# CITY OF MISSION PLANNING COMMISSION 

## AGENDA

April 27, 2020
7:00 PM

## Virtual Through Zoom

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes from the February 24, 2020 Meeting
3. New Business
A. Case \# 20-02 Second Amendment of Final Site Development Plan for The Gateway Development - 4801 Johnson Drive
An application for an second amendment to the final site development for the Gateway development project at 4801 Johnson Drive for the addition of a fifth floor to the office building
a. Staff Report
b. Site Plan and Elevation
c. Memo from City's Traffic Engineer
d. Updated Traffic Study
4. Old Business

Discussion of Phase I Requirements For Projects When A Lender Is Not Involved
5. PC Comments
6. Staff Updates
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The regular meeting of the Mission Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Mike Lee at 7:01 PM Monday, February 24, 2020. Members also present: Robin Dukelow, Burton Taylor, Charlie Troppito, Pete Christiansen, Jordan McGee and Frank Bruce. Stuart Braden and Brad Davidson were absent. Also in attendance: Jim Brown, Building Official, and Audrey McClanahan, Secretary to the Planning Commission.

## Approval of Minutes from the November 25, 2019 Meeting

Comm. Troppito moved and Comm. Bruce seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the November 25, 2019, Planning Commission meeting, with two corrections noted by Comm. Bruce.

The vote was taken (5-0). The motion carried. Commissioners Christiansen and McGee abstained from the vote.

## New Business <br> Election of New Officers

Comm. Dukelow moved and Comm. Troppito seconded a motion to elected Mike Lee as Chairman of the Planning Commission.
The vote was taken (6-0). The motion carried. Commissioner Lee abstained from the vote.

Chair Lee moved and Comm. Taylor seconded a motion to elect Commissioner Braden as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission.
The vote was taken (6-0). The motion carried.

## Case \#20-01 Non-Conforming Situation Permit 5959 Broadmoor Street

Mr. Brown: I'm bringing you this evening Case \#20-01, a request for a non-conforming situation permit for property located at 5959 Broadmoor Street. In attendance this evening is Russ Ehnen, the architect of this project, along with the owner. For specific design questions, landscaping elements, etc., they'll be able to respond to those. This property is comprised of three individual parcels identified. It's located at the northeast corner of Broadmoor Street and Martway Street and is addressed as 5959 Broadmoor Street. The existing one-story building is approximately 3,700 square feet, and a small garage for storage located toward the back of the property has been there for several years. I think they stored barbecue cookers and that sort of thing. The building has been a restaurant since its construction in 1973. It started out as Straw Hat Pizza, and most notably, it served as Johnny's Bar-B-Que for 25 -plus years. In January, the restaurant closed due to the retirement of the owner. The applicant represents a prospective buyer that would like to continue to use the building as a restaurant. The buyer intends to open a restaurant known as The Other Place in the building.
The property is zoned "C-2B" Retail and Service District. A restaurant is an allowable use in this zoning district. This property is subject to the Mission, Kansas Design Guidelines
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for the Johnson Drive Corridor. It is also located in Block S of the West Gateway Overlay District and therefore subject to the West Gateway Form Based Code.
Surrounding properties are all zoned C-2B in this area, both north, east south and west, and both with various entities such as a post office, pet supply, retail stores, carwash, etc. The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Recommendation identifies the subject property for mixed use high density development to include a pedestrian friendly mix of offices, retail, service uses and medium to high density residential. The Form Based Code implements this via the requirement for mid-rise and high-rise structures.
The applicant is requesting approval for modifications to the exterior façade of the existing building by removing the existing mansard style roof elements and replacing with a parapet wall and new entry element, which will incorporate a modern and appealing architectural design. Materials to be used will include brick, native stone veneer and a metal trim overhang. A more detailed description will come a little later in the staff report under the analysis. All proposed exterior renovations are in keeping with the Johnson Drive Design Guidelines. There is no proposed expansion to the existing building or site. A building permit will also be required for the exterior renovation as well as the proposed interior modifications. We will handle that through the building department and permit issuance.
As noted above, the subject property is zoned $\mathrm{C}-2 \mathrm{~B}$, and the intent of this zoning district is for the purpose of permitting, regulating and encouraging retail and service establishments which serve a broad section of the general public. Products and services offered will vary, and in this case, the existing use is permitted within the zoning district. The structure and overall property comply with the stipulations of the zoning district in terms of height, setbacks and parking. In addition, this property is located in Block " S " of the West Gateway Form Based Code district, which stipulates mid-rise structures (2-4 stories in height) and high-rise structures ( $5-16$ stories in height) with parking structures located behind. Upon the adoption of the FBC, the subject property no longer conformed to one or more of the regulations applicable to the Form Based Code. As such, it makes it a legal non-conforming situation.
There are three (3) types of non-conforming situations regulated by the Code. These are use, lot area, and site improvements. The type which applies to this property is the site improvement, which means that the property has improvements like, but not limited to, parking, storm water facilities, sidewalks and landscaping that no longer conform to the current codes that regulate the property. Section 410.340 (C) (1) of the Mission Municipal Code provides for the following:
C. There is hereby incorporated herein by this reference the "Form Based Code for the West Gateway Study Area" ("Form Based Code"), copies of which are on file in the City offices.
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1. Designs and uses set forth in the Form Based Code shall govern all facets of the development or redevelopment in the West Gateway Study Area, except as indicated in Sections 420.130 through 420.230 .
Section 420.190 specific to non-conforming site improvements state that on lots with nonconforming site improvements, no additions to or repairs or renovations of any structure or site improvement may be made without first either bringing the non-conforming site improvements into complete conformity with the regulations applicable to the zoning district in which the lot is located, or obtaining a non-conforming situation permit, which is the reason before us this evening. However, this section does not apply to the following circumstances:
2. Repairs or restoration of a structure pursuant to Subsection (B) of Section 420.170; or
3. Minor repairs or renovation of a structure or site improvement.

Minor repairs or renovation are defined as renovation or repair costs that do not exceed ten percent ( $10 \%$ ) of the structural value of a structure, or the site itself. When an addition to or repairs or renovation of any structure or site improvement is proposed on a lot with a non-conforming site improvements, the Planning Commission may approve the nonconforming situation permit allowing such addition or repairs or renovation if it finds that:

1. The non-conforming site improvement(s) is the only non-conforming situation pertaining to the property.
2. Compliance with the site improvement requirements applicable to the zoning district in which the property is located is not reasonably possible.
3. The property can be developed as proposed without any significant adverse impact on surrounding properties or the public health or safety.
The existing structure does conform to the underlying C-2B district zoning regulations. However, it does not conform to the Form Based Code relative to height and setbacks. In this particular case, Section 420.130 applies specifically to the non-conforming site, and it states:
"No additions to or repairs or renovations of any structure or site improvement may be made without first either bringing the non-conforming site improvements into complete conformity with the regulations applicable to the zoning district in which the lot is located, or obtaining a non-conforming situation permit."

Also, this section will not apply to the following circumstances: Repairs, as we've mentioned, whether minor, or pursuant to 420.170. Specifically, Section 420.170 states:
"Minor repairs to and routine maintenance of structures where non-conforming situations exist are permitted and encouraged. Major renovation, i.e., work estimated to cost more than fifty percent (50\%) of the fair market value of the structure to be renovated shall not be permitted."
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Any repairs, renovation or restoration of a structure pursuant to this Section which would require the issuance of any permit shall also require the issuance of a non-conforming situation permit. That's the reason that we're here. The cost of renovation or repair or restoration shall mean the fair market value of the materials and services necessary to accomplish such renovation, repair or restoration.

The Johnson County Appraiser's Office reflects the value of the structure as being $\$ 373,840$. Fifty percent of this value is $\$ 186,920$. The applicant has indicated the
exterior improvements will be valued at $\$ 275,000$. Minor repairs or renovation of a structure is defined as anything less than $10 \%$. Again, the appraisal is $\$ 373,840$. Ten percent is $\$ 37,384$. And again, exterior improvements will be valued at around $\$ 275,000$. So, in this case doesn't apply. The 10 percent applies. So, what applies in this specific case I Subsection C of Section 420.190.

When an addition to or repairs or renovation of any structure or site improvement is proposed on a lot with a non-conforming site improvements, the Board of Zoning Appeals - or here, the Planning Commission - may approve the non-conforming situation permit. Following those three guidelines, those three bullet points we mentioned earlier, basically the findings define the parameters of whether the Planning Commission will be in favor, or not.

