connection along Mitchell Mill Road.

The study analyzes traffic conditions during the weekday AM and PM peak hours for the following scenarios:

- 2022 Existing Traffic Conditions
- 2027 No-Build Traffic Conditions
- 2027 Build Traffic Conditions


## Trip Generation

It is estimated that the proposed development will generate approximately 302 primary trips (112 entering and 190 exiting) during the weekday AM peak hour and 293 primary trips (172 entering and 121 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour.

## Rolesville Community Transportation Plan

Per the Rolesville Community Transportation Plan (CTP), the ultimate cross-section of Mitchell Mill Road is identified as a 4-lane median-divided roadway. It is recommended that the proposed development widen one-half section of Mitchell Mill Road along the site frontage in accordance with the Town's CTP.

## Adjustments to Analysis Guidelines

Capacity analysis at all study intersections was completed according to NCDOT Congestion Management Guidelines. Refer to section 6.1 of this report for a detailed description of any adjustments to these guidelines made throughout the analysis.

## Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary

All the study area intersections (including the proposed site driveways) are expected to operate at acceptable levels-of-service under existing and future year conditions with the exception of those identified in Section 7 of this report.

## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, specific geometric improvements have been identified and are recommended to accommodate future traffic conditions. See a more detailed description of the recommended improvements below. Refer to Figure 14 for an illustration of the recommended lane configurations for the proposed development.

## Recommended Improvements by Developer

Required Frontage Improvements per Rolesville Community Transportation Plan

- Widen one-half section of Mitchell Mill Road along the site frontage to this roadway's ultimate section (4-lane median divided).


## US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road

- Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and the Town.


## US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location

- Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and the Town.


## Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

- Construct a southbound (Jonesville Road) left-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.
- It should be noted that this improvement was also identified by the 5109 Mitchell Mill Road TIA.
- Construct a westbound (Mitchell Mill Road) right-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.
- Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and the Town.


## Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 1

- Construct the southbound approach (Site Access 1) as a right-in/right-out with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Provide stop-control for the southbound approach (Site Access 1).
- Construct a concrete median on Mitchell Mill Road that restricts access to right-in/right-out.


## Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 2

- Construct the southbound approach (Site Access 2) with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Provide stop-control for the southbound approach (Site Access 2).
- Construct an eastbound (Mitchell Mill Road) left-turn lane with at least 150 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.
- Construct a westbound (Mitchell Mill Road) right-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.

**Refer to Section 9 of the report for more information

Hills at Harris Creek Rolesville, NC

## Recommended Lane Configurations

## APPENDIX A

## SCOPING DOCUMENTATION

| From: | Warren, Jeremy L [jlwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:jlwarren@ncdot.gov) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, May 23, 2023 12:17 PM |
| To: | Andrew Eagle; Nolfo, Matthew J |
| Cc: | Jessica McClure; Daniel Reisfeld; Elabarger, Michael S; Gruber, Meredith; Jason Pfister; |
|  | Lineberger, Nicholas C; Darnell, Trevor S |
| Subject: | RE: [External] RE: Hills at Harris Creek |

Andrew,
We would prefer to see an updated TIA with the new volumes and the RIRO.
Thanks,
Jeremy Warren, P.E.
Assistant Division Maintenance Engineer
Division 5
North Carolina Department of Transportation
jlwarren@ncdot.gov
4009 District Drive
Raleigh, NC 27607


Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the
North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: Andrew Eagle [AEagle@rameykemp.com](mailto:AEagle@rameykemp.com)
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2023 9:34 AM
To: Warren, Jeremy L [jlwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:jlwarren@ncdot.gov); Nolfo, Matthew J [mjnolfo@ncdot.gov](mailto:mjnolfo@ncdot.gov)
Cc: Jessica McClure [jmcclure@rameykemp.com](mailto:jmcclure@rameykemp.com); Daniel Reisfeld [dreisfeld@rameykemp.com](mailto:dreisfeld@rameykemp.com); Elabarger, Michael S [michael.elabarger@rolesville.nc.gov](mailto:michael.elabarger@rolesville.nc.gov); Gruber, Meredith [meredith.gruber@rolesville.nc.gov](mailto:meredith.gruber@rolesville.nc.gov); Jason Pfister [jason@ellisdevgroup.com](mailto:jason@ellisdevgroup.com)
Subject: RE: [External] RE: Hills at Harris Creek

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Jeremy/Matt,
It's my understanding NCDOT prefers Access A to be RIRO. We can update the TIA to match this configuration. Also, the developer now plans the commercial area to be 12,000 square feet of Day Care instead of 14,000 square feet of retail. This results in 30 more entering trips and 20 more exiting trips during the AM peak hour when compared to the original TIA. During the PM peak hour the Day Care scenario results in 11 fewer entering trips and 4 more exiting trips.

Does NCDOT want the TIA updated to reflect the Day Care trip generation as well as the RIRO?

## Andrew Eagle, PE, PTOE

## Senior Traffic Engineering Project Manager

D 7042206847 |C 7044670325

From: Andrew Eagle
Sent: Monday, May 8, 2023 2:59 PM
To: Warren, Jeremy L [jlwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:jlwarren@ncdot.gov); Nolfo, Matthew J [mjnolfo@ncdot.gov](mailto:mjnolfo@ncdot.gov)
Cc: Jessica McClure [JMCClure@rameykemp.com](mailto:JMCClure@rameykemp.com); Daniel Reisfeld [dreisfeld@rameykemp.com](mailto:dreisfeld@rameykemp.com); Elabarger, Michael S [michael.elabarger@rolesville.nc.gov](mailto:michael.elabarger@rolesville.nc.gov); Gruber, Meredith [meredith.gruber@rolesville.nc.gov](mailto:meredith.gruber@rolesville.nc.gov); Jason Pfister [jason@ellisdevgroup.com](mailto:jason@ellisdevgroup.com)
Subject: RE: [External] RE: Hills at Harris Creek

The link below can be used to download the TIA, site plan, and Synchro files. Please review and let me know if you have any questions/comments. Thank you!
$\square \underline{20498-0005-H i l l s ~ a t ~ H a r r i s ~ C r e e k ~-~ 05-08-2023 ~}$

```
Andrew Eagle, PE, PTOE Senior Traffic Engineering Project Manager D 7042206847 | C 7044670325
TOGETHER WE ARE LIMITLESS
```

From: Warren, Jeremy L [jlwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:jlwarren@ncdot.gov)
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2023 8:53 AM
To: Andrew Eagle [AEagle@rameykemp.com](mailto:AEagle@rameykemp.com); Nolfo, Matthew J [mjnolfo@ncdot.gov](mailto:mjnolfo@ncdot.gov)
Cc: Jessica McClure [JMCClure@rameykemp.com](mailto:JMCClure@rameykemp.com); Daniel Reisfeld [dreisfeld@rameykemp.com](mailto:dreisfeld@rameykemp.com)
Subject: RE: [External] RE: Hills at Harris Creek

The study area should be the same so an updated TIA with an explanation should suffice.

## Jeremy Warren, P.E.

Assistant Division Maintenance Engineer
Division 5
North Carolina Department of Transportation
ilwarren@ncdot.gov
4009 District Drive
Raleigh, NC 27607

From: Andrew Eagle [AEagle@rameykemp.com](mailto:AEagle@rameykemp.com)
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2023 8:37 AM
To: Warren, Jeremy L < jlwarren@ncdot.gov>; Nolfo, Matthew J [mjnolfo@ncdot.gov](mailto:mjnolfo@ncdot.gov)
Cc: Jessica McClure [imcclure@rameykemp.com](mailto:imcclure@rameykemp.com); Daniel Reisfeld [dreisfeld@rameykemp.com](mailto:dreisfeld@rameykemp.com)
Subject: [External] RE: Hills at Harris Creek

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify. Send all suspicious email as an attachment to Report Spam.

Jeremy,

NCDOT approved the Hills at Harris Creek TIA in June of last year. The site plan has been changed, resulting in less density and fewer trips. The Town of Rolesville wants the TIA updated to match the latest site plan. Do you want an updated MOU, or can we revise the TIA and submit it via email with an explanation of the changes?
...and a heads up due to the similar names, this is a different project from Harris Creek Farm. NCDOT recently approved the MOU for that one on April 3.

Thanks,

## Andrew Eagle, PE, PTOE

Senior Traffic Engineering Project Manager
D 7042206847 |C 7044670325

## RAMEY KEMP ASSOCIATES

- TOGETHER WE ARE LIMITLESS

From: Warren, Jeremy L [jlwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:jlwarren@ncdot.gov)
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2022 1:47 PM
To: Tucker Fulle [tfulle@rameykemp.com](mailto:tfulle@rameykemp.com)
Cc: Nolfo, Matthew J [mjnolfo@ncdot.gov](mailto:mjnolfo@ncdot.gov); Brennan, Sean P [spbrennan@ncdot.gov](mailto:spbrennan@ncdot.gov)
Subject: FW: Hills at Harris Creek
Please see congestions comments.
Jeremy Warren, P.E.
District Engineer
Division 5, District 1
North Carolina Department of Transportation
9197333213 office
jlwarren@ncdot.gov
4009 District Drive
Raleigh, NC 27607

Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the
North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: Walker, Braden M [bmwalker1@ncdot.gov](mailto:bmwalker1@ncdot.gov)
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2022 9:32 AM
To: Warren, Jeremy L [ilwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:ilwarren@ncdot.gov)
Cc: Lacy, Kevin [jklacy1@ncdot.gov](mailto:jklacy1@ncdot.gov); Brennan, Sean P [spbrennan@ncdot.gov](mailto:spbrennan@ncdot.gov); Grant, John H [jhgrant@ncdot.gov](mailto:jhgrant@ncdot.gov); Keilson, David P [dpkeilson@ncdot.gov](mailto:dpkeilson@ncdot.gov); Ishak, Doumit Y [dishak@ncdot.gov](mailto:dishak@ncdot.gov); Bunting, Clarence B [cbunting@ncdot.gov](mailto:cbunting@ncdot.gov); Jones, Brandon H [bhjones@ncdot.gov](mailto:bhjones@ncdot.gov); Parrott, Tracy N [tnparrott@ncdot.gov](mailto:tnparrott@ncdot.gov); Holmes, Benjamin W [bwholmes@ncdot.gov](mailto:bwholmes@ncdot.gov); Mcneal, Douglas R [dmcneal@ncdot.gov](mailto:dmcneal@ncdot.gov); Nolfo, Matthew J [mjnolfo@ncdot.gov](mailto:mjnolfo@ncdot.gov)
Subject: Hills at Harris Creek

Attached is a PDF copy of our final review letter for Hills at Harris Creek. This letter is only being distributed electronically and should be considered as the official documentation. If you have any questions, please contact me or Clarence Bunting.

Thank you,

## Braden M. Walker, PE.

Congestion Management Project Design Engineer
Traffic Management Unit
North Carolina Department of Transportation

9198145078 office
bmwalker1@ncdot.gov

750 N. Greenfield Parkway
Garner, NC 27529

## Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the

North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Meredith Gruber, PLA, AICP
Town of Rolesville - Planning Director
PO Box 250
502 Southtown Circle
Rolesville, NC 27571
meredith.gruber@rolesville.nc.gov
[Sent via Email]
Reference: Hills at Harris Creek
Rolesville, North Carolina

Subject: Memorandum of Understanding for TIA Report

Dear Ms. Gruber:

The following is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining the proposed scope of work and assumptions related to the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed Hills at Harris Creek development in Rolesville, North Carolina. The proposed development is to be located north of Mitchell Mill Road, west of Manly Farm Road, and east of Gro Peg Lane in Rolesville, NC. The development is expected to consist of 211 single-family homes, 109 townhomes, and 3.626 acres of commercial development. This MOU reflects the assumptions outlined during the initial coordination between Ramey Kemp Associates (RKA), the Town of Rolesville (Town), and the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). Refer to the attached site location map. Site access to the proposed development is expected to be provided via two (2) full-movement driveway connections along Mitchell Mill Road. Refer to the attachments for a copy of the preliminary site plan.

