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## INTRODUCTION

Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. (GPI) has prepared this Traffic Impact and Access Study (TIAS) for a proposed retail motor fuel outlet located 158 Epping Road (NH Route 27) in Exeter, New Hampshire. The site is currently occupied by a $\pm 12,190$ square foot (SF) vacant Jaguar auto dealership. The project consists of razing the existing buildings on the site and constructing a retail motor fuel outlet with a $\pm 5,500 \mathrm{SF}$ convenience store, a gasoline station with six (6) Multi-Product Dispensers (MPDs) having twelve (12) vehicle-fueling positions (VFPS), and a $\pm 4,182$ SF automated car wash having one (1) tunnel. Access and egress are proposed via two (2) full access/egress driveways; one on Epping Road (NH Route 27) and one on Continental Drive.

The site is bounded by Continental Drive to the north, Al's Service Center to the south, Epping Road (NH Route 27) to the east, and vacant land to the west. The site location in relation to the surrounding roadways is shown on the map on Figure 1.


## EXISTING CONDITIONS

## Study Area

Evaluation of the traffic impacts associated with the proposed project requires an evaluation of existing and projected traffic volumes on the adjacent streets, the volume of traffic expected to be generated by the project, and the impact that this traffic will have on the adjacent streets and nearby intersections. In preparing the TIAS for the proposed site, the following intersections have been analyzed and evaluated:

- Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Continental Drive
- Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Brentwood Road (NH Route 111A) and Columbus Avenue
- Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Existing/Proposed Site Driveway
- Continental Drive at Proposed Site Driveway


## Epping Road (NH Route 27)

Epping Road (NH Route 27) is classified as minor arterial and is under the jurisdiction of the Town of Exeter. NH Route 27 is an east-west highway, but in the vicinity of the project site runs in a north-south direction with one travel lane in each direction. Directional travel is separated by a double-yellow center line. The speed limit adjacent to the site is posted at 30 miles per hour (mph). Paved shoulders of various widths are provided along both sides of Epping Road (NH Route 27).

## Continental Drive

Continental Drive is local road under the jurisdiction of the Town of Exeter. Continental Drive runs in an east-west direction with one travel lane in each direction. No pavement markings are provided on the roadway. The speed limit is not posted, but has been assumed to be 30 mph .

## Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Continental Drive

Continental Drive intersects Epping Road (NH Route 27) from the west to form a T-type signalized intersection. The Continental Drive eastbound approach consists of a left-turn lane and a right-turn lane with storage of approximately 125 feet, the Epping Road northbound approach consists of an exclusive leftturn lane with storage of approximately 250 feet and a through lane, and the southbound approach consists of a through lane and an exclusive right-turn lane with a storage of approximately 225 feet. No sidewalks or pedestrian accommodations are provided at the intersection.

The intersection of Epping Road (NH Route 27) and Continental Drive was recently placed under traffic signal control with a GRIDSMART system. The signal operates with a northbound lead-left with an eastbound right-turn overlap, followed by the northbound through and southbound through/right-turn, ending with the eastbound approach with a southbound right-turn overlap.

## Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Brentwood Road (NH Route 111A) and Columbus Avenue

Brentwood Road (NH Route 111A) intersects Epping Road (NH Route 27) from the east and Columbus Avenue intersects Brentwood Road and Epping Road from the south to form three minor intersections. The Epping Road northbound left turn and through movements and the Epping Road southbound through movement operate freely, with all other movements under STOP control. The three minor intersections formed consist of one to the northwest (Epping Road at Columbus Avenue), one to the northeast (Epping Road at Brentwood Road), and one to the south (Brentwood Road at Columbus Avenue).

## Traffic Volumes

Base traffic conditions within the study area were developed by obtaining the traffic-volume networks from the Epping Road (NH Route 27) Corridor Study ${ }^{1}$ prepared by Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB) in December 2020. The Corridor Study base conditions were established from new counts conducted in March 2020 as well as other historical data sources in order to account for the change in traffic patterns as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. The detailed breakdown of data sources can be found in the Corridor Study. The Epping Road (NH Route 27) weekday corridor peak hours were established as 7:15-8:15 AM and 4:00-5:00 PM. It should be noted that the Jaguar Exeter auto dealership was still open at the time of the March 2020 counts, but has since closed. The traffic volume networks from the Epping Road Corridor Study are provided in the Appendix.

Table 1 summarizes the existing peak-hour traffic volumes on Epping Road (NH Route 27) and Continental Drive. The 2021 Existing traffic-flow networks for the weekday AM and weekday PM peak hours are shown graphically on Figures 2 and 3, respectively. The 2020 Base Peak Hour Volumes from the Corridor Study were assumed for the 2021 Existing Traffic-Volumes, as typical background traffic growth is not expected between the years 2020 and 2021 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

## TABLE 1

Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volume Summary

| Location/Time Period | Peak Hour <br> Volume (vph) | Directional $_{\text {(istribution }}{ }^{\mathbf{b}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Epping Road, north of Continental Dr: |  |  |
| Weekday Daily |  |  |
| Weekday AM Peak Hour | 1,320 | $56 \%$ SB |
| Weekday PM Peak Hour | 1,565 | $59 \%$ NB |
| Continental Drive, west of Epping Rd: |  |  |
| Weekday Daily |  |  |
| Weekday AM Peak Hour | 180 | $83 \%$ WB |
| Weekday PM Peak Hour | 230 | $80 \%$ EB |
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## Collisions

As part of the Corridor Study, collision data for the study area intersections were obtained from the Town of Exeter for the latest complete six years available (2014 to 2019).

The intersection of Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Continental Drive experienced seven collisions over the 6 -year study period, averaging 1.2 crashes per year. This intersection was recently put under traffic signal control with a GRIDSMART system. Accordingly, the crash data summarized from 2014 to 2019 took place while the intersection was unsignalized. Due to the recent signalization at the intersection, the 2020 crash data was requested from the Town. In 2020 only one crash with a deer was reported at this location, resulting in no injuries.

The intersection of Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Brentwood Road and Columbus Avenue experienced 24 collisions over the 6 -year study period, averaging four crashes per year. It should be noted that 79 percent of the crashes involved angle-type collisions, which is likely a result of the three roadways intersecting to make three minor intersections. As part of the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) grant, the intersections will be realigned. Epping Road and Brentwood Road will operate as a T-type intersection and Columbus Avenue will intersect Brentwood Road with a median island on Brentwood Road restricting left turns into or out of Columbus Avenue. The new alignment reduces the number of conflict points which in turn should reduce the number of future crashes. Additionally, pedestrian safety will be improved with the addition of a crosswalk across Brentwood Road with a pedestrian refuge. Crosswalks will remain across Epping Road and Columbus Avenue. Based on supplemental research, there were three crashes that occurred in 2020, none resulting in injury.

## Vehicle Speeds

Vehicle speed measurements were conducted along Epping Road (NH Route 27) and Continental Drive by use of radar. The Epping Road speeds were obtained from the Corridor Study and the Continental Drive speeds were obtained in April 2021. All speed data is provided in the Appendix. The primary use of this information is explained in the Sight Distance section where the speeds are correlated to sight distance measurements taken at the location of the site driveways to assure that adequate sight distances exist at the driveways to provide safe operation. The results of the speed measurements are summarized in Table 3.

## TABLE 3

Observed Travel Speeds

| Location/Direction | Posted <br> Speed Limit $^{\text {a }}$ | Average <br> Speed $^{\mathbf{b}}$ | $\mathbf{8 5}^{\text {th }}$ Percentile <br> Speed $^{\mathbf{c}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Epping Road, north of Continental Dr: <br> Southbound <br> Northbound | 30 | 36 |  |
| Continental Drive, west of Epping Rd: | 30 | 37 | 40 |
| Westbound |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | $30^{\text {d }}$ | 30 | 42 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ In miles per hour (mph).
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Average speed of all observed vehicles.
${ }^{\text {c }}$ Speed at, or below which 85 percent of all observed vehicles travel.
${ }^{\text {d }}$ Speed not posted, assumed to be 30 mph .

As shown in Table 3, the average speeds along Epping Road (NH Route 27) were found to be between 36 and 37 mph with the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speeds to be between 40 and 42 mph . The average speeds along Continental Drive were found to be between 30 and 33 mph with the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speeds to be between 34 and 36 mph . The observed speeds were found to be consistently higher than the posted speed limit on Epping Road, and slightly higher than the assumed 30 mph speed limit on Continental Drive.

## FUTURE CONDITIONS

To estimate the impact of site-generated traffic within the study area, the projected 2030 Mid-Term Build traffic volumes were utilized from the Epping Road (NH Route 27) Corridor Study. The proposed redevelopment is expected to be completed and fully operational well within this time frame. Traffic volumes on the roadway network at that time include existing traffic and new traffic due to normal traffic growth. These 2030 Mid-Term Build traffic volumes were used to represent the 2030 No-Build traffic volumes for the proposed project, which assume that the proposed redevelopment is not built. The incremental impacts of the proposed project may then be determined by adding site-generated traffic volumes (Build conditions) and making comparisons to the No-Build conditions.

## Traffic Growth

Two components of traffic growth were considered in the development of the 2030 Mid-Term Build traffic volumes from the Corridor Study. First, an annual growth percentage was determined. Based on NHDOT historical traffic volumes along Epping Road (NH Route 27) and Brentwood Road (NH Route 111A), as well as coordination efforts with the Rockingham Planning Commission officials, a 0.5 percent compounded annual growth was assumed.

Second, any planned or approved specific developments in the area that would generate a significant volume of traffic on study area roadways were considered. The following projects were included:

- Ray Farm Exeter -A 55+ active adult residential community with 116 total units located at 183 Epping Road was in construction at the time of the counts. The anticipated traffic for the remaining units were added to the traffic volume networks.
- Gateway at Exeter - The Gateway at Exeter development is proposed on the west side of Epping Road (NH Route 27), south of the NH Route 101 interchange. This mixed-use development includes 11,225 SF of retail space, 17,295 SF of office space, a 20,040 SF daycare facility, and 224 residential dwelling units. The anticipated traffic associated with this project was added to the traffic volume networks.
- Unitil Corporation - This 60,000 SF Unitil facility was under construction at 27 Gourmet Place at the time of the counts, and therefore the anticipated traffic associated this project was added to the traffic volume networks.
- Primrose Daycare School - A 13,000 SF Daycare School was being considered to replace the previously approved mixed-use development at the end of McKay Drive. Traffic was generated for the daycare using ITE and was added to the traffic volume networks.

It should be noted that a 5 -lot subdivision was considered (3 lots off Spruce Street and 2 lots off Brentwood Road (NH Route 111A), but due to the small amount of traffic to be generated by this project, it was considered to be included in the annual growth rate. The known developments networks from the Corridor Study are included in the Traffic-Count Data section of the Appendix.