Suggested Findings of Fact for this particular case is applicable to those three items. When we look at item 1, the non-conforming site improvements is the only nonconforming situation pertaining to the property. In this case, the existing structure is the primary non-conforming situation on the property. The Form Based Code stipulates a mid-rise structure with a minimum height of two (2) stories and a setback of no more than ten feet. The existing structure is one story and the existing setbacks from the property lines are approximately 25 feet south, 65 feet west; 29 feet north and 132 feet to the east edge of the parking lot. Full compliance with the Form Based Code would necessitate substantial renovation or the demolition and re-building of the structure which is not reasonably possible or economically feasible.
Item 2. Compliance with the site improvement requirements applicable to the zoning district in which the property is located is not reasonably possible. Full compliance with the Form Based Code would necessitate substantial renovation or the demolition and rebuilding of the structure which is not reasonably possible. Item 3, the property can be developed as proposed without any significant adverse impact on surrounding properties or the public health or safety.
The existing structure was constructed in 1973 and has operated in its current capacity for 47 years without an adverse impact to surrounding properties or the public health and safety. The proposed improvements are cosmetic in nature and will greatly enhance the appearance of the building by providing a fresh modern look and reflect harmony with other recent façade improvements along the Johnson Drive corridor.
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The proposed renovations to the existing structure will begin with removal of the current, faux mansard roofing element that goes around the building, which is discouraged in the Johnson Drive Design Guidelines. An approximately five (5) foot EFIS parapet will be added around the perimeter of the structure to hide the mechanical equipment on the roof. The top of the parapet will be approximately 15 feet in height. Trim accents at each of the corners of the building will help to visually scale down the height of the parapet. In addition to the parapet, an 18 foot accent wall, covered in a native stone, will be added to one side of each entrance, the east and west sides. Perpendicular to the façade and projecting out approximately two feet. From this accent wall a pre-finished metal canopy will extend approximately twenty feet across the east and west façades above the entrances. Altogether, this will create a visually appealing focal point, accenting each entrance to the building The entire building will be painted in a beige color, which you can see here. Including the current brick work, which is [inaudible].
A sign will be added to the wall above each entrance with the name of the proposed business. These are all signs you see here. The script on each one of these signs is 91 square feet, which is within $10 \%$ of the overall façade, which is 975 square feet. The sign does project slightly above the roof line - the parapet - which is not permitted in the City's sign regulation. However, this does not seem to detract from the overall appearance of the building, and staff would be supportive of the minor deviation, meaning this deviation here. We've removed the roof line. Any signage that's above the roof line. It's basically the word "The" and maybe just a portion of some of the letters. Furthermore, the applicant is proposing to remove the existing pole sign located at the corner of Broadmoor and Martway. In its place, the applicant proposes a monument sign, which is acceptable under the sign regulations in lieu of one of the allowable wall signs. Three wall signs are basically allowed, but the applicant is seeking only two, thereby allowing for the monument sign. Monument signs can be no more than six feet in height. The monument sign would be in this location here. Here are the monument sign details. Typically, they are six feet in height and they must be 10 feet back from the curb, in this case. For every additional 10 feet that you are back from the curb, you are allowed one foot in height increase. So, this monument sign is probably 25 feet back; therefore, seven feet as proposed is allowed. And then, all sign requirements in addition to, as far as approving the process, is going to be approved through City staff with a sign permit application.
The two existing sweet gum trees located will be removed and replaced with Heritage River birch, which is a preferred tree for Northeast Kansas. A western red cedar trellis is proposed to be constructed around the cooler that protrudes from the southside of the building. The trellis will have English Ivy with daylilies planted around the base, all to serve as a screen for the cooler, and break-up the massing of the south wall. Junipers will be placed around the perimeter of the outdoor patio on the west side of the building, which is this area here. In addition, the patio that you see here, that's also noted in the plan as having a future trellis [inaudible] developments of new concrete, but that's at a future date, and that's not going to be part of the immediate scope of work for the building.
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All proposed renovations are in keeping with Johnson Drive guidelines, and staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the findings of fact contained in this staff report and grant a non-conforming situation permit for Case \#20-01, located at 5959 Broadmoor Street. There will be no City Council action required.

Chair Lee: Thank you. Would the applicant like to step forward?
Mr. Ehnen: Good evening, I'm Russ Ehnen, I'm the architect, here on behalf of The Other Place. I'd like to introduce Troy Stedman, the owner of the Owner Place, and Clayton Pressley (?), one of his colleagues. Troy will speak to you in a few minutes.
First, I'd like to commend City of Mission staff. Jim and Brian Scott, while they were very firm and professional in protecting Mission's interests, they were also very reasonable in recognizing that we have a 45-year-old building and development that's not been covered by very new and modern building code and zoning ordinance. They were very helpful and provided good guidance through the process. Thankful, that's a very welcome and refreshing change to what we experience in a lot of jurisdictions. l'd just like to extend kudos to them for doing a fine job.

Briefly, a couple words about the architecture. I had the good fortune to design the Cornerstone project just to the northeast of this, and we've picked up on a lot of the details and materials. While not exactly mimicking that project, we have a lot of the proportions and same hues and earth tones as that, and we think it makes for a nice homogenous addition to the area. In terms of the landscaping, we picked materials that are very hardy and durable. This is a semi-urban situation and there's not a lot of green space, and it's not irrigated, so we wanted things that you kind of have to work at to hurt, that kind of take care of themselves.
Lastly, one thing that we did that wasn't in the report, that we think is very important, the adjacent property about right here has a pretty big drop-off. This is a car wash, and right now, there's only some concrete wheel stops there. We're going to install a steel guardrail there so that people and cars don't, even though it's not on our property, where the hazard is, we think it's important to provide that margin of safety there. That's about all I had. I'm certainly willing to entertain any questions or comments. If not, l'll let Troy tell you a little more about his business.

Chair Lee: Any questions?
Comm. Troppito: I have a question. There's the building, and the improvements, and then there's the property. Who owns the property? Who will [inaudible] on the property? Will the applicant's lease the property, or acquire title to the whole property?
Mr. Ehnen: The Other Place is purchasing the property and the building.
Comm. Troppito: Okay, thank you.
Unidentified Commissioner: I have questions in regard to some of the existing fans that are located on the roof, particularly the grease fan. Will the parapet be above that grease fan? Will that grease fan be concealed?
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Mr. Ehnen: That's one of the reasons why we raised these two elements, particularly on the main entry side [inaudible] parking. That roof top equipment is about right here, and this awning comes out of this raised height here, and will do a good job screening it.
Unidentified Commissioner: So from the street, the sidewalk, are people going to be able to see it?
Mr. Ehnen: It's not particularly visible from this direction now. It's more visible when you're coming in. So, we think this is the most effective way to do it. I'm not going to warrant to you that you'll never, ever see equipment up there because this existing parapet is really low. But within the bounds of what we can do, we thought that would be the most effective way to do it.
Comm. Dukelow: I have a couple questions as a follow up to what Commissioner [inaudible] said. When one is heading south on Martway from, say, the post office, I'm pretty sure you'd be able to see the roof. Because as you know, it goes up. So, my question would be, would you agree to screen the rooftop equipment as required by the City?
Mr. Ehnen: Your assessment is correct. We really can't raise the wall up high enough to screen it when you're looking from above. We can certainly put some metal panels that are maybe the same color as the band, or something like that, to screen it. You wouldn't see the veins, or the grills, or all the parts of the mechanical equipment itself, but you would see the metal screens.

Comm. Dukelow: That would be desirable, if you'd work with City staff to accomplish that. And I also have a question regarding the dumpster enclosure. I don't see any details, and if memory serves me, there currently is no enclosure for the dumpster. So, l'm wondering what the plan and the details are for that.
Mr. Ehnen: We would match the base of the building with the concrete slope block that's painted the gray. Or currently painted gray, will be beige.
Comm. Dukelow: [inaudible] painted [inaudible] fully grouted, details, I don't know...? Where are you going with it?
Mr. Ehnen: Well, the current building is made out of a concrete block product called slump block, and we would match that slump block veneer around the [inaudible] base. Of course, it would have gates. We'd match the base of the building, basically?
Comm. Dukelow: And a steel gate?
Mr. Ehnen: Typically we would do steel.
Comm. Dukelow: And the location of that? It looks like it might be in front of it.
Mr. Ehnen: It is. There's a pad here right now, and there was a wood enclosure there, but it was dilapidated, so we removed... We would just be replacing that in the same location with the hard material.
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Comm. Dukelow: And is that adequate for both the trash dumpster and the grease container?
Mr. Ehnen: Yes, it is. Most of the restaurants anymore have a grease management system, where they have a couple of tanks. They don't generate the kind of grease they used to, so it's all filtered and run through those tanks.
Comm. Dukelow: Okay. So, I anticipate that any containers or refuse would fit inside whatever that detailed enclosure comes out to be?
Mr. Ehnen: Right. There's a 30 or 40 yard dumpster that will go in there, and the management is based on frequency, how often it gets serviced.
Comm. Dukelow: So that's another detail that we need to look at with City staff. It's not been represented in our documents today. Two more questions related to landscape. This may be in part a question for City staff, and it may be in part a question for the design team. The south side of the parking area along Martway, certainly that parking could be screened by low plant material. And I'm not sure exactly what the City has in mind. I know that we recently re-did the Broadmoor corridor there with site elements, sidewalks, and all of that. So, l'm not sure if there's been any dialog regarding the landscape screening, the screening of the parking along Martway, at this point.
Mr. Ehnen: Additional landscaping in this area?
Comm. Dukelow: Correct. It's, what, about 30 feet?
Mr. Ehnen: No, it's about 120 feet.
Comm. Dukelow: I'm looking at... Just the section where there are two...
[crosstalk]
Mr. Ehnen: This is $60 . .$.
Comm. Dukelow: Right...
[crosstalk]
Mr. Ehnen: ... with a 30 -foot drive... [crosstalk] So, 90 feet.
Comm. Dukelow: ... certainly don't want to interrupt the triangle there. My third question has to do with, again, landscaping. The Heritage River birch. Is that one of the trees on our plant materials palette?
Mr. Ehnen: Preferred planning list, yes.

## Comm. Dukelow: It is?

Mr. Ehnen: It is.
Comm. Dukelow: Thank you. That's all I have.
Comm. Troppito: I have a couple more questions. In this area where the shed is, and what's shown as green space there. I tried to get staff to pull the satellite picture there.
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What I'm looking at is a satellite image taken by Google in January. And if anybody wants to verify it, [inaudible]. It shows around the shed what appears to be just a whole bunch of junk laying around. Maybe a car. Look at Johnny's Bar-B-Que. If you're using AIMS, I'm not sure you're going to see what l'm looking at.

## Unidentified Female: This one?

Comm. Troppito: Click on satellite view, down on the lower left. Zoom in on Johnny's. Zoom in towards the shed, where the shed is. All right. It's kind of hard to see the same details l'm seeing because of the resolution on the screen, but what l'm seeing is some cars parked there, a bunch of miscellaneous, what appears to be junk laying around there. [inaudible] potential green space, once it was all cleaned up. You could do more plantings in there, I would think. To the left of the shed.

Mr. Brown: I can certainly warrant that The Other Place will pick up and remove any debris, anything that's abandoned. I can't speak to the landscaping. I'd like to look at the ordinance for both parking lot screening and that. But one of the things, for instance, that you're seeing here is dumpsters that will, one will go away, and one will go here and be enclosed. Frankly, I'm not sure what those circular things are on that map.
Comm. Troppito: Well, I'm kind of [inaudible] higher resolution image in my laptop. There, you can see a lot more. Nonetheless, the point l'm trying to make besides it needs to be cleaned up is there's potential to plant more trees there. More birch trees and landscaping. Depending on what use the new owners are going to make of it. I haven't seen anything addressed about what use that shed is going to be, or what it's going to be used for.