The proposed development, anticipated to be completed in 2027, is expected to consist of 211 singlefamily homes, 109 townhomes, and 3.626 acres of commercial development. It should be noted that the commercial development land use(s) and intensity are not known at this time. Therefore, 7,000 square feet (sq. ft.) of general retail space per acre of land [approximately $25,400 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.] was assumed for the commercial development in this study. The proposed development is assumed to consist of the following land uses:

- 211 single-family homes
- 109 townhomes
- 25,400 sq. ft. of general retail


## Study Area

Based on a coordination with NCDOT and Town staff, the study area is proposed to consist of the following intersections:

- Mitchell Mill Road \& Jonesville Road / Peebles Road (unsignalized)
- US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road (unsignalized)
- US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location (unsignalized)
- Mitchell Mill Road and Site Driveways (2)


## Existing Traffic Volumes

Existing peak hour traffic volumes will be determined based on previously collected traffic counts at the study intersections below, in November 2021 during typical weekday AM (7:00 AM - 9:00 AM) and PM (4:00 PM - 6:00 PM) peak periods, while schools were in session for in-person learning:

- Mitchell Mill Road \& Jonesville Road / Peebles Road
- US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road
- US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location

These previously collected counts will be projected to the year 2022 using a compounded annual growth rate of $2 \%$. Refer to the attachments for an illustration of 2022 existing peak hour traffic volumes.

## Background Traffic Volumes

Based on coordination with NCDOT and the Town, background traffic volumes will be determined by projecting 2022 existing traffic volumes to the year 2027 using a $2 \%$ annual growth rate. Additionally, it was determined that the following adjacent developments are to be included in this study:

- Cobblestone Crossing Mixed-Use
- Young Street PUD
- Wheeler Tract
- Louisbury Road Assemblage
- Kalas / Watkins Family Property


## Future Roadway Improvements

Based on coordination with the Town and NCDOT, it was determined that there are no future roadway improvements within the study area to consider under future traffic conditions.

## Trip Generation

Average weekday daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trips for the proposed development were estimated using methodology contained within the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition. Refer to

Table 1, on the following page, for a summary of the proposed site trip generation for full buildout of the proposed development.

Table 1: Trip Generation Summary

| Land Use (ITE Code) | Intensity | Daily <br> Traffic (vpd) | Weekday AM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Single-Family Home (210) | 211 DU | 2,010 | 38 | 109 | 147 | 126 | 74 | 200 |
| Multi-Family Home (Low-Rise) (220) | 109 DU | 770 | 14 | 43 | 57 | 42 | 25 | 67 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Retail (<40 KSF) } \\ (822) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 25.4* KSF | 1,300 | 32 | 21 | 53 | 75 | 76 | 151 |
| Total Trips |  | 4,080 | 84 | 173 | 257 | 243 | 175 | 418 |
| Internal Capture$(2 \%$ AM, $1 \%$ PM)** |  |  | -2 | -3 | -5 | -5 | -3 | -8 |
| Total External Trips |  |  | 82 | 170 | 252 | 238 | 172 | 410 |
| Pass-By Trips: Shopping Center ( $34 \%$ PM) |  |  | - | - | - | -25 | -25 | -50 |
| Total Primary Trips |  |  | 82 | 170 | 252 | 213 | 147 | 360 |

*Since the commercial development is unknown at this time, $7,000 \mathrm{SF}$ of general retail space per acre of land [3.626 acres in total] was assumed for this land use.
**Utilizing methodology contained in the NCHRP Report 684.
It is estimated that the proposed development will generate approximately 4,080 site trips on the roadway network during a typical 24 -hour weekday period. Of the daily traffic volume, it is anticipated that 257 trips (84 entering and 173 exiting) will occur during the weekday AM peak hour and 418 trips ( 243 entering and 175 exiting) will occur during the weekday PM peak hour.

Internal capture of trips between the retail and residential land uses was considered in this study. Internal capture is the consideration for trips that will be made within the site between different land uses, so the vehicle technically never leaves the internal site but can still be considered as a trip to that specific land use. Based on NCHRP Report 684 methodology, weekday AM and PM peak hour internal capture rates of $2 \%$ and $1 \%$, respectively, were applied to the trips generated from the development. The internal capture reductions are expected to account for approximately 5 trips ( 2 entering and 3 exiting) during the weekday AM peak hour and 8 trips ( 5 entering and 3 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour. Refer to the attached NCHRP internal capture reports for reference.

Pass-by trips will also be taken into consideration in this study. Pass-by trips are made by the traffic already using the adjacent roadway, entering the site as an intermediate stop on their way to another destination. Pass-by percentages are applied to site trips after adjustments for internal capture. Passby trips are expected to account for approximately 50 trips ( 25 entering and 25 exiting) during the
weekday PM peak hour. It should be noted that the pass-by trips were balanced, as it is likely that these trips would enter and exit in the same hour.
The total primary trips are the calculated site trips after the reduction for internal capture and pass-by trips. Primary site traffic is expected to generate approximately 252 trips ( 82 entering and 170 exiting) during the weekday AM peak hour, and 360 trips ( 213 entering and 147 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour.

## Trip Distribution and Assignment

Site trips are distributed based on the locations of existing traffic patterns, population centers adjacent to the study area, and engineering judgment. A summary of the overall distributions is below.

## Residential

- $30 \%$ to/from the west via US 401 Bypass
- $15 \%$ to/from the east via US 401 Bypass
- $10 \%$ to/from the south via Peebles Road
- $35 \%$ to/from the west via Mitchell Mill Road
- $10 \%$ to/from the east via Mitchell Mill Road


## Commercial

- $25 \%$ to/from the west via US 401 Bypass
- $15 \%$ to/from the east via US 401 Bypass
- $10 \%$ to/from the south via Peebles Road
- $40 \%$ to/from the west via Mitchell Mill Road
- $10 \%$ to/from the east via Mitchell Mill Road

Refer to the attached site trip distribution figures.

## Analysis Scenarios

All capacity analyses will be performed utilizing Synchro (Version 10.3). All study intersections will be analyzed during the weekday AM and PM peak hours under the following proposed traffic scenarios:

- 2022 Existing Traffic Conditions
- 2027 No-Build Traffic Conditions
- 2027 Build Traffic Conditions


## Report

The TIA report will be prepared based on the Town and NCDOT requirements.
If you find this memorandum of understanding acceptable, please let me know so that we may include it in the TIA report. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
Ramey Kemp Associates,


Michael Karpkinski, P.E.
Traffic Engineering Project Manager
Attachments: Site Location Map
Site Plan
2022 Existing Traffic Volumes Figure NCHRP 684 Internal Capture Reports
Proposed Site Trip Distribution Figures


| LEGEND: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ | RPENSPACE |
| $\square$ | ROND |
| $\square$ |  |
| $\square$ |  |
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LOT TYPES:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SINGLE FAMLY LOT WIDTH } \\
& \hline \text { TOWNHOME LOT DIMS } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{|l}
\hline \text { SETBACKS: } \\
\hline \text { FRONT } \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline \text { FRONT } \\
\hline \text { SIDE YARD } \\
\hline \text { SIDE CORNER } \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline \text { BUFFER REQUIREMENTS: } \\
\text { ROAD WIDENING }
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { RRAD WIDENING } \\
& \text { OPEN SPACE AREA REQUIRED. }
\end{aligned}
$$

OWNER INFORMATION:

 WSTATES WAY, CARY, NC 27513, $919-389-2372$
EST
$\square$
 $\square$


| NCHRP 684 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Project Name: | Hills at Harris Creek | Organization: | Ramey Kemp \& Associates |  |
| Project Location: | Rolesville, NC | TF |  |  |
| Scenario Description: | AM Street Peak Hour | Performed By: | Date: | $3 / 18 / 2022$ |
| Analysis Year: | 20xx Build | Checked By: |  |  |
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour | Date: |  |  |


| Table 1-A: Base Vehicle-Trip Generation Estimates (Single-Use Site Estimate) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Development Data (For Information Only) |  |  | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | ITE LUCs ${ }^{1}$ | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail | 822 | 25,400 | sq.ft. |  | 32 | 21 |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential | 210,220 | 211,109 | units |  | 52 | 152 |
| Hotel |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0 | 84 | 173 |


| Table 2-A: Mode Split and Vehicle Occupancy Estimates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Entering Trips |  |  | Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. ${ }^{4}$ | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized | Veh. Occ. ${ }^{4}$ | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized |
| Office | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Retail | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Restaurant | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Residential | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Hotel | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |


| Table 3-A: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Destination (To) |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Table 4-A: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |  |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Retail | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Residential | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 5-A: Computations Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| All Person-Trips | 282 | 92 | 190 |
| Internal Capture Percentage | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| External Vehicle-Trips $^{5}$ | 251 | 81 | 170 |
| External Transit-Trips |  |  |  |
| External Non-Motorized Trips $^{6}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 6-A: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| Office | N/A | N/A |
| Retail | $6 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Restaurant | N/A | N/A |
| Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A |
| Residential | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Hotel | N/A | N/A |

${ }^{1}$ Land Use Codes (LUCs) from Trip Generation Manual, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.
${ }^{2}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator.
${ }^{3}$ Enter trips assuming no transit or non-motorized trips (as assumed in ITE Trip Generation Manual).
${ }^{4}$ Enter vehicle occupancy assumed in Table 1-A vehicle trips. If vehicle occupancy changes for proposed mixed-use project, manual adjustments must be made to Tables 5-A, 9-A (O and D). Enter transit, non-motorized percentages that will result with proposed mixed-use project complete.
${ }^{5}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A.
${ }^{6}$ Person-Trips
Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number
Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A\&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1

| Project Name: | Hills at Harris Creek |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |
| Table 7-A: Conversion of Vehicle-Trip Ends to Person-Trip Ends |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Table 7-A (D): Entering Trips |  |  | Table 7-A (0): Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* |
| Office | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1.10 | 32 | 35 | 1.10 | 21 | 23 |
| Restaurant | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1.10 | 52 | 57 | 1.10 | 152 | 167 |
| Hotel | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 8-A (0): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Origin) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 7 |  | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 3 | 2 | 33 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 8-A (D): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Destination) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential |  |  |
| Office |  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| Retail | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Restaurant | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Residential | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Hotel | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |


| Table 9-A (D): Internal and External Trips Summary (Entering Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Destination Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 2 | 33 | 35 | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1 | 56 | 57 | 51 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 9-A (0): Internal and External Trips Summary (Exiting Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1 | 22 | 23 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 2 | 165 | 167 | 150 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

${ }^{1}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A
${ }^{2}$ Person-Trips
${ }^{3}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator
*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

| NCHRP 684 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Project Name: | Hills at Harris Creek | Organization: | Ramey Kemp \& Associates |
| Project Location: | Rolesville, NC | Performed By: | TF |
| Scenario Description: | AM Street Peak Hour | Date: |  |
| Analysis Year: | 20xx Build | Checked By: |  |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour | Date: |  |


| Table 1-P: Base Vehicle-Trip Generation Estimates (Single-Use Site Estimate) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Development Data (For Information Only) |  |  | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | ITE LUCs ${ }^{1}$ | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail | 822 | 25,400 | sq.ft. |  | 75 | 76 |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential | 210,220 | 211,109 | units |  | 168 | 99 |
| Hotel |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0 | 243 | 175 |


| Table 2-P: Mode Split and Vehicle Occupancy Estimates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Entering Trips |  |  | Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. ${ }^{4}$ | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized | Veh. Occ. ${ }^{4}$ | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized |
| Office | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Retail | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Restaurant | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Residential | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Hotel | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |


| Table 3-P: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential |  |  |
| Office |  | 4000 | 4000 |  | 4000 |  |  |
| Retail |  |  |  |  | 4000 |  |  |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  | 4000 |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  | 4000 |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel |  | 4000 | 4000 |  | 4000 |  |  |


| Table 4-P: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential |  |  |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel |  |
| Retail | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Residential | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |


| Table 5-P: Computations Summary |  |  |  | Table 6-P: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| All Person-Trips | 461 | 268 | 193 | Office | N/A | N/A |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 1\% | 1\% | 2\% | Retail | 1\% | 2\% |
|  |  |  |  | Restaurant | N/A | N/A |
| External Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{5}$ | 414 | 241 | 173 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A |
| External Transit-Trips ${ }^{6}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Residential | 1\% | 1\% |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ${ }^{6}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A |