## Planned Roadway Improvements

Based on the NHDOT Project Information Center, Project \#41372 is in the design phase. Work includes the construction of sidewalks on Epping Road, Brentwood Road, Winter Street and Spring Street.

The improvements at the intersection of Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Brentwood Road (NH Route 111A) and Columbus Avenue as part of the TAP grant, previously discussed in the Collisions section, are included in the 2030 No-Build conditions of the analysis for the proposed project.

Finally, based on the Corridor Study, the 2030 Mid-Term improvements include a two-way left-turn lane (TWLTL) along Epping Road (NH Route 27) corridor, from north of Cronin Road to south of Brookside Drive. Accordingly, these improvements were included in the 2030 No-Build conditions of the analysis for the proposed project as well. The Conceptual Plans for these Mid-Term improvements are provided in the Appendix. Full Build-Out improvements including widening along the corridor, median barriers, new traffic signals, and roundabouts were provided in the Corridor Study as well, but were based on the development of the vacant parcels along the corridor. Due to the project costs and property impacts required to support this future development along the corridor, the Full Build-Out Improvements were not a viable option for the Town of Exeter, and therefore, the Mid-Term scenario improvements were used to represent the 2030 NoBuild conditions.

## No-Build Conditions

The 2030 Mid-Term Build traffic volumes were utilized from the Epping Road (NH Route 27) Corridor Study to represent the 2030 No-Build traffic volumes, which were developed by applying a 0.5 percent compounded annual traffic growth rate ( 5.1 percent over ten years) to the 2020 Base traffic volumes from the Corridor Study. The 2030 No-Build traffic volumes are shown graphically on Figures 4 and 5 for the weekday AM, weekday PM and Saturday midday peak hours, respectively.

## Site Access

Access and egress to the development are proposed via two (2) full access/egress driveways; one on Epping Road (NH Route 27) and one on Continental Drive. The existing driveway on Epping Road (NH Route 27) is a wide-open curb-cut that is shared with the property to the south, Al's Automotive \& Truck Service Center. As part of the redevelopment, this driveway will continue to be shared; however, it will be better defined providing only a 44 -foot wide curb-cut consisting of one entering lane and two exiting lanes for left and right turns. This is an improvement over the existing condition as it minimizes the conflict points along Epping Road (NH Route 27).

A new full access/egress driveway is proposed on Continental Drive. It is proposed to be located approximately 115 feet west of the stop bar on Continental Drive, at the end of the left and right turn lanes. The driveway is located in such a way to provide optimal on-site circulation while also providing an area for vehicles to queue up as they wait for a gap in traffic to exit onto Continental Drive. In addition, the location helps optimize the queue storage lanes for the drive-through and car wash.
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## Sight Distance

To identify potential safety concerns associated with site access and egress, sight distances have been evaluated at the proposed site driveway locations to determine if the available sight distances for vehicles exiting the site meet or exceed the minimum distances required for approaching vehicles to safely stop. The available sight distances were compared with minimum requirements, as established by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) ${ }^{2}$. AASHTO is the national standard by which vehicle sight distance is calculated, measured, and reported.

Sight distance is the length of roadway ahead that is visible to the driver. Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) is the minimum distance required for a vehicle traveling at a certain speed to safely stop before reaching a stationary object in its path. The values are based on a driver perception and reaction time of 2.5 seconds and a braking distance calculated for wet, level pavements. When the roadway is either on an upgrade or downgrade, grade correction factors are applied. Stopping sight distance is measured from an eye height of 3.5 feet to an object height of 2 feet above street level, equivalent to the taillight height of a passenger car. The SSD is measured along the centerline of the traveled way of the major road.

Intersection sight distance (ISD) is provided on minor street approaches to allow the drivers of stopped vehicles a sufficient view of the major roadway to decide when to enter the major roadway. By definition, ISD is the minimum distance required for a motorist exiting a minor street to turn onto the major street, without being overtaken by an approaching vehicle reducing its speed from the design speed to 70 percent of the design speed. ISD is measured from an eye height of 3.5 feet to an object height of 3.5 feet above street level. The use of an object height equal to the driver eye height makes intersection sight distances reciprocal (i.e., if one driver can see another vehicle, then the driver of that vehicle can also see the first vehicle). When the minor street is on an upgrade that exceeds 3 percent, grade correction factors are applied.

SSD is generally more important as it represents the minimum distance required for safe stopping while ISD is based only upon acceptable speed reductions to the approaching traffic stream. The ISD, however, must be equal to or greater than the minimum required SSD in order to provide safe operations at the intersection. In accordance with the AASHTO manual, "If the available sight distance for an entering or crossing vehicle is at least equal to the appropriate stopping sight distance for the major road, then drivers have sufficient sight distance to anticipate and avoid collisions. However, in some cases, this may require a major-road vehicle to stop or slow to accommodate the maneuver by a minor-road vehicle. To enhance traffic operations, intersection sight distances that exceed stopping sight distances are desirable along the major road." Accordingly, ISD should be at least equal to the distance required to allow a driver approaching the minor road to safely stop.

The available SSD and ISD at the proposed site driveway locations were measured and compared to minimum requirements as established by AASHTO. Based on both the posted speed limit and observed speeds, the SSD and ISD requirements at this intersection were calculated. The required minimum sight distances for the driveways are compared to the available distances, as shown in Table 4.

[^2]TABLE 4
Sight Distance Summary

| Location/Direction | Stopping Sight Distance (feet) |  | Intersection Sight Distance (feet) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Measured | Minimum Required ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ | Measured | Minimum Required ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Desirable ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| Epping Road at Site Driveway: <br> North of intersection (SB) <br> South of intersection (NB) | $\begin{aligned} & 500+ \\ & 500+ \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 305 \\ & 325 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 500+ \\ & 500+ \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 305 \\ & 325 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 290 \\ & 355 \end{aligned}$ |
| Continental Dr at Site Driveway: East of intersection (WB) West of intersection (EB) | $\begin{gathered} 125^{d} \\ 450 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 230 \\ & 265 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 125^{d} \\ 365 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 230 \\ & 265 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 355 \\ & 290 \end{aligned}$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Values based on AASHTO requirements for minimum SSD based on $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speeds; $40 \mathrm{mph}(\mathrm{SB})$ and $42 \mathrm{mph}(\mathrm{NB})$ on Epping Road and $34 \mathrm{mph}(\mathrm{WB})$ and 36 mph (EB) on Continental Drive.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Values based on AASHTO requirements for SSD.
${ }^{\text {c }}$ Values based on AASHTO requirements for ISD for posted speed of 30 mph on Epping Road and 30 on Continental Drive.
${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ Measurement to end of roadway.

As indicated in Table 4, available sight distances at the proposed site driveways exceed the minimum and desirable SSD and ISD requirements for safe operation with exception to the site driveway on Continental Drive, east of the intersection, which is limited to 125 feet due to the adjacent T-intersection with Epping Road (NH Route 27). Based on AASHTO requirements, 125 feet is safe for speeds up to 22 mph . Due to the proximity of the intersection, it is not likely that vehicles in the westbound direction will be traveling greater than 22 mph on Continental Drive in between Epping Road and the site driveway as they are entering onto Continental Drive from a turning movement. Left-turn speeds are generally 15 mph and rightturn speeds are generally 9 mph . The speeds measurements collected along Continental Drive were captured further west closer to Jillian Lane.

To ensure the safe and efficient flow of traffic to and from the site, it is recommended that any proposed plantings, vegetation, landscaping, and signing along the site frontage be kept low to the ground (no more than 3.0 feet above street level) or set back sufficiently from the edge of Epping Road and Continental Drive so as not to inhibit the available sight lines.

## Trip Generation

The site is currently occupied by a $\pm 12,190$ SF vacant Jaguar auto dealership. The project consists of constructing a retail motor fuel outlet with a $\pm 5,500$ SF convenience store, a gasoline station with six (6) MPDs having twelve (12) VFPS, and a $\pm 4,182$ SF automated car wash having one (1) tunnel.

Traffic generated by the existing site was estimated using the trip rates contained in the ITE Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition ${ }^{3}$ for Land Use Code (LUC) 840 (Automobile Sales [New]). Traffic to be generated by the proposed development was forecast using trip rates for LUC 960 (Super Convenience Market/Gas Station) and LUC 948 (Automated Car Wash). All trip-generation data are provided in the Appendix.

[^3]Studies have shown that for developments of mixed-use or multi-use sites, it is realistic to assume that there will be some multi-use trips within the site itself. For example, someone fueling their vehicle may also get a car wash. Therefore, a reduction in the overall trips experienced at the site driveways can be anticipated as a result of multi-use trips that include stops at more than one use on the site. Based on information published in the ITE Trip Generation Handbook ${ }^{4}$, Procedure for Estimating Multi-Use Trip Generation, it is estimated that multi-use trips account for 6 percent of weekday AM peak hour and 7 percent of weekday PM peak hour trips generated by the site. The Multi-Use Development Trip Generation and Internal Capture Worksheets are provided in the Appendix.

Not all of the vehicle trips expected to be generated by the proposed development represent new trips on the study area roadway system. Studies have shown that for developments such as the one proposed, a substantial portion of the site-generated vehicle trips are already present in the adjacent passing stream of traffic. Based on information published in the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, the average pass-by trip percentage is 62 percent during the weekday AM peak hour and 56 percent during the weekday PM peak hour for Gasoline/Service Station with Convenience Market. The lower of the two pass-by trip percentages (56 percent) was applied to the weekday daily volumes. The pass-by data are provided in the Appendix.

As shown in Table 5, the proposed redevelopment is expected to generate 118 additional vehicles trips ( 54 entering and 64 exiting) during the weekday AM peak hour and 94 additional vehicles trips ( 51 entering and 43 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour beyond the study area.

At the site driveways, the proposed redevelopment is expected to generate 350 additional vehicles trips (170 entering and 180 exiting) during the weekday AM peak hour and 268 additional vehicles trips (138 entering and 130 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour.

TABLE 5
Peak Hour Trip Generation Summary

| Time Period/Direction | Existing Trips ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Proposed Trips |  |  | Additional Trips |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Pass-By ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | New ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Total ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | New ${ }^{\text {f }}$ |
| Weekday AM Peak Hour: <br> Enter <br> Exit <br> Total | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ \frac{6}{23} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 187 \\ 186 \\ \hline 373 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 116 \\ 116 \\ \hline 232 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 71 \\ 70 \\ \hline 141 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 170 \\ 180 \\ \hline 350 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 54 \\ 64 \\ \hline 118 \end{array}$ |
| Weekday PM Peak Hour: <br> Enter <br> Exit <br> Total | $\begin{array}{r}18 \\ 26 \\ \hline 44\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}156 \\ 156 \\ \hline 312\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}87 \\ 87 \\ \hline 174\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 69 \\ 69 \\ \hline 138 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}138 \\ 130 \\ \hline 268\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}51 \\ 43 \\ \hline 94\end{array}$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ ITE LUC 840 (Automobile Sales [New]) for 12,187 SF.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ External Trips based on ITE LUC 960 (Super Convenience Market/Gas Station) for 12 VFPs and LUC 948 (Automated Car Wash) for 4,182 SF.
${ }^{\text {c }} 62$ percent of Total Trips during the Weekday AM peak hour and 56 percent during the Weekday PM peak hour.
${ }^{\text {d }}$ Proposed Total Trips minus Proposed Pass-By Trips.
${ }^{e}$ Proposed Total Trips minus Existing Trips, which represents the Additional Trips to the site driveways.
${ }^{\dagger}$ Proposed New Trips minus Existing Trips, which represents the Additional Trips beyond the study area.