Mr. Brown: I'll let them speak in more detail to that. The property line us here, and there's really not enough breadth for a drive and more parking, so I don't think that's a feasible solution. But I don't know that they've got anything projected long term for that particular space at this time.
Comm. Troppito: I just see an opportunity to provide more planting here [inaudible] reduce CO-2 emissions. That's my main [inaudible]. Birch trees would be good for that.
Unidentified: Just to clarify, are you asking them to put trees there, or are we asking staff, if it's required by staff?

Comm. Troppito: Well, I'm asking if they're planning to do it, whether it's required or not.
Unidentified: We haven't discussed that area at all, and I don't know if they've contemplated anything. I'll let them speak to what they may or may not do in the future.
Comm. Troppito: I'd just like to see it.
Chair Lee: Other questions? Thanks.
Mr. Stedman: Good evening, everyone. Troy Stedman is my name. I'm the owner and operator of The Other Place restaurants here in Johnson County. I'm a big fan of trees, by the way, so l'll start with that. A little bit about myself. We've been in Johnson County
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since 1997. We had our first location in downtown Overland Park, and have been operating [inaudible] three years. Recently, we opened another store in western Shawnee. That's been fantastic for us. Now, truth be told, l've had my eye on the Mission community for quite some time. When this opportunity arose, I didn't hesitate to jump on it. I know it's big shoes to fill with Johnny's, which has been there for... 40 years now? Is that right? So, we will do our very best to contribute. I would love to take questions if you have any.
Comm. Troppito: Well, nothing but what l've already asked.
Mr. Stedman: Okay. Anything regarding the concept, or...?
Comm. Dukelow: I've been to The Other Place in Overland Park several times. I enjoy it. It seems to be a good use. The questions I had were really regarding the landscaping and the site development, which I already shared.
Comm. Bruce: What are your anticipated hours of operation?
Mr. Stedman: Eleven a.m. daily to probably midnight during the week. I would say until 1:00 or 1:30 on Friday and Saturday. The community will kind of dictate those hours. If it's worth our while, we'll stay open.
Chair Lee: Anything else? [None.] Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to speak? [None.] I have a question for staff. When you address the sign extending above the roof line, these canopies that are going away, that are.... Sounds like [inaudible]. Do those not become the new roof [inaudible]...?
Mr. Brown: We'll be looking at all of that, yes.
Chair Lee: So that may not be a deviation.
Mr. Brown: It may not.
Chair Lee: Comments? Discussion? [None.]
Comm. Troppito: Mr. Chair, I move that the Planning Commission approve the NonConforming Situation Permit for Application \#20-01; allowing the applicant to make modifications to the exterior facade of the building at 5959 Broadmoor Street once applicable City building permits have been reviewed and issued.
Mr. Bruce: Second.
Comm. Dukelow: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make an amendment to the motion. The motion as stated, with: Work with City staff to get all the landscape plan along Martway; work with City staff on details of the dumpster and roof containment, enclosure, per City requirements; and work with City staff to screen rooftop equipment.
Comm. Troppito: And the dumpster?
Comm. Dukelow: That was dumpster and grease container.
Comm. Troppito: Second.
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The vote was taken (7-0). The motion as amended passed.
The vote was taken (7-0). The motion passed.

## Old Business

Mr. Troppito: At our last meeting in November, I requested staff to consult with the City Administrator and City Attorney regarding requiring Phase 1 environmental site assessments for certain applications coming before this commission by applicants whose property did not meet the subject of the [inaudible] sophisticated lenders. I asked for a report for that. I was advised by Brian by email that [inaudible] he couldn't get to it, [inaudible]. I just want to note for the record that I'm still looking forward to receiving that at our next meeting.

Mr. Brown: I'll make sure I pass that information on to Mr. Scott.

## Staff Updates

Mr. Brown stated that a joint meeting between Planning Commission and City Council is scheduled for Thursday, March $12^{\text {th }}$. Also, interviews for a full-time planner are taking place.

ADJOURNMENT
With no other agenda items, Comm. Bruce moved and Comm. Christiansen seconded a motion to adjourn. (Vote was unanimous). The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 7:47 P.M.

Mike Lee, Chair
ATTEST:

Audrey McClanahan, Secretary

## STAFF REPORT Planning Commission Meeting April 27, 2020

AGENDA ITEM NO.:<br>1<br>PROJECT NUMBER / TITLE: Application \# 20-02<br>\section*{REQUEST:}<br>\section*{LOCATION:}<br>\section*{APPLICANT:}<br>PROPERTY OWNER:<br>STAFF CONTACT:<br>Second Amendment of Final Site Development Plan for The Gateway Development<br>4801 Johnson Drive (Approx. 17 acres bounded by Johnson Drive Roeland Dr., Shawnee Mission Pkwy., and Roe Ave.)<br>Matt Valenti, Cameron Group, LLC.<br>Aryeh Realty, LLC<br>140 Broadway, Floor 41<br>New York, NY 10005<br>Brian Scott, Assistant City Administrator<br>PUBLIC HEARING:<br>Not Applicable



## Property Information:

The subject property is an approximately 17 acre parcel located at the southwest corner of Johnson Drive and Roe Avenue. It is the site of the former Mission Mall. The property is bounded by Johnson Drive on the north, Roe Avenue on the east, Shawnee Mission Parkway on the south and Roeland Drive on the west. The property is zoned Planned Mixed Use District "MXD." This district is intended to encourage a variety of land uses in closer proximity to one another than would be possible with more conventional zoning districts, and to encourage building configurations that create a distinctive and memorable sense of place.
Developments in this district are allowed and expected to have a mixture of residential, office and retail uses, along with public spaces, entertainment uses and other specialty facilities that are compatible in both character and function. Developments are also expected to utilize shared parking facilities linked to multiple buildings and uses by an attractive and
logical pedestrian network that places more emphasis on the quality of the pedestrian experience than is generally found in a typical suburban development. Buildings are intended to be primarily multi-story structures with differing uses organized vertically rather than the horizontal separation of uses that commonly results from conventional zoning districts. The property is also subject to the Mission, Kansas Design Guidelines for the Johnson Drive Corridor.

Surrounding properties are zoned and developed as follows:
North: Roeland Park "OB" Office Building District-small offices, "PUB" Public Services - park, and "MXD" Mixed Use District - bank and micro-hospital
West: Mission "RP-3" Planned Townhome District-Roeland Court Townhomes, "MS2" Main Street District 2 - restaurant and vacant building, "R-1" Single Family Residential District-detached dwelling units,
South: Mission "RP-6" Planned High Rise Apartment District-vacant "C-1" Restricted Business District-bank, "C-O" Office Building District-dentist and other office uses.
East: Fairway "R-1" Single Family Residential District-detached dwelling units.
Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Recommendation for this area:
The Comprehensive Plan indicates this area is appropriate for Mixed Use High-Density to be composed of a pedestrian friendly mix of neighborhood and community office uses, retail-commercial and service-commercial uses, institutional, civic, and medium to high density residential.

## Project Background:

The subject property was once the site of the Mission Shopping Center (AKA the Mission Mall), one of the first suburban shopping centers built in the region in the mid 1950s. In 2005 The Cameron Group, LLC, a development company from East Syracuse, New York, purchased the property with plans to demolish the mall and build a mixed-use development on the site. In 2006 the Planning Commission reviewed and approved the rezoning and preliminary site plan for the redevelopment of the subject property for urban development composed of retail, office, hotel, restaurant, and residential uses (Ordinance \#1203).

Since the "MXD" zoning and preliminary site plan was first approved, the project has evolved through several iterations reflected in revised plans presented to the Planning Commission and City Council in 2007, 2008, 2012, 2015 and 2016. The current preliminary site development plan was approved by the City Council on January 20, 2016 after a public hearing and consideration before the Planning Commission on September 28, 2015. A final site development plan was approved by the Planning Commission in March of 2017.

At the time of approval, the plan encompassed three, connected apartment buildings (Buildings "C," "D" and "E") at the corner of Johnson Drive and Roeland Drive; a seven-story hotel at the corner of Roeland Drive and Shawnee Mission Parkway (Building "B"); an office building (Building "F"); and a large, somewhat undefined retail space (Building "A"). Each of these buildings surrounded a three-level parking structure within the interior of the site. The developer's intent was to proceed with the development of the project in three, sequential phases beginning with the apartment buildings and then the hotel and garage, and finally the retail space. The office building would be constructed when a tenant was identified and specific needs for use defined.

## Project Update:

Since the approval of the final development plan by the Planning Commision in March of 2017, the developer has been presented with opportunities that better defined the future retail component of the project and necessitated changing the phasing of the construction.

Construction plans were submitted a year ago for an approximately 90,000 square foot movie theater and entertainment venue known as Cinergy, a company based out of Texas and new to the Kansas City market. Construction plans were approved and a building permit issued last summer. Construction is currently underway and is expected to be completed late summer or early fall of this year.

Immediately adjacent to the Cinergy building, on the northside, will be a 39,995 square foot food hall. The building will be 2-stories. The first story will comprise a 4,300 square foot, sit-down restaurant and an 18,000 square foot, food hall providing approximately 14 stalls for independent food vendors around a communal dining area. The second story component will include a possible indoor golf experience ( 8,700 square feet) and restaurant terrace ( 1,000 square feet). The balance of the space is for kitchen, preparation and storage. This was approved with the amended FDP in October of 2019. Design work is currently underway.

As proposed in the originally approved FDP, there will be a parking structure in the middle of the development site that provides parking for all of the uses. The originally approved parking structure was a 3 level garage with 793 parking spaces. The parking structure connected directly to both the hotel and the office building. The parking structure has been redesigned to be a 4 level structure with 808 parking spaces, but with a smaller footprint on the site. This redesigned parking structure was approved with the amended FDP in October of 2019. Plans have been submitted and reviewed, and a building permit was issued the first week of March. Construction is expected to be completed in the fall.

Building " $F$ " was initially proposed in the approved 2017 FDP to be a 3 -story office building totalling 58,000 squre feet. This past fall the developer requested approval for an additional 4th-story bringing the total square footage to 76,487 . This was approved with the amended FDP in October of 2019.

Building " B " on the southwest corner of the site is a 202 room, 7 -story hotel. To the north, Buildings "C", "D" and "E" along Roeland Drive and Johnson Drive are three, separate aparment buildings connected by an enclosed walkway between each. Each apartment building is 4-stories, three stories of residential units above small retail shops on the ground floor. There are 168 residential units between all three buildings. Both the hotel and the apartment buildings remain substantially the same since the original FDP was approved in March of 2017. Construction plans for both have been submitted and reviewed. These projects are expected to be initiated this summer once financing is secured.