${ }^{1}$ Land Use Codes (LUCs) from Trip Generation Manual , published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.
${ }^{2}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator.
${ }^{3}$ Enter trips assuming no transit or non-motorized trips (as assumed in ITE Trip Generation Manual ).
${ }^{4}$ Enter vehicle occupancy assumed in Table 1-P vehicle trips. If vehicle occupancy changes for proposed mixed-use project, manual adjustments must be made
${ }^{5}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P.
${ }^{6}$ Person-Trips
*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.
Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A\&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1

| Project Name: | Hills at Harris Creek |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |
| Table 7-P: Conversion of Vehicle-Trip Ends to Person-Trip Ends |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Table 7-P (D): Entering Trips |  |  | Table 7-P (O): Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* |
| Office | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1.10 | 75 | 83 | 1.10 | 76 | 84 |
| Restaurant | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1.10 | 168 | 185 | 1.10 | 99 | 109 |
| Hotel | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 8-P (O): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Origin) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 2 |  | 24 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 |  | 3 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 8-P (D): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Destination) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential |  |  |
| Office |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Retail | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 8 |  |  |
| Restaurant | 0 | 42 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Residential | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 |  |  |
| Hotel | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |


| Table 9-P (D): Internal and External Trips Summary (Entering Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Destination Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1 | 82 | 83 | 75 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 2 | 183 | 185 | 166 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 9-P (0): Internal and External Trips Summary (Exiting Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 2 | 82 | 84 | 75 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1 | 108 | 109 | 98 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

[^0]


## APPENDIX B

## TRAFFIC COUNTS



## TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Jonesville)AM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 1

|  | Jonesville Road Southbound |  |  |  | US 401 Westbound |  |  |  | Jonesville Road Northbound |  |  |  | US 401 <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 63 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 24 | 380 | 21 | 425 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 18 | 182 | 3 | 203 | 714 |
| 07:15 AM | 42 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 39 | 362 | 24 | 425 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 11 | 125 | 7 | 143 | 647 |
| 07:30 AM | 51 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 80 | 318 | 23 | 421 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 24 | 136 | 15 | 175 | 695 |
| 07:45 AM | 65 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 38 | 249 | 16 | 303 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 135 | 10 | 170 | 563 |
| Total | 221 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 181 | 1309 | 84 | 1574 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 133 | 78 | 578 | 35 | 691 | 2619 |
| 08:00 AM | 61 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 26 | 236 | 13 | 275 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 30 | 120 | 10 | 160 | 519 |
| 08:15 AM | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 12 | 233 | 9 | 254 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 13 | 94 | 9 | 116 | 422 |
| 08:30 AM | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 10 | 213 | 5 | 228 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 91 | 3 | 100 | 361 |
| 08:45 AM | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 9 | 145 | 5 | 159 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 11 | 85 | 2 | 98 | 295 |
| Total | 149 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 57 | 827 | 32 | 916 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 60 | 390 | 24 | 474 | 1597 |
| Grand Total | 370 | 0 | 0 | 370 | 238 | 2136 | 116 | 2490 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 138 | 968 | 59 | 1165 | 4216 |
| Apprch \% | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 9.6 | 85.8 | 4.7 |  | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 11.8 | 83.1 | 5.1 |  |  |
| Total \% | 8.8 | 0 | 0 | 8.8 | 5.6 | 50.7 | 2.8 | 59.1 | 4.5 | 0 | 0 | 4.5 | 3.3 | 23 | 1.4 | 27.6 |  |
| Cars + | 366 | 0 | 0 | 366 | 233 | 2094 | 114 | 2441 | 188 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 135 | 916 | 57 | 1108 | 4103 |
| \% Cars + | 98.9 | 0 | 0 | 98.9 | 97.9 | 98 | 98.3 | 98 | 98.4 | 0 | 0 | 98.4 | 97.8 | 94.6 | 96.6 | 95.1 | 97.3 |
| Trucks | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 42 | 2 | 49 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 52 | 2 | 57 | 113 |
| \% Trucks | 1.1 | 0 | 0 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 2 | 1.7 | 2 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 5.4 | 3.4 | 4.9 | 2.7 |



TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Jonesville)AM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 2

|  | Jonesville Road Southbound |  |  |  | US 401 Westbound |  |  |  | Jonesville Road Northbound |  |  |  | US 401 Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for | Entire In | tersect | Beg | ins at 07 | 00 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 AM | 63 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 24 | 380 | 21 | 425 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 18 | 182 | 3 | 203 | 714 |
| 07:15 AM | 42 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 39 | 362 | 24 | 425 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 11 | 125 | 7 | 143 | 647 |
| 07:30 AM | 51 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 80 | 318 | 23 | 421 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 24 | 136 | 15 | 175 | 695 |
| 07:45 AM | 65 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 38 | 249 | 16 | 303 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 135 | 10 | 170 | 563 |
| Total Volume | 221 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 181 | 1309 | 84 | 1574 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 133 | 78 | 578 | 35 | 691 | 2619 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 11.5 | 83.2 | 5.3 |  | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 11.3 | 83.6 | 5.1 |  |  |
| PHF | . 850 | . 000 | . 000 | . 850 | . 566 | . 861 | . 875 | . 926 | . 693 | . 000 | . 000 | 693 | 780 | . 794 | . 583 | . 851 | . 917 |




TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Jonesville)PM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 1

|  | Jonesville Road Southbound |  |  |  | US 401 Westbound |  |  |  | Jonesville Road Northbound |  |  |  | US 401 Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 47 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 13 | 124 | 6 | 143 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 37 | 217 | 22 | 276 | 487 |
| 04:15 PM | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 13 | 119 | 6 | 138 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 15 | 231 | 20 | 266 | 464 |
| 04:30 PM | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 19 | 118 | 12 | 149 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 12 | 291 | 28 | 331 | 542 |
| 04:45 PM | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 22 | 137 | 6 | 165 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 8 | 303 | 30 | 341 | 553 |
| Total | 126 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 67 | 498 | 30 | 595 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 72 | 1042 | 100 | 1214 | 2046 |
| 05:00 PM | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 10 | 143 | 7 | 160 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 322 | 30 | 375 | 595 |
| 05:15 PM | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 22 | 146 | 11 | 179 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 15 | 257 | 26 | 298 | 543 |
| 05:30 PM | 39 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 20 | 145 | 3 | 168 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 23 | 262 | 14 | 299 | 540 |
| 05:45 PM | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 10 | 112 | 9 | 131 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 11 | 227 | 21 | 259 | 436 |
| Total | 130 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 62 | 546 | 30 | 638 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 72 | 1068 | 91 | 1231 | 2114 |
| Grand Total | 256 | 0 | 0 | 256 | 129 | 1044 | 60 | 1233 | 226 | 0 | 0 | 226 | 144 | 2110 | 191 | 2445 | 4160 |
| Apprch \% | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 10.5 | 84.7 | 4.9 |  | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 5.9 | 86.3 | 7.8 |  |  |
| Total \% | 6.2 | 0 | 0 | 6.2 | 3.1 | 25.1 | 1.4 | 29.6 | 5.4 | 0 | 0 | 5.4 | 3.5 | 50.7 | 4.6 | 58.8 |  |
| Cars + | 252 | 0 | 0 | 252 | 127 | 1020 | 60 | 1207 | 223 | 0 | 0 | 223 | 142 | 2051 | 191 | 2384 | 4066 |
| \% Cars + | 98.4 | 0 | 0 | 98.4 | 98.4 | 97.7 | 100 | 97.9 | 98.7 | 0 | 0 | 98.7 | 98.6 | 97.2 | 100 | 97.5 | 97.7 |
| Trucks | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 59 | 0 | 61 | 94 |
| \% Trucks | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 0 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 0 | 2.5 | 2.3 |



TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Jonesville)PM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 2

|  | Jonesville Road Southbound |  |  |  | US 401 Westbound |  |  |  | Jonesville Road Northbound |  |  |  | US 401 Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for | ntire In | ersection | n Beg | ns at 04 | 30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30 PM | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 19 | 118 | 12 | 149 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 12 | 291 | 28 | 331 | 542 |
| 04:45 PM | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 22 | 137 | 6 | 165 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 8 | 303 | 30 | 341 | 553 |
| 05:00 PM | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 10 | 143 | 7 | 160 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 322 | 30 | 375 | 595 |
| 05:15 PM | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 22 | 146 | 11 | 179 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 15 | 257 | 26 | 298 | 543 |
| Total Volume | 112 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 73 | 544 | 36 | 653 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 58 | 1173 | 114 | 1345 | 2233 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 11.2 | 83.3 | 5.5 |  | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 4.3 | 87.2 | 8.5 |  |  |
| PHF | . 757 | . 000 | . 000 | 757 | . 830 | . 932 | . 750 | 912 | 854 | 000 | . 000 | 854 | 630 | . 911 | . 950 | 897 | 938 |




## TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Eastern U Turn)AM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No :1

| Groups Printed- Cars + - Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  | Int Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | US 401 Westbound |  |  | US 401 Eastbound |  |  |  |
| Start Time | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Thru | UTrn | App. Total |  |
| 07:00 AM | 421 | 0 | 421 | 198 | 12 | 210 | 631 |
| 07:15 AM | 410 | 0 | 410 | 136 | 24 | 160 | 570 |
| 07:30 AM | 392 | 0 | 392 | 149 | 36 | 185 | 577 |
| 07:45 AM | 279 | 0 | 279 | 137 | 17 | 154 | 433 |
| Total | 1502 | 0 | 1502 | 620 | 89 | 709 | 2211 |
| 08:00 AM | 253 | 0 | 253 | 130 | 20 | 150 | 403 |
| 08:15 AM | 243 | 0 | 243 | 98 | 13 | 111 | 354 |
| 08:30 AM | 223 | 0 | 223 | 94 | 7 | 101 | 324 |
| 08:45 AM | 147 | 0 | 147 | 85 | 9 | 94 | 241 |
| Total | 866 | 0 | 866 | 407 | 49 | 456 | 1322 |
| Grand Total | 2368 | 0 | 2368 | 1027 | 138 | 1165 | 3533 |
| Apprch \% | 100 | 0 |  | 88.2 | 11.8 |  |  |
| Total \% | 67 | 0 | 67 | 29.1 | 3.9 | 33 |  |
| Cars + | 2318 | 0 | 2318 | 973 | 136 | 1109 | 3427 |
| \% Cars + | 97.9 | 0 | 97.9 | 94.7 | 98.6 | 95.2 | 97 |
| Trucks | 50 | 0 | 50 | 54 | 2 | 56 | 106 |
| \% Trucks | 2.1 | 0 | 2.1 | 5.3 | 1.4 | 4.8 | 3 |



## TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Eastern U Turn)AM Peak
Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 2

|  | US 401 Westbound |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { US } 401 \\ \text { Eastbound } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:00 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 AM | 421 | 0 | 421 | 198 | 12 | 210 | 631 |
| 07:15 AM | 410 | 0 | 410 | 136 | 24 | 160 | 570 |
| 07:30 AM | 392 | 0 | 392 | 149 | 36 | 185 | 577 |
| 07:45 AM | 279 | 0 | 279 | 137 | 17 | 154 | 433 |
| Total Volume | 1502 | 0 | 1502 | 620 | 89 | 709 | 2211 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 |  | 87.4 | 12.6 |  |  |
| PHF | . 892 | . 000 | . 892 | . 783 | . 618 | . 844 | 876 |




## TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Eastern U Turn)PM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No :1

| Groups Printed- Cars + - Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | US 401 <br> Westbound |  |  | US 401 Eastbound |  |  |  |
| Start Time | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Thru | UTrn | App. Total |  |
| 04:00 PM | 130 | 0 | 130 | 240 | 12 | 252 | 382 |
| 04:15 PM | 128 | 0 | 128 | 237 | 15 | 252 | 380 |
| 04:30 PM | 129 | 0 | 129 | 311 | 19 | 330 | 459 |
| 04:45 PM | 149 | 0 | 149 | 317 | 19 | 336 | 485 |
| Total | 536 | 0 | 536 | 1105 | 65 | 1170 | 1706 |
| 05:00 PM | 149 | 0 | 149 | 342 | 8 | 350 | 499 |
| 05:15 PM | 160 | 0 | 160 | 284 | 19 | 303 | 463 |
| 05:30 PM | 161 | 0 | 161 | 273 | 22 | 295 | 456 |
| 05:45 PM | 120 | 0 | 120 | 235 | 12 | 247 | 367 |
| Total | 590 | 0 | 590 | 1134 | 61 | 1195 | 1785 |
| Grand Total | 1126 | 0 | 1126 | 2239 | 126 | 2365 | 3491 |
| Apprch \% | 100 | 0 |  | 94.7 | 5.3 |  |  |
| Total \% | 32.3 | 0 | 32.3 | 64.1 | 3.6 | 67.7 |  |
| Cars + | 1101 | 0 | 1101 | 2175 | 125 | 2300 | 3401 |
| \% Cars + | 97.8 | 0 | 97.8 | 97.1 | 99.2 | 97.3 | 97.4 |
| Trucks | 25 | 0 | 25 | 64 | 1 | 65 | 90 |
| \% Trucks | 2.2 | 0 | 2.2 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 2.6 |



## TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Eastern U Turn)PM Peak
Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 2

|  | US 401 Westbound |  |  | US 401 Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30 PM | 129 | 0 | 129 | 311 | 19 | 330 | 459 |
| 04:45 PM | 149 | 0 | 149 | 317 | 19 | 336 | 485 |
| 05:00 PM | 149 | 0 | 149 | 342 | 8 | 350 | 499 |
| 05:15 PM | 160 | 0 | 160 | 284 | 19 | 303 | 463 |
| Total Volume | 587 | 0 | 587 | 1254 | 65 | 1319 | 1906 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 |  | 95.1 | 4.9 |  |  |
| PHF | . 917 | . 000 | . 917 | . 917 | . 855 | . 942 | . 955 |




## TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

File Name : Rolesville(Jonesville and Mitchell Mill)AM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/30/2021
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Cars + - Trucks

|  | Peebles Road Southbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Westbound |  |  |  | Peebles Road Northbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 4 | 17 | 13 | 34 | 8 | 73 | 5 | 86 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 74 | 1 | 75 | 215 |
| 07:15 AM | 4 | 36 | 7 | 47 | 8 | 101 | 2 | 111 | 3 | 26 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 32 | 1 | 33 | 221 |
| 07:30 AM | 6 | 34 | 5 | 45 | 16 | 87 | 3 | 106 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 35 | 210 |
| 07:45 AM | 2 | 43 | 6 | 51 | 8 | 49 | 1 | 58 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 24 | 4 | 29 | 155 |
| Total | 16 | 130 | 31 | 177 | 40 | 310 | 11 | 361 | 11 | 76 | 4 | 91 | 2 | 163 | 7 | 172 | 801 |
| 08:00 AM | 7 | 31 | 12 | 50 | 4 | 53 | 1 | 58 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 28 | 3 | 31 | 150 |
| 08:15 AM | 12 | 17 | 3 | 32 | 1 | 37 | 1 | 39 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 24 | 1 | 26 | 105 |
| 08:30 AM | 6 | 4 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 49 | 2 | 54 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 92 |
| 08:45 AM | 1 | 13 | 3 | 17 | 4 | 32 | 1 | 37 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 18 | 2 | 21 | 80 |
| Total | 26 | 65 | 20 | 111 | 12 | 171 | 5 | 188 | 4 | 22 | 5 | 31 | 2 | 89 | 6 | 97 | 427 |
| Grand Total | 42 | 195 | 51 | 288 | 52 | 481 | 16 | 549 | 15 | 98 | 9 | 122 | 4 | 252 | 13 | 269 | 1228 |
| Apprch \% | 14.6 | 67.7 | 17.7 |  | 9.5 | 87.6 | 2.9 |  | 12.3 | 80.3 | 7.4 |  | 1.5 | 93.7 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Total \% | 3.4 | 15.9 | 4.2 | 23.5 | 4.2 | 39.2 | 1.3 | 44.7 | 1.2 | 8 | 0.7 | 9.9 | 0.3 | 20.5 | 1.1 | 21.9 |  |
| Cars + | 42 | 195 | 50 | 287 | 52 | 479 | 16 | 547 | 15 | 98 | 9 | 122 | 4 | 249 | 13 | 266 | 1222 |
| \% Cars + | 100 | 100 | 98 | 99.7 | 100 | 99.6 | 100 | 99.6 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 98.8 | 100 | 98.9 | 99.5 |
| Trucks | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| \% Trucks | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.2 | 0 | 1.1 | 0.5 |



## TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

File Name : Rolesville(Jonesville and Mitchell Mill)AM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/30/2021
Page No : 2

|  | Peebles Road Southbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Westbound |  |  |  | Peebles Road Northbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for | Entire | ersect | on Begi | ins at 07 | JO AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 AM | 4 | 17 | 13 | 34 | 8 | 73 | 5 | 86 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 74 | 1 | 75 | 215 |
| 07:15 AM | 4 | 36 | 7 | 47 | 8 | 101 | 2 | 111 | 3 | 26 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 32 | 1 | 33 | 221 |
| 07:30 AM | 6 | 34 | 5 | 45 | 16 | 87 | 3 | 106 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 35 | 210 |
| 07:45 AM | 2 | 43 | 6 | 51 | 8 | 49 | 1 | 58 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 24 | 4 | 29 | 155 |
| Total Volume | 16 | 130 | 31 | 177 | 40 | 310 | 11 | 361 | 11 | 76 | 4 | 91 | 2 | 163 | 7 | 172 | 801 |
| \% App. Total | 9 | 73.4 | 17.5 |  | 11.1 | 85.9 | 3 |  | 12.1 | 83.5 | 4.4 |  | 1.2 | 94.8 | 4.1 |  |  |
| PHF | . 667 | . 756 | . 596 | . 868 | . 625 | . 767 | . 550 | . 813 | 458 | . 731 | . 333 | 758 | . 500 | . 551 | . 438 | . 573 | . 906 |




## TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

File Name : Rolesville(Jonesville and Mitchell Mill)PM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/30/2021
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Cars + - Trucks

|  | Peebles Road Southbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Westbound |  |  |  | Peebles Road Northbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 7 | 11 | 13 | 31 | 6 | 25 | 1 | 32 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 16 | 2 | 44 | 6 | 52 | 131 |
| 04:15 PM | 6 | 11 | 4 | 21 | 2 | 27 | 2 | 31 | 1 | 17 | 3 | 21 | 1 | 62 | 4 | 67 | 140 |
| 04:30 PM | 3 | 13 | 3 | 19 | 4 | 30 | 2 | 36 | 0 | 27 | 1 | 28 | 3 | 64 | 3 | 70 | 153 |
| 04:45 PM | 2 | 8 | 5 | 15 | 4 | 37 | 0 | 41 | 3 | 18 | 0 | 21 | 3 | 71 | 3 | 77 | 154 |
| Total | 18 | 43 | 25 | 86 | 16 | 119 | 5 | 140 | 5 | 76 | 5 | 86 | 9 | 241 | 16 | 266 | 578 |
| 05:00 PM | 1 | 15 | 6 | 22 | 5 | 31 | 0 | 36 | 3 | 19 | 2 | 24 | 1 | 78 | 5 | 84 | 166 |
| 05:15 PM | 3 | 15 | 6 | 24 | 4 | 23 | 0 | 27 | 3 | 26 | 1 | 30 | 4 | 89 | 7 | 100 | 181 |
| 05:30 PM | 5 | 11 | 9 | 25 | 8 | 36 | 0 | 44 | 1 | 27 | 2 | 30 | 5 | 62 | 3 | 70 | 169 |
| 05:45 PM | 1 | 7 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 21 | 1 | 24 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 17 | 4 | 55 | 6 | 65 | 118 |
| Total | 10 | 48 | 25 | 83 | 19 | 111 | 1 | 131 | 9 | 85 | 7 | 101 | 14 | 284 | 21 | 319 | 634 |
| Grand Total | 28 | 91 | 50 | 169 | 35 | 230 | 6 | 271 | 14 | 161 | 12 | 187 | 23 | 525 | 37 | 585 | 1212 |
| Apprch \% | 16.6 | 53.8 | 29.6 |  | 12.9 | 84.9 | 2.2 |  | 7.5 | 86.1 | 6.4 |  | 3.9 | 89.7 | 6.3 |  |  |
| Total \% | 2.3 | 7.5 | 4.1 | 13.9 | 2.9 | 19 | 0.5 | 22.4 | 1.2 | 13.3 | 1 | 15.4 | 1.9 | 43.3 | 3.1 | 48.3 |  |
| Cars + | 28 | 91 | 50 | 169 | 35 | 229 | 6 | 270 | 14 | 161 | 12 | 187 | 23 | 524 | 37 | 584 | 1210 |
| \% Cars + | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99.6 | 100 | 99.6 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99.8 | 100 | 99.8 | 99.8 |
| Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| \% Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |



## TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

File Name : Rolesville(Jonesville and Mitchell Mill)PM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/30/2021
Page No : 2

|  | Peebles Road Southbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Westbound |  |  |  | Peebles Road Northbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for | Entire I | ersect | n Beg | ins at 04 | 45 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:45 PM | 2 | 8 | 5 | 15 | 4 | 37 | 0 | 41 | 3 | 18 | 0 | 21 | 3 | 71 | 3 | 77 | 154 |
| 05:00 PM | 1 | 15 | 6 | 22 | 5 | 31 | 0 | 36 | 3 | 19 | 2 | 24 | 1 | 78 | 5 | 84 | 166 |
| 05:15 PM | 3 | 15 | 6 | 24 | 4 | 23 | 0 | 27 | 3 | 26 | 1 | 30 | 4 | 89 | 7 | 100 | 181 |
| 05:30 PM | 5 | 11 | 9 | 25 | 8 | 36 | 0 | 44 | 1 | 27 | 2 | 30 | 5 | 62 | 3 | 70 | 169 |
| Total Volume | 11 | 49 | 26 | 86 | 21 | 127 | 0 | 148 | 10 | 90 | 5 | 105 | 13 | 300 | 18 | 331 | 670 |
| \% App. Total | 12.8 | 57 | 30.2 |  | 14.2 | 85.8 | 0 |  | 9.5 | 85.7 | 4.8 |  | 3.9 | 90.6 | 5.4 |  |  |
| PHF | . 550 | . 817 | . 722 | . 860 | . 656 | . 858 | . 000 | . 841 | . 833 | . 833 | . 625 | 875 | 650 | . 843 | . 643 | . 828 | . 925 |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Peak Hour Data <br> Peak Hour Begins at 04:45 PM <br> Cars + <br> Trucks |  |

## APPENDIX C

## ADJACENT DEVELOPMENT <br> INFORMATION

# TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS 

FOR

# COBBLESTONE CROSSING MIXED-USE 

## LOCATED

IN

## ROLESVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA

Prepared For:
Town of Rolesville
502 Southtown Circle
Rolesville, NC 27571

Prepared By:
Ramey Kemp \& Associates, Inc. 5808 Faringdon Place, Suite 100

Raleigh, NC 27609


License \#C-0910

MARCH 2021


| Moving forward. <br> RAMEY KEMP ASSOCIATES | Cobblestone Crossing Mixed-Use Rolesville, NC | Site Location Map |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 1 |



## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, specific geometric improvements have been identified and are recommended to accommodate future traffic conditions. See a more detailed description of the recommended improvements below. Refer to Figure 14 for an illustration of the recommended lane configuration for the proposed development.