[^4]
## Trip Distribution

Having estimated project-generated vehicle trips, the next step is to determine the distribution of project traffic and assign these trips to the local roadway network. The directional distribution of site traffic is dependent on expected travel route to and from the site and existing travel patterns. Accordingly, 55 percent of the site traffic is expected to/from the north along Epping Road (NH Route 27), 30 percent is expected to/from the south along Epping Road (NH Route 27/NH Route 111A), and 15 percent is expected to/from the west along Brentwood Road (NH Route 111A).

## Build Traffic Volumes

Based on the traffic generation and distribution estimates for this project, the traffic volumes associated with the proposed redevelopment were assigned to the roadway network. The site-generated traffic networks are shown on Figures 6 and 7 for the weekday AM and weekday PM peak hours, respectively. The sitegenerated traffic volumes were then combined with the 2030 No-Build traffic volumes to develop the 2030 Build peak-hour traffic-volume networks. The 2030 Build weekday AM and weekday PM peak hour traffic volumes are illustrated on Figures 8 and 9 , respectively.
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FIGURE 8
2030 BUILD WEEKDAY AM


FIGURE 9
2030 BUILD WEEKDAY PM

## Traffic Increases

The proposed redevelopment will result in increases in traffic on the study area roadways. As shown on Figures 6 through 7, traffic-volume increases beyond the study area during the peak hours are expected to be in the range of 13 to 66 vehicles. These increases represent, on average, one additional vehicle approximately every 1 minute to 4.5 minutes during the peak hours.

## CAPACITY AND QUEUE ANALYSIS

Capacity and queue analyses were conducted at all study area locations under 2021 Existing, 2030 NoBuild, and 2030 Build traffic-volume conditions. The impact of site-generated traffic can be measured by comparing 2030 No-Build conditions to 2030 Build conditions.

## Methodology

The capacity analysis methodology is based on the concepts and procedures in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) ${ }^{5}$ and is described in the Appendix.

For signalized intersections, the maximum back of queue during a typical (average) signal cycle and a $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile signal cycle were calculated for each lane group during the peak periods studied. The back of queue is the length of a backup of vehicles from the stop line of a signalized intersection to the last vehicle in the queue that is required to stop, regardless of the signal indication. The length of this queue depends on a number of factors including signal timing, vehicle arrival patterns, and the saturation flow rate. For unsignalized intersections, the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue represents the length of queue of the critical minorstreet movement that is not expected to be exceeded 95 percent of the time during the analysis period (typically one hour). In this case, the queue length is a function of the capacity of the movement and the movement's degree of saturation.

## Analysis Results

The results of the level-of-service (LOS) and queue analyses are shown in Table 6 and are discussed below. Capacity and queue analyses were conducted at the study area intersections utilizing Synchro software. ${ }^{6}$ The capacity and queue analysis worksheets for all conditions are provided in the Appendix.

## Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Continental Drive

As shown in Table 6, under existing and future traffic-volume conditions, the signalized intersection of Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Continental Drive is expected to operate at an overall LOS A/B with all movements at LOS C or better during the weekday peak hours. There are no drops in level of service as a result of the proposed redevelopment project. Increases in delay as a result of the redevelopment are less than 3 seconds on the overall intersection, and less than 5 seconds on any particular movement. The volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratios are below 1.00 indicating there will be adequate capacity to accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes.

[^5]
## Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Brentwood Road (NH Route 111A) at Columbus Avenue

Under existing traffic-volume conditions, the Columbus Avenue left-turn movement onto Epping Road operates at LOS D with all other movements at this Epping Road/Brentwood Road/Columbus Avenue location at LOS A/B during the weekday peak hours. With the geometric improvements at this location, the Brentwood Road eastbound left-turn onto Epping Road is expected to operate at LOS D with all other movements at LOS A/B under future traffic-volume conditions. With the proposed redevelopment in place, increases in delay on any movement are expected to be less than 4 seconds with a negligible increase in queue lengths. The $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios are anticipated to be well below 1.00 indicating there will be adequate capacity to accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes.

## Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Site Driveway

Under future traffic-volume conditions, the site driveway on Epping Road (NH Route 27) is anticipated to operate with left-turn movements out of the site at LOS D and right-turn movements at LOS C during the weekday peak hours. All queues on site are anticipated to be one vehicle or less with v/c ratios well below 1.00 indicating adequate capacity. The Epping Road northbound left-turn movement into the site is anticipated to be LOS B with queue lengths of one vehicle or less.

## Continental Drive at Site Driveway

Under future traffic-volume conditions, the site driveway on Continental Drive is expected to operate with all movements at LOS A/B during the weekday peak hours. Queue lengths are anticipated to be one vehicle or less and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios are anticipated to be well below 1.00 indicating there will be adequate capacity to accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes. It should be noted that all average queues from the traffic signal are not expected to block the site driveway. Under 2030 Build conditions during the weekday PM peak hour, however, when the uses on Continental Drive are leaving for the day, the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue for the eastbound left-turn lane at the traffic signal is expected the block the Continental Drive site driveway. This is expected to occur approximately two times during the weekday PM peak hour. During these times, queues on the driveway may become longer until the traffic light for the eastbound approach turns green, but there is adequate room on site without disrupting flow into and out of the driveway.

## TABLE 6

Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary

| Intersection/Peak Hour/Lane Group | 2021 Existing |  |  |  | 2030 No-Build |  |  |  | 2030 Build |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | V/C ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Del. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | LOS ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Queue ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | V/C | Del. | LOS | Queue | V/C | Del. | LOS | Queue |
| Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Continental Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday AM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Continental Drive EB left turn | 0.09 | 18.7 | B | 5/26 | 0.13 | 24.2 | C | 10/33 | 0.39 | 27.0 | C | 46/97 |
| Continental Drive EB right turn | 0.04 | 13.7 | B | 0/14 | 0.05 | 18.0 | B | 0/14 | 0.04 | 18.8 | B | 0/14 |
| Epping Road NB left turn | 0.22 | 18.4 | B | 14/55 | 0.28 | 24.0 | C | 27/66 | 0.31 | 27.7 | C | 29/66 |
| Epping Road NB through | 0.46 | 2.9 | A | 77/115 | 0.54 | 3.1 | A | 112/172 | 0.54 | 4.0 | A | 112/167 |
| Epping Road SB through | 0.73 | 9.8 | A | 198/325 | 0.81 | 11.6 | B | 295/507 | 0.84 | 14.9 | B | 323/548 |
| Epping Road SB right turn | 0.12 | 3.8 | A | 0/10 | 0.13 | 3.5 | A | 0/11 | 0.14 | 3.2 | A | 0/12 |
| Overall Intersection | -- | 6.9 | A | --/-- | -- | 8.1 | A | --/- | -- | 10.8 | B | --/-- |
| Weekday PM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Continental Drive EB left turn | 0.39 | 17.4 | B | 49/121 | 0.56 | 24.2 | C | 77/156 | 0.69 | 28.5 | C | 116/255 |
| Continental Drive EB right turn | 0.15 | 13.4 | B | 0/26 | 0.21 | 18.4 | B | 0/31 | 0.20 | 19.0 | B | 0/31 |
| Epping Road NB left turn | 0.12 | 21.1 | C | 6/26 | 0.14 | 26.4 | C | 8/29 | 0.15 | 28.8 | C | 8/29 |
| Epping Road NB through | 0.74 | 6.9 | A | 166/315 | 0.83 | 7.8 | A | 285/453 | 0.81 | 8.5 | A | 262/410 |
| Epping Road SB through | 0.74 | 11.3 | B | 201/339 | 0.80 | 11.8 | B | 322/482 | 0.82 | 13.7 | B | 336/506 |
| Epping Road SB right turn | 0.03 | 2.6 | A | 0/5 | 0.03 | 2.2 | A | 0/5 | 0.04 | 2.1 | A | 0/5 |
| Overall Intersection | -- | 9.6 | A | ---- | -- | 11.0 | B | ---- | -- | 12.9 | B | ---- |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Volume-to-capacity ratio.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Average control delay in seconds per vehicle.
${ }^{\text {c }}$ Level of service.
${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ Average $/ 95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length in feet per lane (assuming 25 feet per vehicle).