## Plan Review and Modifications

Since obtaining approval for the amended FDP this past October, the developer has secured another tenant for the office building (Building "F"), necessitating another floor to be added to the building. Thus, the developer is requesting a second amendment to the FDP.

As stated above, the office building was initially proposed in the approved 2017 FDP as a 3 -story office building totalling 58,000 square feet. The developer requested approval for a 4 -story office building totaling 76,487 square feet this past October, which was approved. The
developer is now requesting approval for a 5-story office building with a total square footage of 103,557 square feet (an additional 27,070 square feet). The 4 -story building was approved with a total height of 58 feet (all four stories). There is a mechanical screen on the roof bringing the overall height to 73 feet. The additional story will bring the overall height to 73 feet (all five stories). The mechanical screen would be an additional 17 feet bringing the overall height to 95 feet.

The overall design of the building remains the same as it was approved in October of 2019. The ground level of the building will be mostly open to allow for vehicle circulation underneath and future access to utilities. There will be a small entry point comprised of a vestibule, elevator, and stairway. Toward the back of the ground level there will be an area for service deliveries, storage, maintenance and mechanical equipment. A bike storage area for employees wishing to ride their bike to work will also be located here. The upper four levels are comprised of open office space. Floor plans are shown on sheet FDP-A114.

The exterior of the building (sheet FDP-A205) consists of an aluminum curtain wall system with different shades of glass windows throughout the upper four levels. This makes for an interesting interplay between the metal and glazing. A large prodema panel inset is proposed for the upper two levels of the east elevation of the building. This will create a point of interest for the building, especially for those driving west on Shawnee Mission Parkway. It will also soften the building and give it additional "texture."

The mechanical equipment on the roof of the building will be screened in on all four sides with metal box-rib panels. The base of the building (ground level) will be board formed concrete that will match other elements on the site by the apartment buildings and hotel, again tying the entire site together.

A comparison of the modifications between the approved FDP and the amended FDP and the second amended FDP is shown in the table on the next page. The total floor area with the proposed second amendment has been increased by 27,070 square feet or $35 \%$ for the office building. The total floor area for the entire Gateway development has been increased by $5 \%$. All design elements of the office building, the entire development project, remain unchanged.

An updated traffic study was submitted with the application to indicate the additional office tenant. The study's calculations indicate that the additional trip generations will not have an impact on the overall traffic patterns, and the recommendations remain as they were with the traffic study that was completed with the amended FDP in October. The updated study has been reviewed by the City's on-call traffic engineer, and he concurs with the recommendations.


## Parking and Loading

The approved 2017 FDP provided for a total of 1,528 parking spaces over the entire project site. Surface parking (including on-street parking) totaled 735 spaces and structured parking totaled 793 spaces. The amended FDP that was approved this past October reduced the number of surface parking spaces to 649 while increasing the number of structured parking spaces to 808. The total number of parking spaces overall was reduced by 71 spaces to 1,457 . A reduction of $5 \%$.

Surface parking includes angled parking spaces along Johnson Drive adjacent to street-level retail in Building "E", a surface parking lot along Roeland Drive adjacent to street-level retail in Buildings "C" and " $D$ ", and interior to the site in front of and below the parking structure. Generally all of the surface parking is earmarked for the retail component of the development project.

Parking on the second level of the garage is primarily for hotel patrons and employees working in the office building. The walkway to the hotel is at this level. Parking on the third level is primarily for apartment building residents and office building employees. The four walkways to the apartment buildings are all on this level. Parking on the fourth level of the parking structure is for office employees and retail overflow. There is a walkway from each level of the parking structure to the office building.

MXD zoning provides the following parking requirements:

- 1 parking space for 4 seats in restaurants and theaters. This would equate to 345 parking spaces for both the Cinergy building and food hall.
- 1 parking space for each hotel room plus 1 parking space for each four employees. This would equate to approximately 220 parking spaces.
- 1.5 parking spaces for each residential unit. This would equate to 252 parking spaces for the three apartment buildings.
These three uses total 817 required parking spaces. The MXD zoning is silent on parking requirements for office uses or other retail uses.

Section 425.020 - Minimum Space Requirements of the City's zoning code provides the following parking requirements:

- 2.84 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet for general offices. This would equate to 217 parking spaces for the proposed office building as approved with the amended FDP in October. With the additional floor now being proposed, this will increase the parking count to 294 parking spaces.
- 4 parking spaces per lane for bowling facilities. This would equate to 64 parking spaces for the bowling component of the Cinergy building.
- 3.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of shopping center. This would equate to 189 for the small shop retail on the ground floor of the apartment buildings.

All uses above total $\mathbf{4 , 2 8 7} \mathbf{1 , 3 6 4}$ parking spaces required. This is $\mathbf{1 7 0}$, or $\mathbf{1 3 \%}$, 93, or 7\%, less than 1,457 parking spaces being proposed.

## Access Management \& Traffic Impact

Access into the site is proposed from six access points, three on Roeland Drive, one on Johnson Drive, and two on Roe Avenue. The driveway access to the back of the Cinergy building off of Roe Avenue has been narrowed. All street intersections surrounding the subject
property are currently signalized.
The applicant has submitted an update to the previous traffic impact study analyzing existing conditions, conditions in accordance with the approved 2017 FDP, and conditions with the proposed amendment to the FDP amended FDP approved in October of 2019, and the now proposed second amendment to the FDP. The traffic impact study has made the following recommendations, which can be found on page 37 of the study. These recommendations are the same as what was submitted with the approved amended FDP in October of 2019.

1. Lengthen the eastbound left turn lane at Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive from the current 330 feet to 390 feet to provide for deceleration and additional queuing.
2. Re-time signals at the intersections of Shawnee Mission Parkway with Roeland Drive and Roe Avenue with Johnson Drive to accommodate development trips.
3. Re-stripe the north leg of the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive to provide a dedicated southbound left-turn lane, shared through/left-turn lane, and dedicated southbound right-turn lane.
4. Modify the curb radius in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive to support large trucks. Provide turning templates and specific demission to Kansas Department of Transportation with final design.
5. The existing pavement markings for the outside through lane along Shawnee Mission Parkway at Roeland Drive should be restriped to provide an appropriate taper for the existing outside westbound lane. Turn lane including taper should be 350 ' in length to accommodate right-turn vehicles decelerating from 45 mph .
6. Extend the median along Roe Avenue to limit right-in/right-out access at Drives 5 and 6.
7. Provide appropriate corner radii at Drives 5 and 6 to accommodate truck traffic.
8. Provide a 100 ' southbound right-turn lane at Drive 5 along Roe Avenue.
9. Minimum throat distance of 75 ' should be provided at each proposed drive to allow for vehicles to stack internal the site without effecting vehicles maneuvering within the site.
10. Pedestrian accommodations should be provided along the north and west legs at the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive. Accommodations should conform with ADA standards, this includes adequate ramp design with detectable warnings and vibrotactile push buttons.

In addition, conditions should be re-evaluated in 15 to 20 years with the following possible recommendations in mind.

1. If volumes materialize in the future, it is recommended to consider the following improvements to improve operations at the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive:
2. Provide dual eastbound left turn lanes with 350 ' of storage.
3. Provide dedicated northbound left-turn lane with 100 ' of storage.
4. Provide dedicated westbound right-turn lane with $230^{\prime}$ of storage.
5. Update signal timings.

The City's on-call traffic engineer, George Butler Associates (GBA), has reviewed the applicant's revised Traffic Impact study and the final site plans as well as the Kansas Department of Transportation. GBA accepts the applicant's proposed improvements as adequate for the expected traffic impacts of development of the site.

## Stormwater Management

A multi-barrel reinforced concrete box (RCB) drainage system was installed across the site underground for this portion of Rock Creek. The RCB's were designed to convey the 100 year storm event and a letter of map revision (LOMR) has been approved by FEMA taking the property out of the flood zone. Therefore a floodplain permit is not required. Storm sewers for the site will direct water into this system at various locations and surface grading will direct overflows.

The City's on-call engineer at GBA has reviewed the Drainage Study and the proposed final site plans for storm water control. This included consideration of the amount of impervious surface in the development scenario, peak water flows after rain storms, and the location of below ground development features in relation to existing storm sewers. A reduction in the amount of impervious surface has been demonstrated by the addition of green space compared to the existing (pre-demolition) condition. The layout of any piers footings for the new buildings will be reviewed against the pier plan used during the construction of the RCB's. Venting for the proper function of the RCB's will be taken into consideration with the design of the parking structure and the food hall as part of building permit review.

There is no change to the storm water management as previously proposed.

## Consideration of Final Site Plans (440.160 \& 440.190)

Final site plans which contain modifications from the approved preliminary development plan but which are in substantial compliance with the preliminary plan, may be approved by the Planning Commission without a public hearing, provided that the Commission determines that the landscaping and screening plan is adequate and that all other submission requirements have been satisfied. In addition the site plan shall be approved by the Planning Commission if it determines that:

1. The site is capable of accommodating the building(s), parking areas and drives with appropriate open space.
-The building, parking area, driveways, and open space have been designed to meet codes and guidelines and have been reviewed by the City's on-call engineers.
2. The plan provides for safe and easy ingress, egress and internal traffic circulation.
-There is adequate space on the site to allow for on-site circulation of customer traffic and design vehicles. Impacts to traffic on adjacent public streets has been studied and the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) has been endorsed by City's engineers with stipulations.
3. The plan is consistent with good land planning and site engineering design principles.
-The proposed plan is consistent with the City's zoning and site development standards with the stipulations noted.
4. An appropriate degree of harmony will prevail between the architectural quality of the proposed building(s) and the surrounding neighborhood.
-The proposed project is of high quality design and adds to the diverse architecture of the surrounding area.
5. The plan represents an overall development pattern that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted planning policies.
-The proposed mixed use development is consistent in density and design with the City's adopted plans and policies.
6. Right-of-way for any abutting thoroughfare has been dedicated pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 455.
-A plat reflecting the proposed development pattern has not been submitted. One has been submitted to the City for review and is anticipated to be presented to the Planning Commission next month for consideration. Any required right-of-way changes for this site will be addressed at that time.

## Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Second Amendment to the Final Site Development Plan Case \# 20-02 for the Gateway development project with the following conditions:

1. Roadway construction plans will need to be presented to the City and/or the Kansas Department of Transportation in accordance with the recommendations outlined in the Traffic Impact Study.

## Planning Commission Actions

Case \# 20-02 - Second Amendment to the Gateway Final Development Plan will be presented to the Planning Commission for their consideration at their regularly scheduled meeting on March 23, 2020..
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## DESIGN MEMORANDUM

To: $\quad$ Brian Scott, MPPA, CPM (Assistant City Administrator / Finance Director)<br>From: David J. Mennenga, P.E., PTOE<br>Date: March 9, 2020<br>Subject: On-Call Traffic Engineering Review - Mission Gateway Traffic Impact Study

As you requested, GBA's traffic engineers have completed our review of the updated Traffic Impact Study (TIS) report submitted to the City of Mission by Olsson Associates (OA) on February 14, 2020. This design memorandum summarizes our review comments regarding the submitted TIS report.

- We continue to concur with the overall scope of this traffic study and find it to be appropriate for the large, mixed-use development that is proposed. As you are aware, the previous version of this TIS report was thoroughly reviewed by GBA and KDOT's Access Management staff during 2019, with final revisions made by OA and KDOT approvals finally granted in October 2019. In general, the impetus behind this current update of the TIS report is the developer's desire to provide an additional 30,000 -square feet of proposed office space (i.e., one extra story on the proposed building).
- It should be noted that the OA traffic engineer-of-record for this TIS update is now Shannon Jeffries, whereas Todd Frederickson had sealed all previous TIS reports received by the City on this project. We have noted several instances where slightly different assumptions have now been made that have resulted in revised traffic assignments and phased traffic volumes. In particular, we noted that the pass-by trip distribution percentages on Figure 3 and Figure 8 were modified from previous TIS reports. It appears that a previous error regarding the future growth calculations along southbound Roe Avenue during the P.M. peak hour has now been rectified, as shown on Figure 12. Finally, different allocations of additional green time for north-south vehicles on Roeland Drive versus the mainline east-west through traffic volumes at the intersection with Shawnee Mission Parkway have resulted in slightly worse Synchro Level of Service (LOS) results for the overall intersection, as shown on Figure 14.
- As a result of the proposed land use changes, it was necessary for OA to provide new calculations regarding the expected trip generation estimates for the development site. In addition to the increase in proposed office space, more detailed information is also now available regarding the planned Cinergy entertainment venue and food hall concepts. Therefore, the revised land uses and sizes detailed in Table 9 have now been utilized. When the appropriate internal trip capture rates and pass-by trip deductions are calculated, as shown in Table 10, the revised development program creates a net overall decrease of 81 vehicles (i.e., -1 inbound trips and -80 outbound trips) during the A.M. peak hour and a net overall increase of 117 vehicles (i.e., +39 inbound trips and +78 outbound trips) during the P.M. peak hour. We concur with the trip generation estimates
and calculations provided in these tables. As a result of these revisions, the phased traffic volumes for the "Existing plus Approved plus Development" scenario (see Figure 9) and the Future Year 2038 scenario (see Figure 12) have been logically modified. GBA's traffic engineers independently verified that the driveway assignments at the proposed development access points are consistent with the inbound, outbound, and overall trip totals listed in Table 10.
- Although its need was not specifically indicated from an operational standpoint, this study now includes a 130 -foot northbound right-turn lane into Drive 2 that is provided within the available rights-of-way. This additional turn lane should relieve some prior GBA / City staff concerns regarding the internal blockage of ingress vehicles at Drive 2, by ensuring that inbound vehicle blockages would not directly impact northbound through vehicle movements on Roeland Drive.
- As a result of these revised design traffic volumes for the proposed land uses, and the afore-mentioned differences in the green time allocations at several of the signalized study intersections, there are various changes - sometimes slightly better, sometimes slightly worse in the LOS and vehicle queuing conditions for individual traffic movements (see Figure 11 and Figure 14). In general, most LOS changes for individual movements or overall intersection performances are limited to only one letter grade differences. Overall, in our opinion these minor differences are justified and do not materially change the outcome from this TIS process.
- The conclusions provided in the TIS summary are generally identical to those in the previously approved version of the report. This version of the study continues to appropriately identify several of the final comments addressed by OA in order to gain KDOT's final approval in October 2019, including the geometric extension of the eastbound left-turn lane on Shawnee Mission Parkway at the Roeland Drive intersection to meet KDOT requirements. This report again identifies several additional geometric improvements at this particular study intersection that may be required to satisfy the Future Year 2038 traffic conditions, noting that the "poor operations indicated during the future scenario can be attributed to background traffic growth and is (sic) not specifically attributed to trips associated with the proposed development."
cc: JCC, BAB, KGM, file
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report is an update to a traffic impact study submitted by Olsson in March of 2017, revised October 2019, titled 'The Gateway Development'. The study has been updated to account for a modification to the proposed site plan. The residential/retail portion of the proposed site has been approved by the City and is currently being constructed. This study will provide an update regarding the unconstructed hotel, office, and retail uses located on the south and east sides of the development.

This report studies traffic impacts regarding a proposed development located in the northeast quadrant of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive. A portion of the development including residential apartment units and shopping center has been approved with construction expected to be completed by Fall of 2020. The approved development also included office and retail land uses located south and east of the residential and shopping development. Modifications are proposed to the office and retail uses; thus, this study addresses traffic impacts of these proposed changes.

This report will review the impacts of the proposed development on the existing roadway network and will recommend additional turn lanes, storage bays, and intersection control methods as appropriate. Shawnee Mission Parkway (US-56) is maintained by the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT), thus KDOT's Access Management Policy was used to review Shawnee Mission Parkway (US-56) and Roeland Drive. The remaining study intersections and proposed site drives will be reviewed using KDOT criteria and engineering judgement.

- Roeland Drive and Martway Street
- Roeland Drive and Johnson Drive
- Johnson Drive and Roe Avenue
- Site driveways and access points, as appropriate

For this study, the following scenarios were analyzed:

- Existing plus Approved Development conditions*
- Existing plus Approved plus Proposed Development conditions*
- Future Conditions (2038)*
* Includes approved residential and retail development proposed in the existing plus development scenario of the previous report completed in 2017.

The approximate location of the development is show on the vicinity map, Figure 1.

## FIGURE 1
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## 2. DATA COLLECTION

The data collection effort included acquiring peak hour turning movement counts and documentation of current roadway geometrics. Traffic counts were collected on Tuesday, October $4^{\text {th }}, 2018$ at the study intersections listed in Section 1.0.

The counts were conducted during the typical weekday AM and PM peak periods from 7:009:00 AM and 4:00-6:00 PM. The AM peak hour period for the study intersections was determined to be from 7:30-8:30 AM. The PM peak hour period for the study intersections was determined to be from 5:00-6:00 PM. Existing peak hour count data is shown in Figure 2. Count data collected for this study can be found in Appendix A.

Existing signal timing information for the signalized intersections were obtained from MidAmerica Regional Council (MARC), KCP\&L and the previous study:

- Shawnee Mission Parkway (US-56) and Roeland Drive (MARC)
- Roeland Drive and Martway Street (Previous study)
- Roeland Drive and Johnson Drive (Previous study)
- Johnson Drive and Roe Avenue (KCP\&L)

The signalized intersection of Roeland Drive with Martway Street is currently operating in "flash" mode. The northbound and southbound movements have the yellow "caution" indications, and the eastbound movement has the red "stop" indication. To account for improvements recommended in the 2017 study, the intersection of Roeland Drive and Martway Street was analyzed as a signalized intersection.

Signal timing information for the intersections mentioned above is provided in Appendix A.

## FIGURE 2
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## 3. EXISTING PLUS APPROVED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

To account for the approved development that is currently under construction, trips were generated and added to the existing traffic volumes. Roadway improvements that are associated with the City approved residential and retail development outlined in the 2017 study were accounted for in this scenario as discussed in Section 3.2. This scenario includes the addition of two proposed drives along Roeland Drive and one proposed drive along Johnson Drive. The existing plus approved development traffic conditions were evaluated to provide a baseline for comparative purposes.

### 3.1. Network Characteristics

Five roadways are located within the study area: Shawnee Mission Parkway (US-56), Roeland Drive, Johnson Drive, Roe Avenue, and Martway Street. Referencing the KDOT Access Management Policy, KDOT Functional Classifications map and National Highway System map, current network characteristics were determined and are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Existing Network Summary

| Roadway | Functional <br> Classification | KDOT <br> Classification * | Section | Median <br> Type | Posted <br> Speed | NHS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shawnee <br> Mission Parkway <br> $($ US-56)** | Principle <br> Arterial | B | 4-Lane | Painted/ <br> Grass <br> Median | 45 <br> MPH | Yes |
| Roeland Drive | Local Road | $* * *$ | 3-Lane | None | 25 <br> MPH | No |
| Johnson Drive | Minor Arterial | $* * *$ | 3-Lane | Partial <br> Raised <br> Median | 30 <br> MPH | No |
| Roe Avenue | Arterial <br> Roadway | $* * *$ | 4-Lane | Raised/ <br> Striped <br> Median | 35 <br> MPH | No |
| Martway Street | Local Road | *** | 3-Lane | None | 25 <br> MPH | No |

[^0]Signalized intersection geometric characteristics (number of turn lanes, pedestrian accommodations, etc.) are as follows:

## Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive

- Dedicated left-turn lanes are provided for all movements at the intersection except the south approach.
- Dedicated right-turn lanes are provided for the southbound and eastbound movements.
- No pedestrian accommodations are provided at the intersection.


## Roeland Drive and Johnson Drive

- Dedicated left-turn lanes are provided for all movements at the intersection except the north approach.
- Dedicated right-turn lanes are provided for the eastbound and westbound movements.
- Pedestrian accommodations are provided along the west and south legs of the intersection and include marked crosswalks, pedestrian indications, and push buttons.