## Improvements by STIP U-6241

STIP U-6241 is expected to realign Burlington Mills Road and install a traffic signal at the relocated intersection on Main Street. STIP U-6241 is also expected to provide improvements to the pedestrian and bike facilities along Main Street and add a concrete median island along Main Street west of Rogers Road. These improvements associated with STIP U-6241 will alter the existing lane configurations at the study intersections along Main Street.

## Recommended Improvements by Developer

## Main Street and Site Drive 1

- Construct the southbound approach with one ingress and two egress lanes.
- Provide stop control for the southbound approach.
- Install an eastbound left-turn lane with at least 125 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.


## Young Street and Site Drive 2

- Construct the eastbound approach with one ingress and egress lane.
- Provide stop control for the eastbound approach.



# Revised Traffic Impact Analysis for Young Street PUD 

Rolesville, North Carolina

Prepared for:<br>Ashton Woods<br>Raleigh, North Carolina

Prepared by:
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
NC License \#F-0102
421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 600
Raleigh, NC 27601
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## Kimley») Horn

| YOUNG STREET PUD |
| :---: |
| ROLESVILLE, NC |
| TRAFFICIMPACT ANALYSIS |

$\square$



## Kimley»Horn

### 7.0 Recommendations

## Residential Build-out

The following improvements are recommended to be performed to accommodate projected site traffic volumes at build-out of the residential portion of the development:

## US 401 Bypass:

- Coordinate the traffic signals at the intersections of US 401 at Young Street and the Superstreet U-turns


## Young Street at Quarry Road/North Site Driveway:

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane on Young Street with 100 feet of storage and appropriate tapers
- Construct a southbound right-turn lane on Young Street with 100 feet of storage and appropriate tapers
- Restripe the existing westbound left-turn lane on Quarry Road to a shared left/through lane
- Provide an exclusive left-turn lane with 275 feet of storage and appropriate tapers and a shared through/right lane on the North Site Driveway
- Install a traffic signal when warranted


## Young Street at Central Site Driveway:

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane on Young Street with 100 feet of storage and appropriate tapers
- Construct a southbound right-turn lane on Young Street with 100 feet of storage and appropriate tapers
- Provide exclusive left and right-turn lanes on the Central Site Driveway with 125 feet of storage and appropriate tapers for the left-turn lane


## Young Street at Rolesville High School Driveway/South Site Driveway:

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane on Young Street with 50 feet of storage and appropriate tapers
- Provide one egress lane on the South Site Driveway

Rolesville Road at Mitchell Mill Road:

- Install a traffic signal when warranted

Analyses indicate that with the recommended improvements in place, all of the study intersections except for Young Street at Century Farm Road and Young Street at Rolesville High School Driveway/South Site Driveway are expected to operate at an acceptable LOS at build-out of the residential-only phase of the development.

Analyses indicate that the intersection of Young Street at Century Farm Road is expected to operate with long delays on the minor street approach (Century Farm Road) in the AM peak hour at project build-out. However, it is typical for stop sign controlled side streets and driveways intersecting major streets to experience long delays during peak hours while the majority of the traffic moving through the intersection on the major street experiences little or no delay. SimTraffic traffic simulations indicate that no queuing issues are expected at this intersection.

Analyses indicate that the intersection of Young Street at the Rolesville High School Driveway/South Site Driveway is expected to operate with long delays on the minor street approach (Rolesville High School Driveway) in the AM peak hour and school PM peak hour with or without the proposed project in place in the study year 2025. SimTraffic traffic simulations also indicate the possibility of long queues on the westbound left-turn movement at this intersection in the AM peak hour and school PM peak hour. However, it is typical for stop sign controlled side streets and driveways intersecting major streets to experience long delays during peak hours, while the majority of the traffic moving through the intersection on the major street experiences little or no delay. This intersection is not expected to meet 4-hour or 8-hour MUTCD traffic signal warrants.

## Commercial Build-out

The following additional improvements are recommended to be performed in addition to those recommended above for the residential phase to accommodate projected site traffic volumes when the retail portion of the site is developed:

## US 401 Bypass Eastbound at Young Street:

- Extend the storage of the existing eastbound right-turn lane on US 401 Bypass by approximately 175 feet to provide 400 feet of storage and appropriate tapers


## Young Street at Quarry Road/North Site Driveway:

- Construct a northbound right-turn lane on Young Street with 100 feet of storage and appropriate tapers
- Modify the traffic signal to accommodate the additional laneage

Analyses indicate that with the recommended improvements in place, all of the study intersections except for Young Street at Century Farm Road, Young Street at the Central Site Driveway, and Young Street at Rolesville High School Driveway/South Site Driveway are expected to operate at acceptable LOS at commercial build-out of the development.

Analyses indicate that the intersection of Young Street at Century Farm Road is expected to operate with long delays on the minor street approach (Century Farm Road) in the AM peak hour at project build-out. It is typical for stop sign controlled side streets and driveways intersecting major streets to experience long delays during peak hours, while the majority of the traffic moving through the intersection on the major street experiences little or no delay. SimTraffic
traffic simulations indicate that short queues are likely on the minor street approach in the AM peak hour at commercial build-out.

Analyses indicate that the intersection of Young Street at the Central Site Driveway is expected to operate with long delays on the minor street approach (Central Site Driveway) in the AM peak hour in the commercial build-out traffic condition. It is typical for stop sign controlled side streets and driveways intersecting major streets to experience long delays during peak hours, while the majority of the traffic moving through the intersection on the major street experiences little or no delay. SimTraffic traffic simulations indicate the possibility of long queues on the eastbound leftturn movement at this intersection in the AM peak hour in the commercial build-out condition.

Analyses indicate that the intersection of Young Street at the Rolesville High School Driveway/South Site Driveway is expected to operate with long delays on the minor street approach (Rolesville High School Driveway) in the AM peak hour and school PM peak hour with or without the proposed project in place in the study year 2025. SimTraffic traffic simulations also indicate the possibility of long queues on the westbound left-turn movement at this intersection in the AM peak hour and school PM peak hour. However, it is typical for stop sign controlled side streets and driveways intersecting major streets to experience long delays during peak hours, while the majority of the traffic moving through the intersection on the major street experiences little or no delay. This intersection is not expected to meet 4-hour or 8-hour MUTCD traffic signal warrants.

As shown in the analysis, the impact of site traffic associated with the commercial build-out of this proposed PUD is generally consistent with the currently-approved PUD for the site. The proposed PUD is expected to generate no more than 50 additional peak hour trips in each of the studied peak hours compared to the approved PUD, and delays at commercial build-out of both plans are generally consistent at each of the study intersections.

The recommended laneage for the development is shown on Figure 17.
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## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, specific geometric improvements have been identified and are recommended to accommodate future traffic conditions. See a more detailed description of the recommended improvements below. Refer to Figure 11 for an illustration of the recommended lane configuration for the proposed development.

## Recommended Improvements by Developer

Rolesville Road and Mitchell Mill Road

- Monitor intersection for signalization.


## Rolesville Road and Site Drive 1

- Provide site access via a full movement intersection with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Provide stop control for westbound Site Drive 1 approach.
- Provide a designated southbound left-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

Mitchell Mill Road and Site Drive 2

- Provide site access via a full movement intersection with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Provide stop control for southbound Site Drive 2 approach.



# TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS 

## FOR <br> LOUISBURY ROAD ASSEMBLAGE

## LOCATED

## IN

## RALEIGH, NC

Prepared For: McAdam Company
2905 Meridian Parkway
Durham, NC 27713

Prepared By:
Ramey Kemp \& Associates, Inc.
5808 Faringdon Place, Suite 100
Raleigh, NC 27609
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| Moving forward. | Louisbury Road Assemblage <br> Raleigh, NC | Site Location Map |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 1 |

## LEGEND

O Unsignalized Intersection
Signalized Intersection
$\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{Y} \rightarrow$ Weekday AM / PM Peak Hour Site Trips


| Moving forward. | Louisbury Road Assemblage <br> Raleigh, NC | Site Trip Assignment |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 7 |

## 12. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, specific geometric improvements have been identified and are recommended to accommodate future traffic conditions. See a more detailed description of the recommended improvements below. Refer to Figure 9 for an illustration of the recommended lane configuration for the proposed development.

## Recommended Improvements by Developer

Mitchell Mill Road and Louisbury Road

- Monitor for signalization after site is constructed.


## US 401 and Louisbury Road

- Per NCDOT, extend northbound left turn lane to $\mathbf{1 7 5}^{\prime}$ of storage.
- Monitor for signalization after site is constructed.


## Louisbury Road and Site Drive 1

- Provide site access via full movement intersection with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
- Per NCDOT, provide northbound left turn lane with $100^{\prime}$ of storage.
- Provide stop control for eastbound approach.


## Louisbury Road and Site Drive 2

- Provide site access via full movement intersection with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
- Provide stop control for eastbound approach.

*Based on NCDOT Review


| Moving forward. | Louisbury Road Assemblage <br> Raleigh, NC | Recommended <br> Lane Configurations |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 9 |
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## KALAS / WATKINS FAMILY PROPERTY TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

Introduction
August 24, 2019

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the transportation impacts of the proposed Kalas / Watkins Family Property development located on the west side of Rolesville Road just north of Mitchell Mill Road in Rolesville, NC. The project location is shown below in Figure 1

Figure 1: Site Location


Trip Generation and Distribution
August 24, 2019
Figure 6: Site Trip Assignment


Traffic Analysis
August 24, 2019

### 5.42025 BUILD WITH IMPROVEMENTS

Geometric improvements such as the installation of turn-lanes are recommended and therefore analyzed in this scenario. These items are listed below as well as in the recommendations section.

## Rolesville Road at Site Driveway A

- Construct Driveway A as a full-movement access point onto Rolesville Road with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Construct an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Driveway A.
- Construct an exclusive northbound left-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Rolesville Road.
- Construct an exclusive southbound right-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Rolesville Road.


## Rolesville Road at Site Driveway B / Wheeler Tract Driveway

- Construct Driveway B as a full-movement access point onto Rolesville Road with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Construct an exclusive northbound left-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Rolesville Road.
- Construct an exclusive southbound right-turn lane with 50 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Rolesville Road.


## Rolesville Road at Site Driveway C

- Construct Driveway $C$ as a full-movement access point onto Rolesville Road with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Construct an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Driveway C.
- Construct an exclusive northbound left-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Rolesville Road.
- Construct an exclusive southbound right-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Rolesville Road.

Accordingly, all study area intersections and approaches operate at acceptable levels of service with the following exceptions:

- The east and westbound approaches to the intersection of Rolesville Road at Rolesville High School Driveway / Young Street PUD Southern Driveway operates at LOS F in the AM peak hour. This causes high overall delays at the intersection. Furthermore, the eastbound approach operates at LOS F and westbound approach operates at LOS E in the PM peak hour.
- The east and westbound approaches at the intersection of Rolesville Road at Site Driveway B / Wheeler Tract Driveway operate at LOS E in the AM peak hour.

The east and westbound approaches to the intersection of Rolesville Road at Rolesville High School Driveway / Young Street PUD Southern Driveway performs unacceptably across analysis scenarios. These delays can be

## KALAS / WATKINS FAMILY PROPERTY TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

Traffic Analysis
August 24, 2019
attributed to both the Young Street PUD and High School traffic on the side street approaches. The Kalas / Watkins development is projected to only add through volumes to the intersection and are anticipated to have a minimal impact on overall delays at this intersection.

Delays on the eastbound approach of Site Driveway B at Rolesville Road can be attributed to high thru volumes on Rolesville Road during the AM peak hour. Traffic volumes using this approach are anticipated to be minor (i.e. 15 vehicles in the AM peak hour and 10 vehicles in the PM peak hour) and side street delays should dissipate after High School Traffic passes through the network. Table 8 lists the results of the capacity analysis under the 2025 buildimproved traffic conditions. The recommended improvements are illustrated in figure 14.