## TABLE 6 (continued)

Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary

| Intersection/Peak Hour/Lane Group | 2021 Existing |  |  |  | 2030 No-Build |  |  |  | 2030 Build |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | V/C ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Del. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | LOS $^{\text {c }}$ | Queue ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | V/C | Del. | LOS | Queue | V/C | Del. | LOS | Queue |
| Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Columbus Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday AM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Columbus Avenue NE approach | 0.67 | 32.0 | D | --/118 | -- | -- | -- | ---- | -- | -- | -- | --/-- |
| Epping Road NB left turn | 0.00 | 0.0 | A | --/<25 | -- | -- | -- | ---- | -- | -- | -- | ---- |
| Weekday PM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Columbus Avenue NE approach | 0.52 | 28.1 | D | --/70 | -- | -- | -- | ---- | -- | -- | -- | --/-- |
| Epping Road NB left turn | 0.00 | 0.0 | A | --/<25 | -- | -- | -- | ---- | -- | -- | -- | --/-- |
| Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Brentwood Road (NH Route 111A) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday AM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Epping Road NB left turn | 0.03 | 8.0 | A | --/<25 | 0.04 | 8.4 | A | --/<25 | 0.04 | 8.4 | A | --/<25 |
| Brentwood Road EB approach | 0.10 | 10.4 | B | --/<25 | -- | -- | -- | ---- | -- | -- | -- | ---- |
| Brentwood Road EB left turn | -- | -- | -- | --/- | 0.60 | 29.0 | D | --/95 | 0.65 | 32.5 | D | --/108 |
| Brentwood Road EB right turn | -- | -- | -- | --/-- | 0.14 | 12.4 | B | --/<25 | 0.14 | 12.7 | B | --/<25 |
| Weekday PM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Epping Road NB left turn | 0.09 | 8.4 | A | --/<25 | 0.12 | 9.2 | A | --/<25 | 0.12 | 9.3 | A | --/<25 |
| Brentwood Road EB approach | 0.10 | 11.1 | B | --/<25 | -- | -- | -- | ---- | -- | -- | -- | --/- |
| Brentwood Road EB left turn | -- | -- | -- | --/- | 0.43 | 29.0 | D | --/50 | 0.47 | 31.4 | D | --/58 |
| Brentwood Road EB right turn | -- | -- | -- | --/-- | 0.18 | 15.6 | C | --/<25 | 0.18 | 15.9 | C | --/<25 |
| Brentwood Road (NH Route 111A) at Columbus Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday AM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Columbus Avenue NB approach | 0.10 | 8.4 | A | --/<25 | 0.10 | 10.4 | B | --/<25 | 0.11 | 10.4 | B | --/<25 |
| Brentwood Road EB approach | 0.33 | 9.9 | A | --/38 | 0.00 | 0.0 | A | --<25 | 0.00 | 0.0 | A | --/<25 |
| Brentwood Road WB approach | 0.06 | 8.1 | A | --/<25 | 0.00 | 0.0 | A | --<25 | 0.00 | 0.0 | A | --/<25 |
| Columbus Avenue SB approach | 0.16 | 8.2 | A | --/<25 | -- | -- | -- | ---- | -- | -- | -- | ---- |
| Weekday PM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Columbus Avenue NB approach | 0.11 | 8.6 | A | --/<25 | 0.09 | 9.6 | A | --/<25 | 0.09 | 9.6 | A | --/<25 |
| Brentwood Road EB approach | 0.23 | 9.6 | A | --/<25 | 0.00 | 0.0 | A | --<<25 | 0.00 | 0.0 | A | --<25 |
| Brentwood Road WB approach | 0.15 | 9.0 | A | --/<25 | 0.00 | 0.0 | A | --/<25 | 0.00 | 0.0 | A | --/<25 |
| Columbus Avenue SB approach | 0.37 | 9.8 | A | --/43 | -- | -- | -- | ---- | -- | -- | -- | ---- |
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## TABLE 6 (continued)

Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary

| Intersection/Peak Hour/Lane Group | 2021 Existing |  |  |  | 2030 No-Build |  |  |  | 2030 Build |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | V/C ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Del. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | LOS ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Queue ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | V/C | Del. | LOS | Queue | V/C | Del. | LOS | Queue |
| Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Site Driveway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday AM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Epping Road NB left turn | 0.01 | 9.1 | A | --/<25 | 0.01 | 9.8 | A | --/<25 | 0.12 | 10.4 | B | --/<25 |
| Site Driveway EB approach | 0.03 | 21.6 | C | --/<25 | 0.02 | 18.4 | C | --/<25 | -- | -- | -- | --/-- |
| Site Driveway EB left turn | -- | -- | -- | --/- | -- | -- | -- | ---- | 0.13 | 26.9 | D | --/<25 |
| Site Driveway EB right turn | -- | -- | -- | --/-- | -- | -- | -- | ---- | 0.26 | 18.7 | C | --/25 |
| Weekday PM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Epping Road NB left turn | 0.01 | 9.2 | A | --/<25 | 0.01 | 9.9 | A | --/<25 | 0.11 | 10.6 | B | --/<25 |
| Site Driveway EB approach | 0.18 | 31.8 | D | --/<25 | 0.12 | 22.5 | C | --/<25 | -- | -- | -- | --/-- |
| Site Driveway EB left turn | -- | -- | -- | --/-- | -- | -- | -- | ---- | 0.16 | 33.2 | D | --/<25 |
| Site Driveway EB right turn | -- | -- | -- | --/-- | -- | -- | -- | ---- | 0.22 | 18.7 | C | --/<25 |
| Continental Drive at Site Driveway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday AM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Driveway NB approach | -- | -- | -- | --/-- | -- | -- | -- | ---- | 0.09 | 9.1 | A | --/<25 |
| Continental Drive WB left turn | -- | -- | -- | --/-- | -- | -- | -- | ---- | 0.02 | 7.3 | A | --/<25 |
| Weekday PM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Driveway NB approach | -- | -- | -- | --/-- | -- | -- | -- | ---- | 0.10 | 10.0 | B | --/<25 |
| Continental Drive WB left turn | -- | -- | -- | --/-- | -- | -- | -- | ---- | 0.01 | 7.8 | A | --/<25 |
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## CONCLUSIONS

Existing and future conditions in the study area have been described, analyzed, and evaluated with respect to traffic operations and the impact of the proposed redevelopment. Conclusions of this effort are presented below.

- The site located at 158 Epping Road (NH Route 27) is currently occupied by a $\pm 12,190$ SF vacant Jaguar auto dealership. The project consists of razing the existing buildings on the site and constructing a retail motor fuel outlet with a $\pm 5,500 \mathrm{SF}$ convenience store, a gasoline station with six (6) MPDs having twelve (12) VFPS, and a $\pm 4,182$ SF automated car wash having one (1) tunnel. Access and egress are proposed via two (2) full access/egress driveways; one on Epping Road ( NH Route 27) and one on Continental Drive.
- Available sight distances at the proposed site driveways exceed the minimum and desirable SSD and ISD requirements for safe operation with exception to the site driveway on Continental Drive, east of the intersection, which is limited to 125 feet due to the adjacent T-intersection Epping Road (NH Route 27). Based on AASHTO requirements, 125 feet is safe for speeds up to 22 mph . Due to the proximity of the intersection, it is not likely that vehicles in the westbound direction will be traveling greater than 22 mph on Continental Drive in between Epping Road and the site driveway as they are entering onto Continental Drive from a turning movement. Left-turn speeds are generally 15 mph and right-turn speeds are generally 9 mph .
- The proposed redevelopment is expected to generate 118 additional vehicles trips ( 54 entering and 64 exiting) during the weekday AM peak hour and 94 additional vehicles trips ( 51 entering and 43 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour beyond the study area. At the site driveways, the proposed redevelopment is expected to generate 350 additional vehicles trips (170 entering and 180 exiting) during the weekday AM peak hour and 268 additional vehicles trips (138 entering and 130 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour. Traffic-volume increases beyond the study area during the peak hours are expected to be in the range of 13 to 66 vehicles. These increases represent, on average, one additional vehicle approximately every 1 minute to 4.5 minutes during the peak hours.
- Under existing and future traffic-volume conditions, the signalized intersection of Epping Road (NH Route 27) at Continental Drive is expected to operate at an overall LOS A/B with all movements at LOS C or better during the weekday peak hours. There are no drops in level of service as a result of the proposed redevelopment project. Increases in delay as a result of the redevelopment are less than 3 seconds on the overall intersection, and less than 5 seconds on any particular movement. The volume-to-capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) ratios are below 1.00 indicating there will be adequate capacity to accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes.
- Under existing traffic-volume conditions, the Columbus Avenue left-turn movement onto Epping Road operates at LOS D with all other movements at this Epping Road/Brentwood Road/Columbus Avenue location at LOS A/B during the weekday peak hours. With the geometric improvements at this location, the Brentwood Road eastbound left-turn onto Epping Road is expected to operate at LOS D with all other movements at LOS A/B under future traffic-volume conditions. With the proposed redevelopment in place, increases in delay on any movement are expected to be less than 4 seconds with a negligible increase in queue lengths. The $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios are anticipated to be well below 1.00 indicating there will be adequate capacity to accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes.
- Under future traffic-volume conditions, the site driveway on Epping Road (NH Route 27) is anticipated to operate with left-turn movements out of the site at LOS D and right-turn movements at LOS C during the weekday peak hours. All queues on site are anticipated to be one vehicle or less with $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios well below 1.00 indicating adequate capacity. The Epping Road northbound leftturn movement into the site is anticipated to be LOS B with queue lengths of one vehicle or less.
- Under future traffic-volume conditions, the site driveway on Continental Drive is expected to operate with all movements at LOS A/B during the weekday peak hours. Queue lengths are anticipated to be one vehicle or less and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios are anticipated to be well below 1.00 indicating there will be adequate capacity to accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes.
- APPENDIX
- Traffic-Count Data
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Location : North of Continental Drive
City/State: Exeter, NH
1857SPD1


Daily

| 15th Percentile : | 30 MPH |
| ---: | ---: |
| 50th Percentile : | 35 MPH |
| 85th Percentile : | 40 MPH |
| 95th Percentile : | 43 MPH |
|  |  |
| Mean Speed(Average) : | 36 MPH |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed : | $31-40 \mathrm{MPH}$ |
| Number in Pace : | 2908 |
| Percent in Pace : | $73.2 \%$ |
| Number of Vehicles > 35 MPH : | 2175 |
| Percent of Vehicles > 35 MPH : | $54.7 \%$ |

Location : NH Route 27
Location : North of Continental Drive
City/State: Exeter, NH
1857SPD1
SB




Daily

| 15th Percentile : | 31 MPH |
| ---: | ---: |
| 50th Percentile : | 36 MPH |
| 85th Percentile : | 42 MPH |
| 95th Percentile : | 44 MPH |
| Mean Speed(Average) : | 37 MPH |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed : | $31-40 \mathrm{MPH}$ |
| Number in Pace : | 3091 |
| Percent in Pace : | $69.9 \%$ |
| Number of Vehicles > 35 MPH : | 2946 |
| Percent of Vehicles $>35 \mathrm{MPH}:$ | $66.7 \%$ |