## Roeland Drive and Martway Drive

- Dedicated left-turn lanes are provided for the northbound and eastbound movements at the intersection.
- Pedestrian accommodations are provided for the southbound movement at the intersection, including marked crosswalks, pedestrian indications, and push buttons.
- Currently, this signalized intersection operates in "Flash" mode for all periods of the day. During "Flash" operation mode, no signalized pedestrian accommodations are provided.


## Roe Avenue and Johnson Drive

- Dedicated left-turn lanes are provided for all movements at the intersection with dual leftturn lanes allocated for the eastbound movement.
- A dedicated right-turn lane is provided for the southbound movement. A channelized right-turn lane is provided for the northbound movement.
- Pedestrian accommodations are provided along the west and north legs of the intersection and include marked crosswalks, pedestrian indications, and push buttons.


### 3.2. Approved Development Roadway Improvements

Roadway improvements and driveway additions associated with the approved residential and retail portions of the development along City maintained streets (outlined in the traffic study completed by Olsson in 2017) were accounted for under the existing plus approved
development scenario. These improvements and driveway additions are as follows and are expected to be completed in Fall of 2020 along with the retail and residential construction:

## Roeland Drive and Drive 2

- Drive 2 is located 300 ' south of the intersection of Roeland Drive and Martway Street.
- A separate left-turn and right-turn lane will be provided for exiting traffic.
- The north approach will be re-striped to provide a 75 ' southbound left-turn lane plus taper using the existing two-way left-turn lane.
- A throat distance of 75 ' was recommended at Drive 2. As stated in the 2017 report if adequate throat distance cannot be achieved "Do Not Block Intersection" signing for westbound vehicles approaching Roeland Drive is to be provided internal to the site along Drive 2 at the parking lot drive.
- Per request of the City of Mission, a 130' northbound right-turn lane will be provided at Drive 2.


## Roeland Drive and Martway Street/Drive 3

- Drive 3 will be constructed as the east leg of the intersection of Roeland Drive and Martway Street
- A separate westbound 75 ' left-turn lane plus taper will be provided to mirror the west approach.
- The north approach will be re-striped to provide a 100 ' southbound left-turn lane plus taper using the existing two-way left-turn lane.
- A throat distance of 75' was recommended at Drive 3. As stated in the 2017 report if adequate throat distance cannot be achieved signing will be provided internal to the site to allow entering vehicles the right-of-way at the intersection of Drive 3 with the internal parking lots.
- Based on the previous study data collected, the Peak Hour Warrant (Warrant 3) was evaluated at Roeland Drive and Martway Street. Insufficient data to was available to perform the other signal warrants. Warrant 3 considers peak hour vehicular volume data to conduct the warrant and is vehicular focused. The signalized intersection of Roeland Street and Martway Street does not warrant a signal, however based on recommendations provided in the approved study a signal should be kept providing pedestrian accommodations for the Rock Creek Trail that crosses along the southside of the intersection. Modifications to the signal at this intersection will be completed with the approved development to accommodate both pedestrian and approved development traffic.


## Johnson Drive and Drive 4

- Drive 4 will be constructed 575 ' east of the intersection of Roeland Drive and Johnson Drive.
- A throat distance of $125^{\prime}$ will be provided at Drive 4.
- Separate left and right-turn lanes will be provided at Drive 4 for exiting traffic. The right turn lane will release traffic into the existing second eastbound through lane on the outside of Johnson Drive.
- An existing westbound left-turn lane will be used for access to Drive 4. The turn lane will have an approximate length of 150 ' plus taper.


### 3.3. Existing Crash Data

Crash data from 2013-2017 was obtained from KDOT for the study intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive. Crash data provided included crashes at the intersection and approximately 250 feet in the vicinity of the intersection along each approach. The crash summary statistics were used to develop an intersection crash rate at this location. Additionally, the individual crash reports were reviewed to identify any crash patterns and possible countermeasures for consideration.

## Intersection Crash Rate

The crash data from 2013-2017 was used to determine the average crash rate at the study intersection. Crashes were reviewed and incidents that were considered non-correctible or nonintersection related (such as crashes due to alcohol impairment, animals, inclement weather, or construction) were removed. This review resulted in a total of 14 crashes at the intersection over the analyzed time period. The crash total was compared to the average daily entering volume for the intersection. The calculated crash rate, reported in the number of crashes per ten million entering vehicles (TMEV), for the study intersection is illustrated in Table $\mathbf{2}$ below. The equation used to calculate the intersection crash rate is also provided below.

Table 2. Crash Rate Summary.

| Intersection | Average Crash Rate 2013-2017 <br> (Crashes/TMEV) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive | 2.0 |

$$
\text { Crash Rate }\left(\frac{\text { Crashes }}{\text { TMEV }}\right)=\frac{5 \text { Year Crash Total }}{\left(\frac{\text { Total Entering Vehicles per Day }}{10,000,000}\right) \times 365 \times 5}
$$

Historically, the KDOT-reported statewide intersection crash rate is near 10.0 crashes/TMEV. To determine if the intersection is experiencing a higher number of crashes when compared to other intersections, the calculated intersection crash rate at the study intersection was compared to the KDOT average crash rate. When comparing the calculated rate to the
statewide crash rates for non-interchange intersections, the Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive intersection was found to be below the statewide average rate. The crash rate calculations are provided in Appendix B.

Crash Report Review - Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive
As stated above, crashes that were considered non-correctible or non-intersection related were removed from the dataset; this resulted in 3 crashes being removed at this location. After removal of non-correctible/non-intersection related crashes, there were a total of 14 intersection related crashes observed from 2013-2017 at Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive. These crashes were categorized by their observed crash pattern and summarized in Table 3. A graphical breakdown of observed crash pattern is illustrated in Exhibit 1.

Table 3. Crash Report Review Summary - Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive.

| Observed <br> Crash Pattern | No. Crashes <br> (2013-2017; <br> Partial 2018- <br> 2019) | Percent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Following too <br> Close / Rear End | 9 | $90 \%$ | Rear end crashes are the most common <br> trend seen at signalized intersections. |
| Angle - Side <br> Impact | 1 | $10 \%$ | One vehicle violated red signal. |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |  |

The most common crash type ( $90 \%$ of the total) was observed to be rear end crashes. Rear end crashes are typically the most common trend seen at signalized intersections occurring as vehicles are approaching stopped vehicles at a red signal indication. The remaining accident was a right-angle crash that was attributed to a vehicle violating the red signal. Overall the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive experiences fewer crashes than the statewide average and the crash pattern observed was consistent with crash types experienced at a signalized intersection.

### 3.4. Approved Development Trip Generation

To assess the impact of the approved development traffic on the roadway network, expected trips associated with the proposed site were generated and applied to the study network. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) provides methods for estimating traffic volumes of common land uses in the Trip Generation Manual (10th Edition). The land use that most resembles the approved development for this site is Land Use Code 220 (Apartment) and 820 (Shopping Center). Expected trips associated with the approved development have been updated to reflect most current trip generation methodology.

Based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, trip generation characteristics were developed for the approved site. Trip generation characteristics expected for the site are shown in Table 4. Detailed ITE trip generation information can be found in Appendix C.

Table 4. Approved Development Trip Generation

|  |  | Average |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Size | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday | Total | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit |  |  |
| Apartment | 168 DU | 1,230 | 79 | 19 | 60 | 94 | 60 | 34 |
| Shopping Center | 54,594 SF | 3,984 | 180 | 112 | 68 | 348 | 168 | 180 |
| Total Trips |  | $\mathbf{5 , 2 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 4}$ |

Consistent with the previous report, internal capture was determined for the approved site. Internal capture calculations were updated to reflect the most current methodology. The site contains multiple land uses, thus internal trip capture was determined for both the AM and PM peak hours. When a site consists of multiple land uses, total trips to a development can be reduced due to internal capture on the site. These are trips that stay within the development area and do not leave the site to travel to other developments. The multi-use reduction percentage is determined using various tables included in the Trip Generation Manual. Worksheets used to determine the multi-use reduction percentage are included in Appendix C. Based on the worksheet results, the internal capture percentage was determined to be $1 \%$ in the AM peak hour and $19 \%$ in the PM peak hour. To be conservative, it was assumed that internal capture trips would not occur during the AM peak hour, thus no internal capture rates were used.

Consistent with the previous report, pass-by was determined for the approved site. Pass-by calculations were updated to reflect the most current methodology. Pass-by characteristics were determined for the Shopping Center land use using the ITE Trip Generation Handbook (10 th Edition). Pass-by trips are made by traffic already on the roadway and passing the site, versus making a direct trip to the development (primary trips). According to the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, the pass-by trips during the AM and PM peak hour periods for the described land use varies from $20 \%$ to $74 \%$. To be conservative, the average rate of $34 \%$ pass-by trips was used for this study and was only applied to the PM peak hour period. Trip generation data considering internal capture and pass-by trips for the approved land uses are illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5. Approved Development Trip Generation with Internal Capture and Pass-by.

|  | Average <br> Weekday | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Land Use | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit |  |  |
| Total Approved Development Trips | 5,214 | 259 | 131 | 128 | 442 | 228 | 214 |
| Total with Internal Trip Capture Reduction (19\%) | - | - | - | 358 | 186 | 172 |  |
| 34\% Pass-by Reduction (Shopping Center) | - | - | - | 122 | 57 | 61 |  |
| Total External, Non-Pass-by Trips | $\mathbf{2 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 1}$ |  |

Trips associated with approved development were distributed through the network based on the anticipated land use, the surrounding area, and the existing distribution of trips in the vicinity of the proposed site. Trip distribution is illustrated in Table 6. This distribution is slightly different than proposed with the previous study. The revised trip distribution considers distribution of existing (year 2018) traffic volumes. The expected trip distribution for the approved development is shown in Figure 3.