Figure 14: Recommended Improvements


## APPENDIX D

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS CALCULATIONS US 401 BYPASS <br> \& <br> JONESVILLE ROAD



| Major/Minor | Major1 | Minor1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 328 | - | 656 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 656 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 6.94 | - | 6.54 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.54 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 3.32 | - | 4.02 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 668 | 0 | 384 | 0 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 460 | 0 |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | 668 | - | 384 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 384 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 460 | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 12 | 17.5 |
| HCM LOS |  | B | C |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 668 | - | -384 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.226 | - | -0.249 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 12 | - | -17.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.9 | - | - |



| Major/Minor | Major1 | Minor1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 485 | - | 970 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 970 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 6.94 | - | 6.54 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.54 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 3.32 | - | 4.02 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 528 | 0 | 252 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 330 | 0 |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | 528 | - | 252 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 252 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 330 | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 14.9 | 29.2 |
| HCM LOS |  | $B$ | D |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR SBLn1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 528 | - | -252 |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.316 | - | -0.419 |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 14.9 | - | -29.2 |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | - | - | D |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 1.3 | - | - | 2 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement EBL | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 44 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 「 |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 873 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 0 | 112 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 873 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 0 | 112 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | Yield | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | 125 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | ${ }^{-}$ | 0 | ${ }^{-}$ | - | 0 | - | ${ }^{-}$ | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 970 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 262 | 0 | 124 | 0 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  |  | Minor1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 485 | - | 970 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 970 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 6.94 | - | 6.54 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.54 | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 3.32 | - | 4.02 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 528 | 0 | 252 | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |  |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 330 | 0 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | 528 | - | 252 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 252 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 330 | - |  |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 18.4 | 32.5 |
| HCM LOS |  | C | D |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR SBLn1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 528 | - | - | 252 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.497 | - | -0.494 |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 18.4 | - | - | 32.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | - | - | D |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 2.7 | - | - | 2.5 |



| Major/Minor | Major1 | Minor1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 678 | - | 1356 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1356 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 6.94 | - | 6.54 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.54 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 3.32 | - | 4.02 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 395 | 0 | 148 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 216 | 0 |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | 395 | - | 148 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 148 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 216 | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 19 | 38.4 |
| HCM LOS |  | C | E |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 395 | - | -148 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.352 | - | -0.278 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 19 | - | -38.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | - | - |
| HCM 95 th \%tile Q(veh) | 1.6 | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 6.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个 $\uparrow$ | F |  |  |  |  |  | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Trafic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 1835 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 41 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 1835 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 41 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | Yield | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | 125 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - |  | 16983 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 2039 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 46 | 0 |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh | 17.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个个 | 「 |  |  |  |  |  | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 0 | 1835 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192 | 0 | 67 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 0 | 1835 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192 | 0 | 67 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |  |
| RT Channelized | － | － | Yield | － | － | None | － |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Storage Length | － | － | 125 | － | － | － | － | － | 0 | － | － | － |  |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | \＃ | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |  |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 2039 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 | 0 | 74 | 0 |  |


| Major／Minor | Major1 | Minor1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 0 | 0 | - | -1020 | - | 2039 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2039 |  |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay，s | 0 | 82.4 | $\$ 353$ |
| HCM LOS |  | $F$ | $F$ |


| Minor Lane／Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR SBLn1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Capacity（veh／h） | 234 | - | - | 56 |  |  |
| HCM Lane V／C Ratio | 0.912 | - | -1.329 |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay（s） | 82.4 | - | $-\$ 353$ |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | - | - | $F$ |  |  |
| HCM 95th \％tile Q（veh） | 7.7 | - | - | 6.6 |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sim$ ：Volume exceeds capacity | $\$:$ Delay exceeds 300s | $+:$ Computation Not Defined | ＊：All major volume in platoon |  |  |  |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 20.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | 中4 | 「 |  | 4 |  |  |  | 7 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1796 | 204 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1796 | 204 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | 150 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1996 | 227 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 276 |





| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | $\$ 348.5$ | 165.2 |
| HCM LOS |  | $F$ | $F$ |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 39 | - | -231 |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 1.14 | - | -1.193 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | $\$ 348.5$ | - | -165.2 |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | - | - | F |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 4.4 | - | -13.3 |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |








| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 47.1 | 14.3 |
| HCM LOS |  | E | B |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 220 | - | -525 |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.646 | - | -0.267 |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 47.1 | - | -14.3 |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | E | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 3.9 | - | - | 1.1 |

## APPENDIX E

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS CALCULATIONS US 401 BYPASS <br> \&

EASTERN U-TURN LOCATION

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  | 体 | o |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1532 | 91 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1532 | 91 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1702 | 101 | 0 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  | 体 | T |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1994 | 100 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1994 | 100 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2216 | 111 | 0 |





| Approach | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 81.9 |
| HCM LOS |  | F |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 201 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.868 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 81.9 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 6.6 | - |


| RKA | Synchro 11 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| Page 2 |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  | 体 | 1 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 66 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 66 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 667 | 73 | 0 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  | 体 | 1 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 892 | 73 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 892 | 73 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 991 | 81 | 0 |




| Major/Minor | Major2 | Minor1 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | -510 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | 0 |
| Stage 2 | - | - | 510 |


| Approach | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 14.7 |
| HCM LOS |  | B |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 493 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.246 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 14.7 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 1 | - |


| RKA | Synchro 11 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| Page 2 |  |

## APPENDIX F

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS CALCULATIONS MITCHELL MILL ROAD \&

JONESVILLE ROAD / PEEBLES ROAD

| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 12.7 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 7 | 166 | 4 | 11 | 316 | 41 | 4 | 78 | 11 | 32 | 133 | 16 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 7 | 166 | 4 | 11 | 316 | 41 | 4 | 78 | 11 | 32 | 133 | 16 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 8 | 184 | 4 | 12 | 351 | 46 | 4 | 87 | 12 | 36 | 148 | 18 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.8 |  |  | 14.9 |  |  | 10.1 |  |  | 11.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $84 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $12 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 93 | 177 | 368 | 181 |
| LT Vol | 4 | 7 | 11 | 32 |
| Through Vol | 78 | 166 | 316 | 133 |
| RT Vol | 11 | 4 | 41 | 16 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 103 | 197 | 409 | 201 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.168 | 0.297 | 0.577 | 0.318 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.85 | 5.433 | 5.079 | 5.696 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 612 | 661 | 711 | 629 |
| Service Time | 3.904 | 3.477 | 3.114 | 3.743 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.168 | 0.298 | 0.575 | 0.32 |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.1 | 10.8 | 14.9 | 11.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | B | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.6 | 1.2 | 3.7 | 1.4 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh $\quad 50.6$ |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 240 | 4 | 12 | 569 | 45 | 4 | 86 | 12 | 35 | 147 | 18 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 240 | 4 | 12 | 569 | 45 | 4 | 86 | 12 | 35 | 147 | 18 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 267 | 4 | 13 | 632 | 50 | 4 | 96 | 13 | 39 | 163 | 20 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.2 |  |  | 82.4 |  |  | 12.5 |  |  | 15 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $84 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $12 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 102 | 252 | 626 | 200 |
| LT Vol | 4 | 8 | 12 | 35 |
| Through Vol | 86 | 240 | 569 | 147 |
| RT Vol | 12 | 4 | 45 | 18 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 113 | 280 | 696 | 222 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.223 | 0.481 | 1.081 | 0.417 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.412 | 6.42 | 5.595 | 7.067 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 487 | 566 | 647 | 513 |
| Service Time | 5.412 | 4.42 | 3.663 | 5.067 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.232 | 0.495 | 1.076 | 0.433 |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.5 | 15.2 | 82.4 | 15 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | F | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.8 | 2.6 | 19.6 | 2 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 142.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 279 | 4 | 31 | 635 | 131 | 4 | 86 | 23 | 86 | 147 | 18 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 279 | 4 | 31 | 635 | 131 | 4 | 86 | 23 | 86 | 147 | 18 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 310 | 4 | 34 | 706 | 146 | 4 | 96 | 26 | 96 | 163 | 20 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 20.4 |  |  | 242.9 |  |  | 14.7 |  |  | 20.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $76 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $20 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 113 | 291 | 797 | 251 |
| LT Vol | 4 | 8 | 31 | 86 |
| Through Vol | 86 | 279 | 635 | 147 |
| RT Vol | 23 | 4 | 131 | 18 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 126 | 323 | 886 | 279 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.26 | 0.59 | 1.481 | 0.545 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.674 | 7.367 | 6.021 | 8.087 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 417 | 495 | 602 | 449 |
| Service Time | 6.674 | 5.367 | 4.101 | 6.087 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.302 | 0.653 | 1.472 | 0.621 |
| HCM Control Delay | 14.7 | 20.4 | 242.9 | 20.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | F | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1 | 3.8 | 43.1 | 3.2 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 103.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | \$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | t |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 279 | 4 | 31 | 635 | 131 | 4 | 86 | 23 | 86 | 147 | 18 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 279 | 4 | 31 | 635 | 131 | 4 | 86 | 23 | 86 | 147 | 18 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 310 | 4 | 34 | 706 | 146 | 4 | 96 | 26 | 96 | 163 | 20 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 23.8 |  |  | 172.6 |  |  | 15.5 |  |  | 15.6 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $76 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $20 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 113 | 291 | 666 | 131 | 86 | 165 |
| LT Vol | 4 | 8 | 31 | 0 | 86 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 86 | 279 | 635 | 0 | 0 | 147 |
| RT Vol | 23 | 4 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 18 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 126 | 323 | 740 | 146 | 96 | 183 |
| Geometry Grp | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.283 | 0.645 | 1.385 | 0.243 | 0.218 | 0.39 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.975 | 7.746 | 6.739 | 6 | 8.989 | 8.391 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 403 | 469 | 540 | 595 | 402 | 433 |
| Service Time | 6.975 | 5.746 | 4.513 | 3.774 | 6.689 | 6.091 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.313 | 0.689 | 1.37 | 0.245 | 0.239 | 0.423 |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.5 | 23.8 | 204.5 | 10.7 | 14.2 | 16.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | C | F | B | B | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.1 | 4.5 | 33.6 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.8 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 10.8 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | \$ |  |  | \& |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 18 | 306 | 13 | 4 | 130 | 21 | 5 | 92 | 10 | 27 | 50 | 11 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 18 | 306 | 13 | 4 | 130 | 21 | 5 | 92 | 10 | 27 | 50 | 11 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 20 | 340 | 14 | 4 | 144 | 23 | 6 | 102 | 11 | 30 | 56 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.2 |  |  | 9.5 |  |  | 9.6 |  |  | 9.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $86 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $9 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 107 | 337 | 155 | 88 |
| LT Vol | 5 | 18 | 4 | 27 |
| Through Vol | 92 | 306 | 130 | 50 |
| RT Vol | 10 | 13 | 21 | 11 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 119 | 374 | 172 | 98 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.175 | 0.489 | 0.233 | 0.146 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.312 | 4.702 | 4.878 | 5.379 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 668 | 760 | 728 | 659 |
| Service Time | 3.407 | 2.766 | 2.957 | 3.477 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.178 | 0.492 | 0.236 | 0.149 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.6 | 12.2 | 9.5 | 9.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.6 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 0.5 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh 19.4 |  |
| Intersection LOS | C |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 436 | 14 | 4 | 339 | 23 | 6 | 102 | 11 | 30 | 55 | 12 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 436 | 14 | 4 | 339 | 23 | 6 | 102 | 11 | 30 | 55 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 22 | 484 | 16 | 4 | 377 | 26 | 7 | 113 | 12 | 33 | 61 | 13 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 24.7 |  |  | 17.3 |  |  | 11.8 |  |  | 11.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $86 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $9 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 119 | 470 | 366 | 97 |
| LT Vol | 6 | 20 | 4 | 30 |
| Through Vol | 102 | 436 | 339 | 55 |
| RT Vol | 11 | 14 | 23 | 12 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 132 | 522 | 407 | 108 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.245 | 0.777 | 0.621 | 0.203 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.682 | 5.357 | 5.493 | 6.79 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 541 | 668 | 651 | 531 |
| Service Time | 4.682 | 3.437 | 3.578 | 4.796 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.244 | 0.781 | 0.625 | 0.203 |
| HCM Control Delay | 11.8 | 24.7 | 17.3 | 11.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1 | 7.4 | 4.3 | 0.8 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 53.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 496 | 14 | 12 | 382 | 77 | 6 | 102 | 28 | 108 | 55 | 12 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 496 | 14 | 12 | 382 | 77 | 6 | 102 | 28 | 108 | 55 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 22 | 551 | 16 | 13 | 424 | 86 | 7 | 113 | 31 | 120 | 61 | 13 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 79.1 |  |  | 48.3 |  |  | 15.1 |  |  | 16.9 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $62 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $75 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $21 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 136 | 530 | 471 | 175 |
| LT Vol | 6 | 20 | 12 | 108 |
| Through Vol | 102 | 496 | 382 | 55 |
| RT Vol | 28 | 14 | 77 | 12 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 151 | 589 | 523 | 194 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.329 | 1.056 | 0.928 | 0.422 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.141 | 6.455 | 6.582 | 8.1 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 444 | 565 | 555 | 447 |
| Service Time | 6.141 | 4.503 | 4.582 | 6.1 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.34 | 1.042 | 0.942 | 0.434 |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.1 | 79.1 | 48.3 | 16.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | F | E | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.4 | 16.9 | 11.6 | 2.1 |
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 60.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | * |  | ${ }^{1}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 496 | 14 | 12 | 382 | 77 | 6 | 102 | 28 | 108 | 55 | 12 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 496 | 14 | 12 | 382 | 77 | 6 | 102 | 28 | 108 | 55 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 22 | 551 | 16 | 13 | 424 | 86 | 7 | 113 | 31 | 120 | 61 | 13 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 112.5 |  |  | 32.4 |  |  | 16.3 |  |  | 14.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $75 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $97 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $82 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $21 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 136 | 530 | 394 | 77 | 108 | 67 |
| LT Vol | 6 | 20 | 12 | 0 | 108 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 102 | 496 | 382 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| RT Vol | 28 | 14 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 12 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 151 | 589 | 438 | 86 | 120 | 74 |
| Geometry Grp | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.345 | 1.149 | 0.835 | 0.146 | 0.286 | 0.165 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.785 | 7.023 | 7.215 | 6.48 | 9.089 | 8.439 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 413 | 524 | 503 | 557 | 398 | 428 |
| Service Time | 6.785 | 5.023 | 4.915 | 4.18 | 6.789 | 6.139 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.366 | 1.124 | 0.871 | 0.154 | 0.302 | 0.173 |
| HCM Control Delay | 16.3 | 112.5 | 36.7 | 10.3 | 15.4 | 12.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | F | E | B | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.5 | 20.4 | 8.4 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 0.6 |