Location : North of Continental Drive
City/State: Exeter, NH


Daily

| 15th Percentile : | 31 MPH |
| ---: | ---: |
| 50th Percentile : | 36 MPH |
| 85th Percentile : | 41 MPH |
| 95th Percentile : | 44 MPH |
| Mean Speed(Average) : | 37 MPH |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed : | $31-40 \mathrm{MPH}$ |
| Number in Pace : | 3189 |
| Percent in Pace : | $69.8 \%$ |
| Number of Vehicles $>35 \mathrm{MPH}:$ | 2906 |
| Percent of Vehicles $>35 \mathrm{MPH}:$ | $63.6 \%$ |



| Location: | Continental Drive, west of Epping Road | Date: $4 / 9 / 2021$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project: | Retail Motor Fuel Outlet - Exeter, NH |  |
| Weather: | Sunny -60's | Time: $12: 00$ PM |


| Eastbound | Westbound |
| :---: | :---: |
| Speed (mph) | Speed (mph) |
| 33 | 27 |
| 31 | 26 |
| 35 | 24 |
| 34 | 33 |
| 34 | 30 |
| 32 | 36 |
| 29 | 36 |
| 32 | 28 |
| 38 | 30 |
| 34 | 30 |
| 41 | 34 |
| 35 | 28 |
| 37 | 27 |
| 31 | 29 |
| 29 | 32 |
| 34 | 35 |
| 35 | 37 |
| 36 | 33 |
| 31 | 26 |
| 35 | 34 |
| 29 | 32 |
| 36 | 25 |
| 29 | 28 |
| 31 | 27 |
| 30 | 30 |
| 30 |  |
| 35 |  |
| 28 | 34 |
| 33 | 30 |
| 36 | 34 |




|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Existing } \\ \text { LUC } 840 \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Proposed } \\ & \hline \text { LUC } 960 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday Daily | In | 160 | 1,383 | 774 | 609 |
|  | Out | 160 | 1,383 | 774 | 609 |
|  | Total | 320 | 2,766 | 1548 | 1,218 |
| Weekday AM | In | 17 | 187 | 116 | 71 |
|  | Out | $\underline{6}$ | 186 | 116 | 70 |
|  | Total | 23 | 373 | 232 | 141 |
| Weekday PM | In | 18 | 156 | 87 | 69 |
|  | Out | $\underline{26}$ | 156 | 87 | 69 |
|  | Total | 44 | 312 | 174 | 138 |
| Saturday Daily | In | 318 | 1,750 | 980 | 770 |
|  | Out | 318 | 1,750 | 980 | $\underline{770}$ |
|  | Total | 636 | 3,500 | 1960 | 1,540 |
| aturday Midday | In | 4 | 178 | 99 | 79 |
|  | Out | $\underline{5}$ | 176 | 99 | 77 |
|  | Total | 9 | 354 | 198 | 156 |
|  |  |  | Pass-By |  |  |
|  |  |  | Wkday Daily | 56\% |  |
|  |  |  | AM | 62\% |  |
|  |  |  | PM | 56\% |  |
|  |  |  | Saturday | 56\% |  |
|  |  |  | SAT | 56\% |  |

No daily Car Wash trip estimates available.

## Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) <br> Land Use Code (LUC) 840 - Automobile Sales (New) <br> General Urban/Suburban

ıverage Vehicle Trips Ends vs 1000 Sq. Feet Gross Floor Area Independent Variable (X):

```
Average Weekday Daily
    T = 28.65 (X) - 29.45
    T=28.65 * 12.187 - 29.45
    T = 319.71
    T=320 vehicle trips
        with 50% ( 160 vph) entering and 50% ( }160\textrm{vph})\mathrm{ ) exiting.
```

Weekday Morning Peak Hour Of Adjacent Street Traffic
$\mathrm{T}=1.87$ * (X)
$\mathrm{T}=1.87 \quad * \quad 12.187$
$\mathrm{T}=22.79$
$\mathrm{T}=23 \quad$ vehicle trips
with $73 \%\left(\begin{array}{lll} & 17 & \mathrm{vph}\end{array}\right)$ entering and 27\% ( 6 vph$)$ exiting.
Weekday Evening Peak Hour Of Adjacent Street Traffic
$\mathrm{T}=1.80(\mathrm{X})+21.60$
$\mathrm{T}=1.80 \quad * \quad 12.187+21.60$
$\mathrm{T}=43.54$
$\mathrm{T}=44 \quad$ vehicle trips
with $40 \%$ ( 18 vph ) entering and $60 \%$ ( 26 vph ) exiting.

## SATURDAY DAILY

$\mathrm{T}=52.24$ * $(\mathrm{X})$
$\mathrm{T}=52.24 \quad * 12.187$
$\mathrm{T}=636.65$
$\mathrm{T}=636 \quad$ vehicle trips with $50 \%$ ( $318 \quad \mathrm{vpd})$ entering and $50 \%$ ( 318 vpd ) exiting.

Saturday Peak Hour Of Generator
$\mathrm{T}=8.56(\mathrm{X})-95.19$
$\mathrm{T}=8.56 \quad * \quad 12.187-95.19$
$\mathrm{T}=9.13$
$\mathrm{T}=9 \quad$ vehicle trips
with $50 \%$ ( $4 \quad v p h$ ) entering and 50\% ( 5 vph ) exiting.

# Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) <br> Land Use Code (LUC) 960 - Super Convenience Market/Gas Station <br> General Urban/Suburban 

Average Vehicle Trips Ends vs:
Vehicle Fueling Positions
Independent Variable (X): 12

```
AvERAGE WEEKDAY DAILY
    T = 230.52 * (X)
    T}=230.52 * 12
    T = 2766.24
    T=2,766 vehicle trips
        with 50% ( 1,383 vpd) entering and 50% ( 1,383 vpd) exiting.
```

Weekday Morning Peak Hour Of Adjacent Street Traffic
$\mathrm{T}=28.08$ * (X)
$\mathrm{T}=28.08 \quad * 12$
$\mathrm{T}=336.96$
$\mathrm{T}=337 \quad$ vehicle trips
with $50 \%$ ( 169 vph ) entering and 50\% ( 168 vph ) exiting.
Weekday Evening Peak Hour Of Adjacent Street Traffic
$\mathrm{T}=22.96$ * (X)
$\mathrm{T}=22.96 \quad * 12$
$\mathrm{T}=275.52$
$\mathrm{T}=276 \quad$ vehicle trips
with $50 \%(138 \mathrm{vph})$ entering and $50 \%(138 \mathrm{vph})$ exiting.
SATURDAY Daily
$\mathrm{T}=291.67$ * (X)
$\mathrm{T}=291.67 \quad * 12$
$\mathrm{T}=3500.04$
$\mathrm{T}=3,500 \quad$ vehicle trips
with $50 \%$ ( $1,750 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) entering and $50 \%$ ( $1,750 \mathrm{vpd})$ exiting.

## Saturday Peak Hour Of Generator

$\mathrm{T}=23.26$ * (X)
$\mathrm{T}=23.26 \quad * 12$
$\mathrm{T}=279.12$
$\mathrm{T}=279 \quad$ vehicle trips with $50 \%(140 \mathrm{vph})$ entering and $50 \%(139 \mathrm{vph})$ exiting.

# Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) 

## Land Use Code (LUC) 948 - Automated Car Wash

General Urban/Suburban
Average Vehicle Trips Ends vs: 1,000 Sq. Ft. Gross Floor Area Independent Variable (X): 4.182

```
Weekday Morning Peak Hour Of Adjacent Street Traffic
    T=14.20 * (X)
    T=14.20 * 4.182
    T=59.38
    T=60 vehicle trips
        with 50% ( 30 vpd) entering and 50% ( 30 vpd) exiting.
* No weekday morning peak hour data available, weekday evening trips were assumed.
```

Weekday Evening Peak Hour Of Adjacent Street Traffic
$\mathrm{T}=14.20$ * (X)
$\mathrm{T}=14.20 \quad * 4.182$
$\mathrm{T}=59.38$
$\mathrm{T}=60 \quad$ vehicle trips
with $50 \%(30 \quad v p d)$ entering and $50 \%(30 \quad v p d)$ exiting.

```
Saturday Peak Hour Of Generator
    T=30.40 * (X)
    T=30.40 * 4.182
    T=127.13
    T=127 vehicle trips
        with 50% ( 64 vph) entering and 50% ( 63 vph) exiting.
```








Table F. 36 Pass-By and Non-Pass-By Trips Weekday, PM Peak Period Land Use Code 944-Gasoline/Service Station

| S\%E | vericue FUELNG POSITIONS | LOCATION | WEEkDAY SURVEY. DATE | $12$ |  |  | NON-PASB-EY(TRIPS(\%) |  |  | AD. STREET PRAKHOUR Votume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 艮的 |  |  |  | INHERVIEWS | TME PERIOD | TRIP (\%) | PRIMARY | DIVERTED | TOTAL |  | SOURCE |
| - | - | Chicago suburbs, IL | 1987 | 48 | 3:00-7:00 p.m, | 21 | - | - | 79 | - | Kenig, O'Hara, Humes, Flock |
| - | - | Chicago suburbs, IL | 1987 | 34 | 3:00-6:00 p.m. | 25 | - | - | 75 | - | Kenig, O'Hara, Humes, Flock |
| - | - | Chicago suburbs, IL | 1987 | 42 | 3:00-6:00 p.m. | 20 | - | - | 80 | - | Kenig, O'Hara, Humes, Flock |
| 2,3 | 6 | Gaithersburg, MD | 1992 | 55 | 4:00-6:00 p.m. | 40 | 11 | 49 | 60 | 2,760 | RBA |
| 2.1 | 6 | Belhesda, MD | 1992 | 30 | 4:00-6:00 p.m. | 53 | 20 | 27 | 47 | 1,060 | RBA |
| 1.7 | 6 | Wheaton, MD | 1992 | 18 | 4:00-6:00 p.m. | 61 | 6 | 33 | 39 | 2,510 | RBA |
| 2.0 | 8 | Gaithersburg, MD | 1992 | 47 | 4:00-6:00 p.m. | 62 | 23 | 15 | 38 | 2,635 | RBA |
| 1.2 | 6 | Damascus, MD | 1992 | 26 | 4:00-6:00 p.m. | 58 | 11 | 31 | 42 | 1,020 | RBA |
| 0.3 | 12 | Wheaton, MD | 1992 | 52 | 4:00-6:00 p.m. | 38 | 10 | 52 | 62 | 3,835 | RBA |

Average Pass-By Trip Percentage: 42
"-" means no data were provided

Table F. 37 Pass-By and Non-Pass-By Trips Weekday, AM Peak Period Land Use Code 945-Gasoline/Service Station with Convenience Market

| $\begin{gathered} \text { sige } \\ 1.000 \text { so } \\ \text { FT, GFA) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | VEHCLE fueling Positions | LOCATION | WEEKDAY SURVEY DATE | NO OF INTERMEWS | TIME PERIOD | PASS-BY TRIP (\%) | NON.PASS.EY TRIPS (\%) |  |  | A0, SIREET PEAKHOUR volume | SOURICE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PRIMARY | DIVERTED | TOTAL |  |  |
| 0.8 | 8 | Louisville area, KY | 1993 | 61 | 7:00-9:00 a.m. | 60 | 15 | 25 | 40 | 4,000 | BartonAschman Assoc. |
| 0.6 | 8 | Louisville, KY | 1993 | 48 | 7:00-9:00 a.m. | 68 | 13 | 19 | 32 | 1,307 | BartonAschman Assoc. |
| 0.7 | 10 | Louisville, KY | 1993 | 47 | 7:00-9:00 a.m. | 67 | 11 | 22 | 33 | 1,105 | BartonAschman Assoc. |
| 0.7 | 8 | Louisville area, KY | 1993 | - | 7:00-9:00 a.m. | 56 | 22 | 22 | 44 | 1,211 | BartonAschman Assoc. |
| 0.7 | 10 | Louisville area, KY | 1993 | - | 7:00-9:00 a.m. | 46 | 42 | 12 | 54 | 1,211 | BartonAschman Assoc. |
| 0.3 | - | Louisville area, KY | 1993 | 75 | 7:00-9:00 a.m. | 72 | 15 | 13 | 28 | - | BartonAschman Assoc. |
| 0.8 | 8 | Silver Spring, MD | 1992 | 36 | 7:00-9:00 a.m. | 47 | 14 | 39 | 53 | 3,095 | RBA |
| 0.4 | 8 | Derwood, MD | 1992 | 46 | 7:00-9:00 a.m. | 75 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 3,770 | RBA |
| 2.2 | 8 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Kensinglon, } \\ \text { MD } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1992 | 31 | 7:00-9:00 a.m. | 47 | 34 | 19 | 53 | 1,785 | RBA |
| 1 | 8 | Silver Spring, MD | 1992 | 35 | 7:00-9:00 a.m. | 78 | 9 | 13 | 22 | 7,080 | RBA |