Table 6. Approved Development Trip Distribution.

|  | Trip <br> Distribution |
| :--- | :--- |
| Direction | $10 \%$ |
| North (Roe Avenue) | $10 \%$ |
| South (Roe Avenue) | $30 \%$ |
| West (Shawnee Mission Parkway) | $10 \%$ |
| West (Johnson Drive) | $10 \%$ |
| East (Johnson Drive) | $30 \%$ |
| East (Shawnee Mission Parkway) |  |

The resulting existing plus approved development volumes are illustrated in Figure 4.
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### 3.5. Existing plus Approved Capacity Analysis

Capacity analysis was performed for the study intersections utilizing the existing lane configurations and traffic control, including proposed access associated with approved development. Analysis was conducted using Synchro, Version 10, based on the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) delay methodologies. For the purposes of this report, capacity analysis was updated to reflect the most current methodology. For simplicity, the amount of control delay is equated to a grade or Level of Service (LOS) based on thresholds of driver acceptance. The amount of delay is assigned a letter grade A through F, LOS A representing little or no delay and LOS F representing very high delay. Table 7 shows the delays associated with each LOS grade for signalized and unsignalized intersections, respectively.

Table 7. Intersection LOS Criteria.

| Level of <br> Service | Average Control Delay <br> (seconds) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Signalized | Unsignalized |
| B | $<10$ | $<10$ |
| C | $>20-20$ | $>10-15$ |
| D | $>35-55$ | $>15-25$ |
| E | $>55-80$ | $>25-35$ |
| F | $>80$ | $>50$ |
| Highway Capacity | Manual (HCM 6 $^{\text {th }}$ Edition) |  |

Results of the analysis indicate that the signalized intersections are expected to operate at a LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hour periods. All individual movements at the intersections are expected to operate at a LOS D or better with acceptable queues during both peak hour periods with the exception of the following movements. The $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue represents the queue length that has a 5 percent probability of being exceeded during the peak hour period.

## Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive

- During the AM peak hour period the eastbound left turn movement is expected to operate at a LOS E. During both peak periods the northbound movements are expected to operate at a LOS E.
- High levels of delay for the eastbound left-turn movement is attributed to the timings at the intersection which cater to traffic along Shawnee Mission Parkway
during the peak hour periods. The $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue length is expected to be contained within the available storage length.
- Currently there is a lack of capacity for the northbound left-turn movement. Due to right-of-way constraints the northbound approach only has a single lane for all movements.
- The southbound left-turn movement is expected to operate at a LOS F during the AM peak hour period and LOS E during the PM peak hour period.
- $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue lengths during the AM and PM peak hour are expected to exceed the available capacity; however, the queue is not expected to encroach on the adjacent intersection of Roeland Drive and Rock Creek Lane. This movement will be monitored in later scenarios to determine if geometric changes are needed to accommodate the queue length.
- During the PM peak hour, the southbound right-turn movement is expected to operate at LOS E.
- The $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue length during the PM peak hour is expected to be contained within the available storage length.


## Roe Avenue and Johnson Drive

- During both peak hour periods the westbound left-turn movements are expected to operate at a LOS E.
- $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue lengths are expected to be contained within the available storage length.
- During the PM peak hour, the eastbound left-turn movement is expected to operate at a LOS E.
- $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue length is expected to be contained within the available storage length.

All movements at the unsignalized intersections are expected to operate at LOS C or better during both peak hour periods.

Merge analysis was performed for the Johnson Drive to Shawnee Mission Parkway ramp using McTrans Highway Capacity Software, Version 7.8, based on HCM density methodologies. Similar to intersection LOS criteria, merge and diverge segment density is equated to a grade or LOS based on thresholds of driver acceptance. Table 8 shows the density associated with each LOS grade for merge and diverge segments.

Table 8. Merge and Diverge Segment LOS Criteria

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Level of Service | Density (pc/mi/ln) |
| A | $<10$ |
| B | $>10-20$ |
| C | $>20-28$ |
| D | $>28-35$ |
| E | $>35$ |
| F | Demand Exceeds Capacity |
| Highway Capacity Manual $\left(H C M ~ 6{ }^{\text {th }}\right.$ Edition) |  |

Results of the analysis indicate that the merge section is expected to operate acceptably at LOS $B$ during both peak hour periods.

Existing lane configurations and traffic control for the study network are illustrated in Figure 5. The existing plus approved development conditions capacity analysis summary are illustrated in Figure 6. Detailed intersection and merge analysis results may be found in Appendix C.
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## 4. EXISTING PLUS APPROVED PLUS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

Conditions with the remaining proposed development in place were evaluated to identify any potential geometric improvements that could be attributed to the additional traffic associated with the proposed development. Land use changes from the previously submitted plan (October 2019) include an increase of general office square footage and removal of the high-turnover (sitdown) restaurant and replacement with a mixed-use space.

The proposed development site will consist of 40,000 square feet of multipurpose recreational facility, an 18-lane bowling alley, a 10 screen movie theater, a 202 room hotel, 105,000 square feet of general office building and 60,076 square feet of space designated for food and entertainment purposes. The site is proposed in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive, south and east of the approved residential and retail development. The proposed site plan is illustrated in Figure 7.

### 4.1. Proposed Development Trip Generation and Distribution

 Based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, trip generation characteristics were developed for the proposed site using the methods described in Section 3.3. The land uses that most resembles the proposed development for this site are Land Use Code 310 (Hotel), Land Use Code 435 (Multipurpose Recreational Facility), Lane Use Code 437 (Bowling Alley), Land Use Code 445 (Movie Theatre) and Land Use Code 710 (General Office Building). The 60,076 square foot space designated as food/entertainment will consist of a food hall (shared seating area serviced by several food vendors), high-turnover (sit-down) restaurant, retail, mini golf, and indoor golf driving range. Land Use Code 930 (Fast Casual Restaurant) was determined to best represent the food hall. Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant), Land Use Code 820 (Shopping Center), Land Use Code 431 (Miniature Golf Course) and Land Use Code 432 (Golf Driving Range) represent the other planned uses. Trip generation for the proposed site is shown inTable 9. Proposed Development Trip Generation.

| Land Use | Size | Average <br> Weekday | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fast Casual Restaurant | 24,221 SF | 7,634 | 51 | 35 | 16 | 343 | 189 | 154 |
| Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit |  |  |  |  |
| High-Turnover (Sit-Down) <br> Restaurant | 6,348 SF | 713 | 64 | 36 | 28 | 63 | 40 | 23 |
| Shopping Center | 984 SF | 260 | 153 | 95 | 58 | 18 | 9 | 9 |
| Miniature Golf Course* | 18 Holes | 60 | - | - | - | 6 | 2 | 4 |
| Golf Driving Range | 18 Bays | 983 | 29 | 18 | 11 | 90 | 41 | 49 |
| Multipurpose Recreational <br> Facility * | 40,000 SF | 1,440 | - | - | - | 144 | 80 | 64 |
| Bowling Alley* | 18 lanes | 234 | 27 | 26 | 1 | 23 | 16 | 7 |
| Multiplex Movie Theater * | 10 screens | 1,380 | - | - | - | 138 | 71 | 67 |
| Hotel | 202 Rooms | 1,854 | 96 | 57 | 39 | 126 | 65 | 61 |
| General Office Building | 105,000 SF | 1,113 | 126 | 109 | 17 | 120 | 20 | 100 |
| Total Proposed Trips |  | 20,885 | $\mathbf{8 0 5}$ | 507 | $\mathbf{2 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 2}$ |

* Daily ITE trip generation information was not provided. It was assumed that PM trips accounted for 10\% of the daily trips.

Internal capture rates for the proposed development were calculated using methods described in Section 3.3. Reviewing the internal capture worksheet results, the internal capture percentage was determined to be $21 \%$ in the AM peak hour and $39 \%$ in the PM peak hour. Internal capture was updated to reflect the inclusion of approved development with proposed development internal capture calculations.

Pass-by reduction was considered for the retail portion of the development only due to the characteristics of the restaurant space (food hall concept). Section 3.3 discusses determination of pass-by trips. Trip generation characteristics expected for the site are shown in Table 10. Detailed ITE trip generation information can be found in Appendix $\mathbf{C}$.

Table 10. Approved Plus Proposed Development Trip Generation.

| Land Use | Size | Average <br> Weekday | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit |  |  |  |  |
| Apartment* | 168 DU | 1,230 | 79 | 19 | 60 | 94 | 60 | 34 |
| Shopping Center* | 54,594 SF | 3,984 | 180 | 112 | 68 | 348 | 168 | 180 |
| Fast Casual Restaurant | 24,221 SF | 7,634 | 51 | 35 | 16 | 343 | 189 | 154 |
| High-Turnover Sit-Down <br> Restaurant | 6,348 SF | 713 | 64 | 36 | 28 | 63 | 40 | 23 |
| Shopping Center | 984 SF | 260 | 153 | 95 | 58 | 18 | 9 | 9 |
| Miniature Golf Course | 18 Holes | 60 | - | - | - | 6 | 2 | 4 |
| Golf Driving Range | 18 Bays | 983 | 29 | 18 | 11 | 90 | 41 | 49 |
| Multipurpose <br> Recreational Facility | 40,000 SF | 1,440 | - | - | - | 144 | 80 | 64 |
| Bowling Alley | 18 lanes | 234 | 27 | 26 | 1 | 23 | 16 | 7 |
| Multiplex Movie Theater | 10 screens | 1,380 | - | - | - | 138 | 71 | 67 |
| Hotel | 202 Rooms | 1,854 | 96 | 57 | 39 | 126 | 65 | 61 |
| General Office Building | 105,000 SF | 1,113 | 126 | 109 | 17 | 120 | 20 | 100 |
| Total Approved plus Proposed Trips | $\mathbf{2 0 , 8 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 0 5}$ | 507 | $\mathbf{2 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 2}$ |  |
| Total with Internal Trip Capture (AM 21\%/PM 39\%) | 637 | 423 | 214 | 925 | 467 | 458 |  |  |
| 34\% Pass-by (Approved Shopping Center) |  | - | - | - | 103 | 50 | 53 |  |
| Total External, Non-Pass-by Trips |  | $\mathbf{6 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ |  |
| *Trips were analyzed in existing plus approved scenario. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Trips were analyzed in existing plus approved scenario.

Comparing trip generation to the October 2019 submittal, the modifications to proposed land use are expected to result in a decrease of 81 trips during the AM peak hour period and an increase of 117 trips during the PM peak hour period.

Trips were distributed through the network using the same trip distribution as developed for approved development as discussed in Section 3.3. The expected trip distribution for the approved and proposed development is shown in Figure 8. The resulting existing plus approved plus proposed development volumes are illustrated in Figure 9.