## APPENDIX G

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS CALCULATIONS MITCHELL MILL ROAD \&

SITE ACCESS 1

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 388 | 765 | 4 | 0 | 32 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 388 | 765 | 4 | 0 | 32 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 431 | 850 | 4 | 0 | 36 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All |  | 0 - | 0 |  | 852 |
| Stage 1 | - | - - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - - | - | - | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - - | - |  | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - - | - | 0 | 359 |
| Stage 1 | 0 | - - | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - - | - | 0 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - - | - |  | 359 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - - | - | - |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 16.1 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | C |

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt EBT WBT WBR SBLn1

| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | - | 359 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | - | 0.099 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | - | 16.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | - | C |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | - | 0.3 |


|  | Synchro 11 Report |
| ---: | ---: |
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个 | b |  |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 632 | 451 | 4 | 0 | 20 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 632 | 451 | 4 | 0 | 20 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 702 | 501 | 4 | 0 | 22 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All |  | 0 - | 0 |  | 503 |
| Stage 1 | - | - - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - - | - | - | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - - | - |  | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - - | - | 0 | 569 |
| Stage 1 | 0 | - - | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - - | - | 0 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - - | - |  | 569 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - - | - | - |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 11.6 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | B |

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt EBT WBT WBR SBLn1

| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | - | 569 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | - | 0.039 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | - | 11.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | - | 0.1 |

RKA Synchro 11 Report

## APPENDIX H

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS CALCULATIONS MITCHELL MILL ROAD \&

SITE ACCESS 2

| Intersection |  | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement E | EBL |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | F | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 101 | 287 | 626 | 11 | 19 | 139 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 101 | 287 | 626 | 11 | 19 | 139 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Fr | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 150 |  | - | 100 | 0 |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 112 | 319 | 696 | 12 | 21 |  |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  | Minor2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 708 | 0 | - | 0 | 1239 | 696 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 696 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 543 | - |
| 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 | 891 | - | - | - | 194 | 442 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 495 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 582 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 891 | - | - | - | 170 | 442 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 170 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 433 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 582 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 2.5 | 0 | 23.1 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | C |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 891 | - | - | -371 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.126 | - | - | -0.473 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9.6 | - | - | -23.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.4 | - | - | - |
| C | 2.4 |  |  |  |


| RKA | Synchro 11 Report |
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| Intersection |  | EBT |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.9 |  | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Movement E | EBL |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 176 | 456 | 353 | 26 | 33 | 98 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 176 | 456 | 353 | 26 | 33 | 98 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Fr | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 150 |  | - | 100 | 0 |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 196 | 507 | 392 | 29 | 37 | 109 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 421 | 0 | - | 0 | 1291 | 392 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 392 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 899 | - |
| 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 | 1138 | - | - | - | 180 | 657 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 683 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 397 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1138 | - | - | - | 149 | 657 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 149 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 566 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 2.5 | 0 | 22.2 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | C |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1138 | - | - | -353 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.172 | - | - | -0.412 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.8 | - | - | -22.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.6 | - | - | - |
| C | 2 |  |  |  |


| RKA | Synchro 11 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
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## APPENDIX I

## TURN LANE WARRANTS



INTERSECTION: Mitchell Mill Road \& Site Access 2

| SCENARIO | Movement | Turn Lane | Turning Volume <br> $\left(\mathbf{V}_{\mathrm{R}} / \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{L}}\right)$ | Approach/ <br> Opposing Volume <br> $\left(\mathbf{V}_{\mathrm{A}} / \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{0}}\right)$ | Symbol |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Build | EBL | Left | 101 | 637 | $\bigcirc$ |
| PM Build | EBL | Left | 176 | 379 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 2

| 2027 Build |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | Approach | Right Turn <br> Volume | Approach <br> Volume | Warranted? |  |
| AM | Westbound | 11 | 637 | No |  |
| PM | Westbound | 26 | 379 | No |  |



## APPENDIX J

## MUTCD / ITRE

 SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS
# Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis 

Warrants 1-3 (Volume Warrants)

| Project Name | Hills at Harris Creek |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project/ File \# | $20498-05$ |
| Scenario | 2027 No-Build |


| Intersection Iniormation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| M ajor Street (E/W Road) | US 401 Bypass | Minor Street (N/S Road) | Jonesville Road / WB Left-Over |
| Analyzed with | 2 or more approach lanes | Analyzed with | 1 Approach Lane |
| Total Approach Volume | 2861 vehicles | Total Approach Volume | 424 vehicles |
| Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings | Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings |
| Right turn reduction of | 100 percent applied | Right turn reduction of | 0 percent applied |

No high speed or isolated community reduction applied to the Volume Warrant thresholds.

| Warrant 1, agnt Four venicular volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | Condition B | Condition A+B* |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours | 2 hours | 2 (Cond. A) \& 2 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - M ajor Street (veh/hr) | 420 | 630 | 336 (Cond. A) \& 504 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - M inor Street (veh/hr) | 105 | 53 | 84 (Cond. A) \& 42 (Cond. B) |

* Should be applied only after an adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay and inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems.

| Warrant 2, Four hour venicular volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied |  |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours |  |
| Criteria | See Figure Below |  |
|  |  |  |
| Warrant 5 , peak four venicular volume |  |  |
|  | Condition A | Condition B |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 1941 total, 41 minor, 0 delay | 2 hours |
| Criteria - Total Approach Volume (veh in one hour) | 800 | See Figure Below |
| Criteria - M inor Street High Side Volume (veh in one hour) | 100 |  |
| Criteria - M inor Street High Side Delay (veh-hrs) | 4 |  |

Figure 4C-2 (Warrant 2-70\% Factor) \& Figure 4C-4 (Warrant 3-70\% Factor)


## US 401 Bypass \& Jonesville Road [Major-Street Left-Turn] [No-Build]

| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vph | g/c | a | b | c |  |  |
| 900 | 0.7 | 0.00004 | 0.0097 | 0.4284 |  |  |
| 961 | 0.7 | $4.0 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.009192 | 0.460018 |  |  |
| 1080 | 0.7 | 0.00004 | 0.0082 | 0.5217 |  |  |


| CVAF | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Volume (vph) | 961 |
| Adjusted Conflicting (vph) | 961 |
| Turning Volume (vph) | 95 |


| PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vph | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{c}$ | a | b | c |  |  |
| 1800 | 0.7 | 0.00004 | 0.0097 | 0.4284 |  |  |
| 1900 | 0.7 | $4.0 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.008867 | 0.480233 |  |  |
| 1980 | 0.7 | 0.00004 | 0.0082 | 0.5217 |  |  |


| CVAF | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Volume (vph) | 1900 |
| Adjusted Conflicting (vph) | 1900 |
| Turning Volume (vph) | 41 |



| Distance to Upstream Signal | 8800 | ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Posted Speed Limit | 55 | mph |
| Travel Time | 109.09 | s |



## US 401 Bypass \& Jonesville Road [Minor-Street Right-Turn] [No-Build]

| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vph | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{c}$ | a | b | c |  |  |
| 720 | 0.7 | 0.00004 | 0.0108 | 0.2587 |  |  |
| 873 | 0.7 | $3.2 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.009525 | 0.34557 |  |  |
| 900 | 0.7 | 0.00003 | 0.0093 | 0.3609 |  |  |


| PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vph | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{c}$ | a | b | c |  |  |
| 1800 | 0.7 | 0.00004 | 0.0108 | 0.2587 |  |  |
| 1835 | 0.7 | $3.8 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.010508 | 0.278572 |  |  |
| 1980 | 0.7 | 0.00003 | 0.0093 | 0.3609 |  |  |


| CVAF | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Volume (vph) | 873 |
| Adjusted Conflicting (vph) | 873 |
| Turning Volume (vph) | 150 |


| CVAF | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Volume (vph) | 1835 |
| Adjusted Conflicting (vph) | 1835 |
| Turning Volume (vph) | 138 |


| Distance to Upstream Signal | 8800 | ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Posted Speed Limit | 55 | mph |
| Travel Time | 109.09 | s |



# Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis 

## Warrants 1-3 (Volume Warrants)

| Project Name | Hills at Harris Creek |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project/Flle \# | 20498-05 |
| Scenario | 2027 Build |


| Intersection Iniormation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| M ajor Street (E/W Road) | US 401 Bypass | Minor Street (N/SRoad) | Jonesville Road/WB Left-Over |
| Analyzed with | 2 or more approach lanes | Analyzed with | 1 Approach Lane |
| Total Approach Volume | 2947 vehicles | Total Approach Volume | 607 vehicles |
| Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings | Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings |
| Right turn reduction of | 100 percent applied | Right turn reduction of | 0 percent applied |

No high speed or isolated community reduction applied to the Volume Warrant thresholds.

| Warrant , Engnt hour ventcular volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | Condition B | Condition A+B* |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours | 2 hours | 2 (Cond. A) \& 2 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - M ajor Street (veh $/ \mathrm{hr})$ | 420 | 630 | 336 (Cond. A) \& 504 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - M inor Street (veh $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) | 105 | 53 | 84 (Cond. A) \& 42 (Cond. B) |