Average Pass-By Trip Percentage: 62
"-" means no data were provided

Figure F. 18 Gasoline/Service Station with Convenience Market (945)
Average Pass-ByTrip Percentage vs: 1,000 Sq. Ft. Gross Floor Area
On a: Weekday, AM Peak Period
Number of Studies: 10
Average 1,000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 0.8

Data Plot


Table F. 38 Pass-By and Non-Pass-By Trips Weekday, PM Peak Period Land Use Code 945-Gasoline/Service Station with Convenience Market

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SRE } \ 1,000 \\ & \text { SQ.FT } \\ & \text { (FFA) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { VEricle } \\ & \text { FURANG } \\ & \text { POSTions } \end{aligned}$ |  | wegionay SURVEY DATE |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pross-8Y } \\ & \text { TBP (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | HON.PMSS-BY TRIPS (\%) |  |  | ADJ STREET PEAK HOUT volume |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Locanor |  | WTERYEWS | TIME PERIOD |  | PRIMARY | DIVERTED | TOTAL |  | SOURCE |
| 0.8 | 8 | Louisville area, KY | 1993 | 83 | 4:00-6:00 p,m, | 52 | 8 | 40 | 48 | 4,965 | BartonAschman Assoc. |
| 0.6 | 8 | Louisville, KY | 1993 | 60 | 4:00-6:00 p.m. | 53 | 20 | 27 | 47 | 1,491 | BartonAschman Assoc. |
| 0.7 | 10 | Louisville, KY | 1993 | - | 4:00-6:00 p.m. | 57 | 19 | 24 | 43 | 1,812 | BartonAschman Assoc. |
| 0.7 | 8 | Louisville area, KY | 1993 | - | 4:00-6:00 p.m. | 72 | 7 | 21 | 28 | 2,657 | BartonAschman Assoc. |
| 0.7 | 10 | Louisville area, KY | 1993 | - | 4:00-6:00 p.m, | 55 | 16 | 29 | 45 | 2,657 | BartonAschman Assoc. |
| 0.8 | 8 | Silver Spring, MD | 1992 | 36 | 4:00-6:00 pm. | 67 | 14 | 19 | 33 | 3,095 | RBA |
| 0.4 | 8 | Denwood, MD | 1992 | 46 | 4:00-6:00 p.m. | 46 | 11 | 43 | 54 | 3,770 | RBA |
| 2.1 | 8 | Kensington, MD | 1992 | 31 | 4:00-6:00 p.m. | 52 | 13 | 35 | 48 | 1,785 | RBA |
| 1 | 8 | Silver Spring, MD | 1992 | 35 | 4:00-6:00 p.m. | 54 | 3 | 43 | 46 | 7,080 | RBA |

Average Pass-By Trip Percentage: 56
"-" means no data were provided

Figure F. 19 Gasoline/Service Station with Convenience Market (945)
Average Pass-ByTrip Percentage vs: 1,000 Sq. Ft. Gross Floor Area
On a: Weekday, PM Peak Period
Number of Studies: 9
Average 1,000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 0.9
Data Plot


## CAPACITY ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

A primary result of capacity analysis is the assignment of levels of service to traffic facilities under various traffic flow conditions. The capacity analysis methodology is based on the concepts and procedures in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). ${ }^{7}$ The concept of level of service (LOS) is defined as a qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream and their perception by motorists and/or passengers. A level-of-service definition provides an index to quality of traffic flow in terms of such factors as speed, travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort, convenience, and safety.

Six levels of service are defined for each type of facility. They are given letter designations from A to F, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F the worst. Since the level of service of a traffic facility is a function of the traffic flows placed upon it, such a facility may operate at a wide range of levels of service, depending on the time of day, day of week, or period of year. A description of the operating condition under each level of service is provided below:

- LOS A describes conditions with little to no delay to motorists.
- LOS B represents a desirable level with relatively low delay to motorists.
- LOS C describes conditions with average delays to motorists.
- LOS D describes operations where the influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Delays are still within an acceptable range.
- LOS E represents operating conditions with high delay values. This level is considered by many agencies to be the limit of acceptable delay.
- LOS $F$ is considered to be unacceptable to most drivers with high delay values that often occur, when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection.


## Unsignalized Intersections

Levels of service for unsignalized intersections are calculated using the operational analysis methodology of the HCM. The procedure accounts for lane configuration on both the minor and major street approaches, conflicting traffic stream volumes, and the type of intersection control (STOP, YIELD, or all-way STOP control). The definition of level of service for unsignalized intersections is a function of average control delay. Control delay includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. The level-of-service criteria for unsignalized intersections are shown in Table A-1.

## Signalized Intersections

Levels of service for signalized intersections are also calculated using the operational analysis methodology of the HCM. The methodology for signalized intersections assesses the effects of signal type, timing, phasing, and progression; vehicle mix; and geometrics on average control delay. Control delay includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. Table A-1 summarizes the relationship between level of service and average control delay.

[^10]TABLE A-1
Level-of-Service Criteria for Intersections

|  | Unsignalized Intersection Criteria <br> Average Control Delay <br> (Seconds per Vehicle) | Signalized Intersection Criteria <br> Average Control Delay <br> (Seconds per Vehicle) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\leq 10$ | $\leq 10$ |
| A | $>10$ and $\leq 15$ | $>10$ and $\leq 20$ |
| B | $>15$ and $\leq 25$ | $>20$ and $\leq 35$ |
| C | $>25$ and $\leq 35$ | $>35$ and $\leq 55$ |
| D | $>35$ and $\leq 50$ | $>55$ and $\leq 80$ |
| E | $>50$ or v/c $>1.0$ | $>80$ or v/c $>1.0$ |
| F |  |  |

Source Highway Capacity Manual $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition, Transportation Research Board; Washington, D.C.; 2016. Pages 19-16, 20-6, and 21-9.

For signalized intersections, this delay criterion may be applied in assigning level-of-service designations to individual lane groups, to individual intersection approaches, or to the entire intersection. For unsignalized intersections, this delay criterion may be applied in assigning level-of-service designations to individual lane groups or to individual intersection approaches.

| Lane Group | $\begin{aligned} & \Rightarrow \\ & \text { EBL } \end{aligned}$ | EBR | NBL | 4NBT | $\frac{1}{1}$SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 4 | 「7 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 15 | 45 | 565 | 635 | 105 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 15 | 45 | 565 | 635 | 105 |
| Turn Type | Prot | pt+ov | Prot | NA | NA | pt+ov |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 45 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 46 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 45 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 46 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 8.0 |  | 8.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 15.0 |  | 20.0 | 75.0 | 55.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 16.7\% |  | 22.2\% | 83.3\% | 61.1\% |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -2.0 |  | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None |  | None | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 11.3 | 22.3 | 11.7 | 45.5 | 38.3 | 49.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.19 | 0.38 | 0.20 | 0.77 | 0.65 | 0.84 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.14 | 0.43 | 0.57 | 0.08 |
| Control Delay | 29.9 | 9.5 | 28.7 | 4.4 | 12.3 | 0.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 29.9 | 9.5 | 28.7 | 4.4 | 12.3 | 0.7 |
| LOS | C | A | C | A | B | A |
| Approach Delay | 19.7 |  |  | 6.2 | 10.7 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | A | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 59.1
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.57
Intersection Signal Delay: 8.9
Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 50.7\%
ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 3: Epping Road (NH 27) \& Continental Drive


|  | $y$ |  | 4 | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 16 | 16 | 49 | 614 | 690 | 114 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.14 | 0.43 | 0.57 | 0.08 |
| Control Delay | 29.9 | 9.5 | 28.7 | 4.4 | 12.3 | 0.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 29.9 | 9.5 | 28.7 | 4.4 | 12.3 | 0.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 5 | 0 | 17 | 77 | 198 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 26 | 14 | 55 | 115 | 325 | 10 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 2747 |  |  | 332 | 2112 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  | 125 | 225 |  |  | 225 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 373 | 716 | 543 | 1803 | 1537 | 1373 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.34 | 0.45 | 0.08 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | $\downarrow$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 4 | 「' |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 15 | 15 | 45 | 565 | 635 | 105 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 15 | 15 | 45 | 565 | 635 | 105 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 16 | 16 | 49 | 614 | 690 | 114 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 183 | 361 | 223 | 1349 | 950 | 968 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.13 | 0.72 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1870 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 16 | 16 | 49 | 614 | 690 | 114 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 1781 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1870 | 1585 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 6.2 | 13.1 | 1.4 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 6.2 | 13.1 | 1.4 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 183 | 361 | 223 | 1349 | 950 | 968 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.22 | 0.46 | 0.73 | 0.12 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 431 | 582 | 627 | 2923 | 2099 | 1942 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 18.5 | 13.7 | 17.9 | 2.6 | 8.7 | 3.7 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.1 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 3.9 | 0.4 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 18.7 | 13.7 | 18.4 | 2.9 | 9.8 | 3.8 |
| LnGrp LOS | B | B | B | A | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 32 |  |  | 663 | 804 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 16.2 |  |  | 4.0 | 8.9 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | A | A |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s |  | 36.8 |  | 8.7 | 9.7 | 27.1 |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 69.0 |  | 9.0 | 14.0 | 49.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 8.2 |  | 2.4 | 3.1 | 15.1 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 4.9 |  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 6.0 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 6.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 7.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | NEL | NER |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 355 | 275 | 120 | 235 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 355 | 275 | 120 | 235 | 0 |
| 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 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 386 | 299 | 130 | 255 | 0 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 429 | 0 | - | 0 | 750 | 364 |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 364 | - |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 386 | - |  |
| 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 | 1130 | - | - | - | 379 | 681 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 703 | - |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 687 | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1130 | - | - | - | 379 | 681 |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 379 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 703 | - |  |


| Approach | NB | SB | NE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | D |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NELn1 | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 379 | 1130 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.674 | - | - | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 32 | 0 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | D | A | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 4.7 | 0 | - | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  |  | ¢ | 个 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 65 | 40 | 355 | 275 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 65 | 40 | 355 | 275 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 71 | 43 | 386 | 299 | 0 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | 771 | 299 | 299 | 0 | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.4 | 0.8 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1262 | - | 741 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.034 | - | 0.095 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8 | 0 | 10.4 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | 0.3 | - | - |



| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $7 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $86 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $7 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 70 | 240 | 40 | 120 |
| LT Vol | 5 | 175 | 5 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 60 | 60 | 35 | 40 |
| RT Vol | 5 | 5 | 0 | 80 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 76 | 261 | 43 | 130 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.101 | 0.333 | 0.057 | 0.158 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.785 | 4.591 | 4.738 | 4.357 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 749 | 783 | 754 | 823 |
| Service Time | 2.818 | 2.62 | 2.776 | 2.386 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.101 | 0.333 | 0.057 | 0.158 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.4 | 9.9 | 8.1 | 8.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.3 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{}$ |  |
| Trafic Vol, veh/h | 3 | 3 | 8 | 607 | 641 | 9 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 3 | 3 | 8 | 607 | 641 | 9 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, | e, \# 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 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 674 | 712 | 10 |
| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1409 | 717 | 722 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 717 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 692 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 153 | 430 | 880 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 484 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 497 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 151 | 430 | 880 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 151 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 476 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 497 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 21.6 |  | 0.1 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 880 | - | 224 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.01 | - | 0.03 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 9.1 | 0 | 21.6 | - |  |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | C | - |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | - | 0.1 | - |  |


| Lane Group | $\Rightarrow$ <br> EBL |  | NBL | $\uparrow$ <br> NBT | $\downarrow$ | $\begin{aligned} & \downarrow \\ & \text { SBR } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 125 | 60 | 15 | 805 | 605 | 30 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 125 | 60 | 15 | 805 | 605 | 30 |
| Turn Type | Prot | pt+ov | Prot | NA | NA | pt+ov |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 45 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 46 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 45 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 46 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 8.0 |  | 8.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 20.0 |  | 15.0 | 70.0 | 55.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 22.2\% |  | 16.7\% | 77.8\% | 61.1\% |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -2.0 |  | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None |  | None | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 13.1 | 24.0 | 10.9 | 46.7 | 39.7 | 53.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.21 | 0.38 | 0.17 | 0.74 | 0.63 | 0.86 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.37 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.63 | 0.56 | 0.02 |
| Control Delay | 29.7 | 5.7 | 31.3 | 8.4 | 13.6 | 0.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 29.7 | 5.7 | 31.3 | 8.4 | 13.6 | 0.8 |
| LOS | C | A | C | A | B | A |
| Approach Delay | 21.9 |  |  | 8.8 | 12.9 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | A | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 62.9
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.63
Intersection Signal Delay: $11.9 \quad$ Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 56.0\%
Analysis Period (min) 15
ICU Level of Service B

Splits and Phases: 3: Epping Road (NH 27) \& Continental Drive


|  | 4 | 7 | 4 | 4 | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 136 | 65 | 16 | 875 | 658 | 33 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.37 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.63 | 0.56 | 0.02 |
| Control Delay | 29.7 | 5.7 | 31.3 | 8.4 | 13.6 | 0.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 29.7 | 5.7 | 31.3 | 8.4 | 13.6 | 0.8 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 49 | 0 | 6 | 166 | 201 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) | 121 | 26 | 26 | 315 | 339 | 5 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 2747 |  |  | 332 | 2112 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  | 125 | 225 |  |  | 225 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 489 | 694 | 336 | 1729 | 1505 | 1377 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.28 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.51 | 0.44 | 0.02 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | NEL | NER |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | N |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 310 | 360 | 290 | 150 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 310 | 360 | 290 | 150 | 0 |
| 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 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 337 | 391 | 315 | 163 | 0 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 706 | 0 | - | 0 | 886 | 549 |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 549 | - |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 337 | - |  |
| 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 | 892 | - | - | - | 315 | 535 |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 579 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 723 | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 892 | - | - | - | 315 | 535 |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 315 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 579 | - |  |


| Approach | NB | SB | NE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 28.1 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | D |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NELn1 | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 315 | 892 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.518 | - | - | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 28.1 | 0 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | D | A | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 2.8 | 0 | - | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 60 | 100 | 310 | 360 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 60 | 100 | 310 | 360 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 65 | 109 | 337 | 391 | 0 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | 946 | 391 | 391 | 0 | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.1 | 2 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1168 | -658 | - | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.093 | -0.099 | - | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.4 | 0 | 11.1 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.3 | - | 0.3 | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 9.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{*}$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 90 | 55 | 5 | 5 | 95 | 0 | 5 | 60 | 5 | 0 | 65 | 225 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 90 | 55 | 5 | 5 | 95 | 0 | 5 | 60 | 5 | 0 | 65 | 225 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 98 | 60 | 5 | 5 | 103 | 0 | 5 | 65 | 5 | 0 | 71 | 245 |
| 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 | 9.6 |  |  | 9 |  |  | 8.6 |  |  |  | 9.8 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |  | A |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $7 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $86 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $7 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 70 | 150 | 100 | 290 |
| LT Vol | 5 | 90 | 5 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 60 | 55 | 95 | 65 |
| RT Vol | 5 | 5 | 0 | 225 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 76 | 163 | 109 | 315 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.105 | 0.228 | 0.152 | 0.372 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.949 | 5.042 | 5.029 | 4.251 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 720 | 708 | 708 | 842 |
| Service Time | 3.01 | 3.107 | 3.098 | 2.294 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.106 | 0.23 | 0.154 | 0.374 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.6 | 9.6 | 9 | 9.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 1.7 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 1 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h |  | 12 | 8 | 806 | 655 | 10 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 14 | 12 | 8 | 806 | 655 | 10 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor |  | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 16 | 13 | 9 | 896 | 728 | 11 |
| Major/Minor M | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1648 | 734 | 739 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 734 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 914 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 ManeuverStage 1 | 109 | 420 | 867 | - | - |  |
|  | 475 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 391 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 107 | 420 | 867 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 107 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 <br> Stage 2 | 465 | - | - | - | - |  |
|  | 391 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s HCM LOS | 31.8 |  | 0.1 |  | 0 |  |
|  | D |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 867 | - | 163 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.01 |  | 0.177 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 9.2 | 0 | 31.8 | - |  |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | D | - |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | - | 0.6 | - |  |


| Lane Group | $\begin{aligned} & \Rightarrow \\ & \text { EBL } \end{aligned}$ | EBR | NBL | 4NBT | $\frac{1}{1}$SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 4 | 「゙ |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 20 | 15 | 55 | 700 | 780 | 130 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 20 | 15 | 55 | 700 | 780 | 130 |
| Turn Type | Prot | pt＋ov | Prot | NA | NA | pt＋ov |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 45 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 46 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 45 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 46 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial（s） | 8.0 |  | 8.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |
| Minimum Split（s） | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Total Split（s） | 15.0 |  | 20.0 | 75.0 | 55.0 |  |
| Total Split（\％） | 16．7\％ |  | 22．2\％ | 83．3\％ | 61．1\％ |  |
| Yellow Time（s） | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All－Red Time（s） | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） | －2．0 |  | －2．0 | －2．0 | －2．0 |  |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lead／Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag |  |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None |  | None | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green（s） | 10.3 | 25.6 | 11.2 | 56.0 | 44.6 | 60.1 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.14 | 0.34 | 0.15 | 0.75 | 0.60 | 0.81 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.23 | 0.56 | 0.78 | 0.11 |
| Control Delay | 34.0 | 10.0 | 34.0 | 5.4 | 18.6 | 0.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 34.0 | 10.0 | 34.0 | 5.4 | 18.6 | 0.7 |
| LOS | C | A | C | A | B | A |
| Approach Delay | 23.5 |  |  | 7.5 | 16.1 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | A | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length： 90
Actuated Cycle Length： 74.6
Natural Cycle： 65
Control Type：Actuated－Uncoordinated
Maximum v／c Ratio： 0.78
Intersection Signal Delay： 12.4
Intersection LOS：B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 59．0\％
ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period（min） 15
Splits and Phases：3：Epping Road（NH 27）\＆Continental Drive


| Lane Group | ¢ EBL |  | 4 | ¢ NBT | $\downarrow$ SBT | ¢ SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 22 | 17 | 61 | 778 | 867 | 144 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.23 | 0.56 | 0.78 | 0.11 |
| Control Delay | 34.0 | 10.0 | 34.0 | 5.4 | 18.6 | 0.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 34.0 | 10.0 | 34.0 | 5.4 | 18.6 | 0.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 10 | 0 | 27 | 112 | 295 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 33 | 14 | 66 | 172 | 507 | 11 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 2747 |  |  | 332 | 2112 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  | 125 | 225 |  |  | 225 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 268 | 600 | 390 | 1704 | 1310 | 1301 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.46 | 0.66 | 0.11 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1095 | 506 | 456 | 0 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 506 | - | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 589 | - | - |  |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - |
| - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 24.6 | 0.6 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT EBLn1 EBLn2 | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1105 | -360 | 566 | - | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.035 | -0.602 | 0.137 | - | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.4 | 0 | 29 | 12.4 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | D | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | 3.8 | 0.5 | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 260 | 5 | 0 | 125 | 0 | 70 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 260 | 5 | 0 | 125 | 0 | 70 |
| 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 | 289 | 6 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 78 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 | Minor1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 295 | 0431 | 292 |
| Stage 1 | - | - - | - 292 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - - | - 139 | - |
| 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 | - | 1266 | 581 | 747 |
| Stage 1 | - | - - | - 758 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - - | - 888 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | 1266 | - 581 | 747 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - - | - 581 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - - | - 758 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - - | - 888 |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 10.4 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | $B$ |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 747 | - | -1266 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.104 | - | - | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 10.4 | - | - | 0 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | $B$ | - | - | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.3 | - | - | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 3 | 3 | 8 | 752 | 786 | 9 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 3 | 3 | 8 | 752 | 786 | 9 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| 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 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 836 | 873 | 10 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1732 | 878 | 883 | 0 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 878 | - | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 854 | - | - |  |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - |
| - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 18.4 | 0.1 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 766 | -276 | - | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.012 | -0.024 | - | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9.8 | 0 | 18.4 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | C | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | 0.1 | - | - |


| Lane Group | $\Rightarrow$ <br> EBL |  | NBL | $\uparrow$ <br> NBT | $\downarrow$ | $\begin{aligned} & \downarrow \\ & \text { SBR } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 「 | * | 4 | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 150 | 70 | 15 | 970 | 760 | 35 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 150 | 70 | 15 | 970 | 760 | 35 |
| Turn Type | Prot | pt+ov | Prot | NA | NA | pt+ov |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 45 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 46 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 45 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 46 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 8.0 |  | 8.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 18.0 |  | 14.0 | 72.0 | 58.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 20.0\% |  | 15.6\% | 80.0\% | 64.4\% |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -2.0 |  | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None |  | None | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 12.9 | 27.2 | 10.2 | 57.2 | 46.5 | 64.5 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.16 | 0.35 | 0.13 | 0.73 | 0.59 | 0.82 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.57 | 0.13 | 0.07 | 0.79 | 0.76 | 0.03 |
| Control Delay | 41.2 | 6.3 | 35.9 | 12.0 | 18.7 | 0.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 41.2 | 6.3 | 35.9 | 12.0 | 18.7 | 0.7 |
| LOS | D | A | D | B | B | A |
| Approach Delay | 30.1 |  |  | 12.4 | 17.9 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | B | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 78.3
Natural Cycle: 65
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.79
Intersection Signal Delay: $16.5 \quad$ Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 66.0\%
Analysis Period (min) 15
ICU Level of Service C

Splits and Phases: 3: Epping Road (NH 27) \& Continental Drive


|  |  |  |  | EBL | EBR | NBL |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |  |  |
| Lane Group | 167 | 78 | 17 | 1078 | 844 | 39 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0.57 | 0.13 | 0.07 | 0.79 | 0.76 | 0.03 |
| v/c Ratio | 41.2 | 6.3 | 35.9 | 12.0 | 18.7 | 0.7 |
| Control Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Delay | 41.2 | 6.3 | 35.9 | 12.0 | 18.7 | 0.7 |
| Total Delay | 77 | 0 | 8 | 285 | 322 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 156 | 31 | 29 | 453 | 482 | 5 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 2747 |  |  | 332 | 2112 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 125 | 225 |  |  | 225 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 323 | 591 | 231 | 1612 | 1313 | 1306 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0.52 | 0.13 | 0.07 | 0.67 | 0.64 | 0.03 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 23.7 | 1.8 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT EBLn1 EBLn2 | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 968 | -259 | 413 | - | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.115 | -0.429 | 0.175 | - | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9.2 | 0 | 29 | 15.6 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | D | C | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.4 | - | 2 | 0.6 | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 160 | 5 | 0 | 345 | 0 | 70 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 160 | 5 | 0 | 345 | 0 | 70 |
| 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 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 |  | - | 0 | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 178 | 6 | 0 | 383 | 0 | 78 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 184 | 0 | 564 | 181 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 181 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 383 | - |
| 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 | - | - | 1391 | - | 487 | 862 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 850 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 689 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1391 | - | 487 | 862 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 487 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 850 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 689 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 9.6 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | A |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 862 | - | -1391 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.09 | - | - | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9.6 | - | - | 0 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.3 | - | - | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 14 | 12 | 8 | 971 | 820 | 10 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 14 | 12 | 8 | 971 | 820 | 10 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| 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 | 16 | 13 | 9 | 1079 | 911 | 11 |
| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| Conflicting Flow All | 2014 | 917 | 922 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 917 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 1097 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 65 | 330 | 741 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 390 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 320 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 63 | 330 | 741 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 187 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 378 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 320 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 22.5 |  | 0.1 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 741 | - | 234 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.012 | - | 0.123 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 9.9 | 0 | 22.5 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | C | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | - | 0.4 | - | - |


| Lane Group | $\begin{aligned} & > \\ & \text { EBL } \end{aligned}$ | EBR | NBL | ¢ ${ }_{\text {NBT }}$ | ¢SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 4 | 「' |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 86 | 15 | 55 | 670 | 800 | 140 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 86 | 15 | 55 | 670 | 800 | 140 |
| Turn Type | Prot | pt+ov | Prot | NA | NA | pt+ov |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 45 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 46 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 45 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 46 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 8.0 |  | 8.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 15.0 |  | 20.0 | 75.0 | 55.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 16.7\% |  | 22.2\% | 83.3\% | 61.1\% |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -2.0 |  | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None |  | None | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.8 | 26.1 | 11.2 | 57.5 | 46.1 | 62.1 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.14 | 0.34 | 0.15 | 0.75 | 0.60 | 0.81 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0.24 | 0.53 | 0.79 | 0.12 |
| Control Delay | 38.7 | 9.8 | 34.9 | 5.3 | 19.7 | 0.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 38.7 | 9.8 | 34.9 | 5.3 | 19.7 | 0.7 |
| LOS | D | A | C | A | B | A |
| Approach Delay | 34.4 |  |  | 7.5 | 16.9 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | A | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 76.6
Natural Cycle: 65
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.79
Intersection Signal Delay: 14.0
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 59.0\%
ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 3: Epping Road (NH 27) \& Continental Drive


| Lane Group | ¢ EBL |  | ${ }_{\text {NBL }}^{4}$ | ¢ NBT | $\downarrow$ SBT | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 96 | 17 | 61 | 744 | 889 | 156 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0.24 | 0.53 | 0.79 | 0.12 |
| Control Delay | 38.7 | 9.8 | 34.9 | 5.3 | 19.7 | 0.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 38.7 | 9.8 | 34.9 | 5.3 | 19.7 | 0.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 46 | 0 | 29 | 112 | 323 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 97 | 14 | 66 | 167 | 548 | 12 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 208 |  |  | 332 | 2112 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  | 125 | 225 |  |  | 225 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 260 | 628 | 380 | 1672 | 1274 | 1295 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.37 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.44 | 0.70 | 0.12 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 268 | 5 | 0 | 134 | 0 | 70 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 268 | 5 | 0 | 134 | 0 | 70 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | 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 | 298 | 6 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 78 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 304 | 0 | 450 | 301 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 301 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 149 | - |
| 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 | - | - | 1257 | - | 567 | 739 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 751 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 879 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1257 | - | 567 | 739 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 567 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 751 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 879 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 10.4 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | B |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 739 | - | -1257 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.105 | - | - | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 10.4 | - | - | 0 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | - | - | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.4 | - | - | 0 | - |




| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |  | Minor1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 278 | 38 |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 38 | - |  |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 240 | - |  |  |  |
| 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 | - | - | 1571 | -712 | 1034 |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 984 | - |  |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 800 | - |  |  |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1571 | - | 700 | 1034 |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 700 | - |  |  |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 984 | - |  |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 786 | - |  |  |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0.8 | 9.1 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | A |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 966 | - | -1571 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.093 | - | -0.016 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9.1 | - | - | 7.3 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.3 | - | - | 0 | - |


| Lane Group | $\Rightarrow$ <br> EBL | EBR | NBL | $\uparrow$NBT | ¢SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 4 | F' |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 209 | 70 | 15 | 935 | 778 | 45 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 209 | 70 | 15 | 935 | 778 | 45 |
| Turn Type | Prot | pt+ov | Prot | NA | NA | pt+ov |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 45 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 46 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 45 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 46 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 8.0 |  | 8.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 18.0 |  | 14.0 | 72.0 | 58.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 20.0\% |  | 15.6\% | 80.0\% | 64.4\% |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -2.0 |  | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None |  | None | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 13.9 | 28.4 | 10.4 | 56.2 | 45.7 | 64.9 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.18 | 0.36 | 0.13 | 0.72 | 0.58 | 0.83 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.74 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.78 | 0.80 | 0.04 |
| Control Delay | 49.9 | 6.3 | 36.1 | 11.7 | 20.3 | 0.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 49.9 | 6.3 | 36.1 | 11.7 | 20.3 | 0.6 |
| LOS | D | A | D | B | C | A |
| Approach Delay | 39.0 |  |  | 12.1 | 19.2 |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | B | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 78.4
Natural Cycle: 70
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.80
Intersection Signal Delay: 18.6
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 67.5\%
ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 3: Epping Road (NH 27) \& Continental Drive


| Lane Group | * | EBR | 4 | ¢ | $\ddagger$ SBT | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 232 | 78 | 17 | 1039 | 864 | 50 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.74 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.78 | 0.80 | 0.04 |
| Control Delay | 49.9 | 6.3 | 36.1 | 11.7 | 20.3 | 0.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 49.9 | 6.3 | 36.1 | 11.7 | 20.3 | 0.6 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 116 | 0 | 8 | 262 | 336 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | \#255 | 31 | 29 | 410 | 506 | 5 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 208 |  |  | 332 | 2112 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  | 125 | 225 |  |  | 225 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 327 | 612 | 233 | 1581 | 1328 | 1315 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.71 | 0.13 | 0.07 | 0.66 | 0.65 | 0.04 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.



| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, S | 25.5 | 1.8 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | D |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT EBLn1 EBLn2 | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 956 | -252 | 403 | - | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.116 | -0.472 | 0.179 | - | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9.3 | 0 | 31.4 | 15.9 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | D | C | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.4 | - | 2.3 | 0.6 | - | - |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 211 | 9 | 12 | 48 | 2 | 68 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 211 | 9 | 12 | 48 | 2 | 68 |
| 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 | 234 | 10 | 13 | 53 | 2 | 76 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |  | Minor1 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 244 | 0 | 318 | 239 |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 239 | - |  |  |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 79 | - |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | - | - | 1322 | - | 675 | 800 |  |  |  |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 801 | - |  |  |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 944 | - |  |  |  |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1322 | - | 668 | 800 |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 668 | - |  |  |  |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 801 | - |  |  |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 935 | - |  |  |  |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 1.6 | 10 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | B |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 796 | - | -1322 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.098 | - | - | 0.01 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 10 | - | - | 7.8 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | - | - | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.3 | - | - | 0 | - |


[^0]:    ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ In vehicles per hour adjacent to the site. Volumes obtained from Figures 2 and 3.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{SB}=$ southbound, $\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound, $\mathrm{WB}=$ westbound and $\mathrm{EB}=$ eastbound. Percentages from volumes on Figures 2 and 3.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB); Corridor Study: Epping Road (NH Route 27), Exeter, NH; December 2020.

[^2]:    2 A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets; American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO); 2018.

[^3]:    3 Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition. Institute of Transportation Engineers; Washington, DC; 2017.

[^4]:    ${ }^{4}$ Trip Generation Handbook; 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Edition; Institute of Transportation Engineers; Washington, DC; June 2004.

[^5]:    5 Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition, Transportation Research Board; Washington, D.C.; 2016.
    6 Synchro plus SimTraffic 11; Trafficware LLC.; Sugar Land, TX; 2019.

[^6]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Volume-to-capacity ratio.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Average control delay in seconds per vehicle.

[^7]:    ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Level of service.
    ${ }^{d}$ Average $/ 95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length in feet per lane (assuming 25 feet per vehicle).

[^8]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Volume-to-capacity ratio.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Average control delay in seconds per vehicle.

[^9]:    ${ }^{c}$ Level of service.
    ${ }^{d}$ Average/ $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length in feet per lane (assuming 25 feet per vehicle).

[^10]:    7 Highway Capacity Manual $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition, Transportation Research Board; Washington, D.C.; 2016.