* Should be applied only after an adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay and inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems.


|  | Condition A | Condition B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 2019 total, 67 minor, 0 delay | 2 hours |
| Criteria - Total Approach Volume (veh in one hour) | 800 | See Figure Below |
| Criteria - M inor Street High Side Volume (veh in one hour) | 100 |  |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Delay (veh-hrs) | 4 |  |



## US 401 Bypass \& Jonesville Road [M ajor-Street Left-Turn] [Build]

| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vph | g/c | a | b | c |  |  |  |
| 900 | 0.7 | 0.00004 | 0.0097 | 0.4284 |  |  |  |
| 995 | 0.7 | $4.0 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.008908 | 0.477642 |  |  |  |
| 1080 | 0.7 | 0.00004 | 0.0082 | 0.5217 |  |  |  |


| PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vph | g/c | a | b | c |  |  |  |
| 1800 | 0.7 | 0.00004 | 0.0097 | 0.4284 |  |  |  |
| 1952 | 0.7 | $4.0 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.008433 | 0.507187 |  |  |  |
| 1980 | 0.7 | 0.00004 | 0.0082 | 0.5217 |  |  |  |


| CVAF | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Volume (vph) | 995 |
| Adjusted Conflicting (vph) | 995 |
| Turning Volume (vph) | 112 |


| Distance to Upstream Signal | 8800 | ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Posted Speed Limit | 55 | mph |
| Travel Time | 109.09 | s |


| CVAF | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Volume (vph) | 1952 |
| Adjusted Conflicting (vph) | 1952 |
| Turning Volume (vph) | 67 |




## US 401 Bypass \& Jonesville Road [M inor-Street Right-Turn] [Build]

| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vph | g/c | a | b | c |  |  |
| 720 | 0.7 | 0.00004 | 0.0108 | 0.2587 |  |  |
| 873 | 0.7 | $3.2 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.009525 | 0.34557 |  |  |
| 900 | 0.7 | 0.00003 | 0.0093 | 0.3609 |  |  |


| PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vph | g/c | a | b | c |  |  |  |
| 1800 | 0.7 | 0.00004 | 0.0108 | 0.2587 |  |  |  |
| 1835 | 0.7 | $3.8 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.010508 | 0.278572 |  |  |  |
| 1980 | 0.7 | 0.00003 | 0.0093 | 0.3609 |  |  |  |


| CVAF | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Volume (vph) | 873 |
| Adjusted Conflicting (vph) | 873 |
| Turning Volume (vph) | 236 |


| Distance to Upstream Signal | 8800 | ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Posted Speed Limit | 55 | mph |
| Travel Time | 109.09 | s |


| CVAF | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Volume (vph) | 1835 |
| Adjusted Conflicting (vph) | 1835 |
| Turning Volume (vph) | 192 |




## Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

## Warrants 1-3 (Volume Warrants)

| Project Name | Hills at Harris Creek |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project/File \# | $20498-05$ |
| Scenario | 2027 No-Build |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  | nformation |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Major Street (E/W Road) | US 401 Bypass | Minor Street (N/S Road) | Eastern U-Turn Location |  |  |
| Analyzed with | 2 or more approach lanes | Analyzed with | 1 Approach Lane |  |  |
| Total Approach Volume | 2886 vehicles | Total Approach Volume | 173 vehicles |  |  |
| Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings | Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings |  |  |
| Right turn reduction of | 0 percent applied | Right turn reduction of | 0 percent applied |  |  |

No high speed or isolated community reduction applied to the Volume Warrant thresholds.

| Warrant 1, Eight Hour Vehicular Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | Condition B | Condition A+B* |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 0 hours | 2 hours | 1 (Cond. A) \& 2 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Major Street (veh/hr) | 420 | 630 | 336 (Cond. A) \& 504 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Minor Street (veh/hr) | 105 | 53 | 84 (Cond. A) \& 42 (Cond. B) |

* Should be applied only after an adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay and inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems.

| Warrant 2, Four Hour Vehicular Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied |  |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours |  |
| Criteria | See Figure Below |  |
|  |  |  |
| Warrant 3, Peak Hour Vehicular volume |  |  |
|  | Condition A | Condition B |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 2094 total, 100 minor, 0 delay | 1 hour |
| Criteria - Total Approach Volume (veh in one hour) | 650 | See Figure Below |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Volume (veh in one hour) | 100 |  |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Delay (veh-hrs) | 4 |  |

Figure 4C-2 (Warrant 2-70\% Factor) \& Figure 4C-4 (Warrant 3-70\% Factor)


## US 401 Bypass \& Eastern U-Turn Location [Major-Street U-Turn] [No-Build]

| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vph | g/c | a | b | c |  |  |  |
| 1800 | 0.7 | 0.00003 | 0.0072 | 0.5106 |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 0.7 | $3.0 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.006984 | 0.539484 |  |  |  |
| 1980 | 0.7 | 0.00003 | 0.007 | 0.5374 |  |  |  |


| PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vph | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{c}$ | a | b | c |  |  |  |
| 720 | 0.7 | 0.00003 | 0.0072 | 0.5106 |  |  |  |
| 892 | 0.7 | $3.0 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.007009 | 0.536209 |  |  |  |
| 900 | 0.7 | 0.00003 | 0.007 | 0.5374 |  |  |  |


| CVAF | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Volume (vph) | 1994 |
| Adjusted Conflicting (vph) | 1994 |
| Turning Volume (vph) | 100 |

$\leftarrow 1994 / 892$

| CVAF | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Volume (vph) | 892 |
| Adjusted Conflicting (vph) | 892 |
| Turning Volume (vph) | 73 |


| Distance to Upstream Signal | 10000 | ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Posted Speed Limit | 55 | mph |
| Travel Time | 123.97 | s |



# Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis 

Warrants 1-3 (Volume Warrants)

| Project Name | Hills at Harris Creek |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project/File \# | 20498-05 |
| Scenario | 2027 Build |


| Intersection InTormation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| M ajor Street (E/W Road) | US 401 Bypass | Minor Street (N/SRoad) | Eastern U-Turn Location |
| Analyzed with | 2 or more approach lanes | Analyzed with | 1 Approach Lane |
| Total Approach Volume | 2929 vehicles | Total Approach Volume | 266 vehicles |
| Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings | Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings |
| Right turn reduction of | 0 percent applied | Right turn reduction of | 0 percent applied |

No high speed or isolated community reduction applied to the Volume Warrant thresholds.

| Warrant , Eignt nour venicular volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | Condition B | Condition A+B* |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours | 2 hours | 2 (Cond. A) \& 2 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Major Street (veh/hr) | 420 | 630 | 336 (Cond. A) \& 504 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Minor Street (veh/hr) | 105 | 53 | 84 (Cond. A) \& 42 (Cond. B) |

* Should be appried only after an adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay and inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems.

| Walrant 2, Four inour venicular volume |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied |  |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours |  |
| Criteria | See Figure Below |  |


| Warrant 5, Peak nour venicular volume |  |  |  | Condition B |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition Satisfied? | Condition A | Sot Satisfied |  |  |
| Required values reached for | 2168 total, 157 minor, 0 delay | 1 hour |  |  |
| Criteria - Total Approach Volume (veh in one hour) | 650 | See Figure Below |  |  |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Delay (veh-hrs) | 100 |  |  |  |

Figure 4C-2 (Warrant $2-70 \%$ Factor) \& Fiqure 4C-4 (Warrant $3-70 \%$ Factor)


## US 401 Bypass \& Eastern U-Turn Location [M ajor-Street U-Turn] [Build]

| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vph | g/c | a | b | c |  |  |  |
| 1980 | 0.7 | 0.00003 | 0.007 | 0.5374 |  |  |  |
| 2011 | 0.7 | $3.0 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.006966 | 0.544651 |  |  |  |
| 2160 | 0.7 | 0.00003 | 0.0068 | 0.5795 |  |  |  |


| PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vph | g/c | a | b | c |  |  |  |
| 900 | 0.7 | 0.00003 | 0.007 | 0.5374 |  |  |  |
| 918 | 0.7 | $3.0 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.00698 | 0.54161 |  |  |  |
| 1080 | 0.7 | 0.00003 | 0.0068 | 0.5795 |  |  |  |



| CVAF | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Volume (vph) | 918 |
| Adjusted Conflicting (vph) | 918 |
| Turning Volume (vph) | 109 |



| Distance to Upstream Signal | 10000 | ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Posted Speed Limit | 55 | mph |
| Travel Time | 123.97 | s |

U Turn-95\% Queue Length


## Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Warrants 1-3 (Volume Warrants)

| Project Name | Hills at Harris Creek |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project/File \# | $20498-05$ |
| Scenario | 2027 No-Build |


| Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Major Street (E/W Road) | Mitchell Mill Road | Minor Street (N/S Road) | Jonesville Road |
| Analyzed with | 1 approach lane | Analyzed with | 1 Approach Lane |
| Total Approach Volume | 1708 vehicles | Total Approach Volume | 518 vehicles |
| Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings | Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings |
| Right turn reduction of | 100 percent applied | Right turn reduction of | 100 percent applied |

No high speed or isolated community reduction applied to the Volume Warrant thresholds.

| Warrant 1, Eight Hour Vehicular Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | Condition B | Condition A+B* |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours | 2 hours | 2 (Cond. A) \& 2 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Major Street (veh/hr) | 350 | 525 | 280 (Cond. A) \& 420 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Minor Street (veh/hr) | 105 | 53 | 84 (Cond. A) \& 42 (Cond. B) |

* Should be applied only after an adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay and inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems.

| Warrant 2, Four Hour Vehicular Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied |  |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours |  |
| Criteria | See Figure Below |  |
|  |  |  |
| Warrant 3, Peak Hour Vehicular volume |  |  |
|  | Condition A | Condition B |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 1178 total, 200 minor, 0 delay | 1 hour |
| Criteria - Total Approach Volume (veh in one hour) | 800 | See Figure Below |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Volume (veh in one hour) | 100 |  |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Delay (veh-hrs) | 4 |  |

Figure 4C-2 (Warrant 2-70\% Factor) \& Figure 4C-4 (Warrant 3-70\% Factor)


# Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis 

Warrants 1-3 (Volume Warrants)

| Project Name | Hills at Harris Creek |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project/File \# | $20498-05$ |
| Scenario | 2027 Build |


| Intersection Iniormation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Major Street (E/W Road) | M itchell Mill Road | Minor Street (N/SRoad) | Jonesville Road |
| Analyzed with | 1 approach lane | Analyzed with | 1 Approach Lane |
| Total Approach Volume | 2087 vehicles | Total Approach Volume | 675 vehicles |
| Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings | Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings |
| Right turn reduction of | 100 percent applied | Right turn reduction of | 100 percent applied |

No high speed or isolated community reduction applied to the Volume Warrant thresholds.

| Warrant , Eignt nour venicular volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | Condition B | Condition A+B* |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours | 2 hours | 2 (Cond. A) \& 2 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Major Street (veh/hr) | 350 | 525 | 280 (Cond. A) \& 420 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Minor Street (veh/hr) | 105 | 53 | 84 (Cond. A) \& 42 (Cond. B) |

* Should be appried only after an adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay and inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems.

| Warrant 2, rour hour venicular volume |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Condition Satisfied? |  |


|  | Condition A | Condition B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 1450 total, 251 minor, 0 delay | 2 hours |
| Criteria - Total Approach Volume (veh in one hour) | 800 | See Figure Below |
| Criteria - M inor Street High Side Volume (veh in one hour) | 100 |  |
| Criteria - M inor Street High Side Delay (veh-hrs) | 4 |  |

Figure 4C-2 (Warrant $2-70 \%$ Factor) \& Fiqure 4C-4 (Warrant $3-70 \%$ Factor)



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P
    ${ }^{2}$ Person-Trip
    ${ }^{3}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator
    *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