### 4.2. Access Characteristics

In addition to the drives constructed for the approved development, three additional access points are planned to serve the proposed development, as illustrated in the site plan (Figure 7). Drive 1 is proposed to be located 350 ' north of the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive. This access point will be the east leg of the unsignalized intersection of 60th Terrace and Roeland Drive. Drive 1 utilizes an existing curb cut at the intersection or Roeland Drive and $60^{\text {th }}$ Terrace.

Two access points will be located along Roe Avenue, approximately 225' (Drive 5) and 550' (Drive 6) south of the intersection of Roe Avenue and Johnson Drive. Drive 6 corresponds with the location of an existing curb cut along Roe Avenue. All drives are proposed to provide two lanes, one lane each for egress and ingress traffic.

A raised median is currently provided along Roe Avenue south of Johnson Drive. Due to the presence of the median, access will be limited at Drives 5 and 6 to right-in/right-out movements only. It is recommended to extend the current median along the south leg of Roe Avenue and Johnson Drive south to the median under the Shawnee Mission Parkway overpass to ensure limitation of left-turn access at Drives 5 and 6 along Roe Avenue.

Minimum throat distance of $75^{\prime}$ ' should be provided at each proposed drive to allow for vehicles to stack internal the site without effecting vehicles maneuvering within the site.

Access Spacing: Access spacing recommendations outlined in KDOT's AMP were reviewed to determine if the drives associated with the proposed development meet access spacing recommendations. Although Roe Avenue and Roeland Drive are not KDOT routes, access spacing requirements using KDOT policy were referenced. Roe Avenue was considered a Class C route, Roeland Drive was considered a Class D route.

According to the policy, access points along Class $C$ and $D$ routes in developed areas should be spaced 120' along roadways with a speed limit of 25 mph (Roeland Drive), and 200' along roadways with a speed limit of 35 mph (Roe Avenue).

Along Roeland Drive, Drive 1 meets minimum spacing guidance including acceptable spacing from the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive. The minimum upstream functional length for the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive was calculated to be 359'; the distance from Drive 1 to the stop bar of the southbound approach at Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive is 360'. Corner clearance recommendations found in Table 4-10 of the AMP requires 115' of spacing from the edge of the curb line of Shawnee Mission Parkway to the edge of curb line of Drive 1. The location of Drive 1 exceeds recommended corner clearance. Detailed calculations can be found in Appendix C. In addition
to reviewing intersection spacing, alignment with existing drives was reviewed. Drive 1 is proposed to align with an existing intersection which is a preferred condition.

Along Roe Avenue, Drive 5 meets minimum spacing guidance. Drive 6 meets minimum spacing guidance from Drive 5. The access spacing between Drives 5 and 6 is 315 ' which is more than the recommended 200'.

Truck Movements: Considering the density of the development, truck and emergency access to and through the site should be considered when developing the site plan. It is indicated on the current site plan that Drive 5 may service large trucks (deliveries and trash disposal). It is recommended that the parking lot that is served by Drive 5 be modified to accept truck traffic. This includes providing proper corner radii at driveways to accept truck traffic and space to maneuver within the site.

A 100' right-turn lane should be provided for the southbound movement at Drive 5 to accommodate anticipated truck traffic and to prevent truck traffic from impeding through traffic along Roe Avenue. Capacity analysis will be reviewed to determine if provided throat length at proposed drives is adequate to accommodate the expected vehicular traffic at each proposed access location.
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### 4.3. Existing Plus Approved Plus Proposed Development Warrant Analysis

## Existing plus Approved plus Proposed Development Turn Lane Warrants: The KDOT AMP

Table 4-26 was used to determine whether an auxiliary right-turn lane is warranted at each study intersection. According to the table, a westbound right-turn lane is warranted at Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive. Currently, a third through lane is added at the intersection. This through lane begins approximately 250 ' to the northeast of the intersection and is part of a ramp that previously provided access from Roe Avenue to Shawnee Mission Parkway. The ramp has been removed and is not operational, however the portion of the lane that merged with Shawnee Mission Parkway remains. Due to the configuration of the additional lane as it approaches the intersection (as a merge lane from the removed ramp), the lane is underutilized by through traffic in its current state and operates primarily as a right-turn lane. It is recommended to provide an appropriate taper along Shawnee Mission Parkway by restriping the existing pavement markings. The turn lane, including taper, should have a total length of 350 ' to accommodate right-turn vehicles decelerating from 45 mph .

Table 4-26 relates right-turn lane requirements to roadway speed; roadways with speed limits less than 35 mph will not require a right-turn lane. Operations will be reviewed to determine if additional right-turn lanes are recommended.

Table 4-27 and Table 4-28 of KDOT's AMP was used to determine whether an auxiliary left-turn lane is warranted at each study intersection. According to the tables, no additional left-turn lanes are warranted under existing plus approved plus proposed development conditions.

Existing lane configurations and traffic control for the study network are illustrated in Figure 10. Turn lane warrant analysis sheets can be found in Appendix C.

### 4.4. Existing Plus Approved Plus Proposed Development Capacity Analysis

Capacity analysis was performed for existing plus approved plus proposed development conditions using the methodologies described in Section 3.5. Existing timings were not modified; however, it is recommended to retime the signals at the intersections of Roe Avenue with Johnson Drive and Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive to accommodate the proposed development traffic. Timing updates are expected to increase the operations of the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive. Capacity analysis will be illustrated in the figures for any improvements recommend in this section. Peak hour factors observed under existing conditions were changed to represent an increase in traffic.

Results of the analysis indicate that the signalized study intersections are expected to operate at similar levels of service to the existing plus approved development conditions with the following exceptions:

## Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive

- AM peak hour period
- Overall operations are expected to be remain at a LOS C.
- The eastbound left turn movement is expected to operate at a LOS F and the southbound right-turn movement is expected to operate at LOS E. Side street and turning movements at the intersection may operate at a lower level of service due to signal timings accommodating higher volume through traffic along Shawnee Mission Parkway.
- The southbound right-turn movement $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue length is expected to be minimal.
- The eastbound left-turn movement $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue length is expected to be contained within the available storage length and is metered by the upstream signal at Shawnee Mission Parkway and Nall Avenue. However, the turn bay length does not meet current KDOT standards. To meet KDOT standard, it is recommended to extend the existing turn lane by 60 ' from 330 ' to 390 ' to meet the required KDOT turn lane length.
- PM peak hour period
- Overall operations are expected to remain at a LOS D.
- The eastbound left-turn movement is expected to operate at a LOS E. The southbound left and right-turn movements are expected to operate at a LOS F. As stated for the AM peak hour period, lower level of service may occur for side street or turning movements at the intersection as high volume through traffic along Shawnee Mission Parkway is accommodated.
- The southbound right-turn movement $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue length is expected to be minimal.
- The eastbound left-turn movement $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue length is expected to be contained within the available storage length.
- It is recommended to increase capacity of the southbound left-turn movement. It is anticipated that queue lengths will extend past the existing intersection of Roeland Drive and Rock Creek Lane during portions of the AM and PM peak hour periods. Due to the existing proximity to the unsignalized intersection of Roeland Drive and Rock Creek Lane, it is not feasible to extend the existing single left-turn lane to provide additional storage. Dual southbound left-turn lanes should be provided at the intersection of

Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive to accommodate the southbound left-turn movement. The intersection is currently operating under split phasing for the north and southbound movements, thus additional capacity can be added for the left-turn movement by re-striping the southbound through lane to a through/left-turn lane.

- The curb radius of the northeast quadrant of the intersection should be modified to support large trucks. Curb radii should match the recommend $25^{\prime}-45^{\prime}$ radius for curb and gutter sections found in Table 4-16 of KDOT's AMP.

All movements at the unsignalized intersections are expected to operate at LOS C or better during both peak hour periods, similar to existing plus approved development conditions.

Merge analysis was performed for the Johnson Drive to Shawnee Mission Parkway ramp using the methodologies described in Section 3.5. Results of the analysis indicate that the merge section is expected to operate acceptably at LOS B during both peak hour periods.

The existing plus approved plus proposed development conditions capacity analysis summary are illustrated in Figure 11. Detailed intersection and merge analysis results may be found in Appendix D.
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## 5. FUTURE YEAR 2038 CONDITIONS

The future year 2038 condition considers approved and proposed development volumes plus growth of background traffic volumes. Based on a review of historical traffic count data provided from 2011-2016 by KDOT along Shawnee Mission Parkway, a 3\% annual growth rate was used for traffic volumes along public roadways. Growth rate used in the previous 2017 study was $0.5 \%$ based on data provided by KDOT at the time (2010-2014). Since this time data has been provided for 2015 and 2016 which resulted in an increase of the annual growth rate. The calculated growth rate was applied to existing volumes for the through movements at the study intersections of Shawnee Mission Parkway with Roeland Drive and Roe Avenue with Johnson Drive to obtain future year background volumes. Volumes were subsequently adjusted through adjacent study intersections. Background traffic growth volumes were added to existing plus approved plus development volumes to obtain future year 2038 traffic volumes.

Figure 12 illustrates the future year 2038 volumes. Additional information for the calculation of background traffic are provided in Appendix E.

### 5.1. Future Year 2038 Warrant Analysis

Turn Lane Warrants: It was determined that no additional turn lanes are warranted considering future year 2038 volumes.

Future year 2038 lane configuration and traffic control for the study network are illustrated in Figure 13. Turn lane warrant analysis sheets can be found in Appendix E.

### 5.2. Future Year 2038 Capacity Analysis

Capacity analysis was performed for future conditions using the methodologies described in
Section 3.3. Split times were updated to account for an increase in background traffic while cycle lengths remained unchanged. Improved operations may be achieved by reviewing signal coordination along the Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roe Avenue corridors. All signalized individual movements are expected to operate with a similar LOS as existing plus approved plus proposed development conditions with the following exceptions:

## Johnson Drive and Roe Avenue

- The intersection is expected to operate at a LOS D during the PM peak hour period. The decrease in LOS from previous conditions is expected to be related to an increase in background traffic volumes.
- The westbound through/right-turn movements are expected to operate at LOS E during the $A M$ and $P M$ peak hour periods. $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue lengths are not expected to extend to Shawnee Mission Parkway.


## Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive

- Overall operations at the intersection are expected to decrease to LOS F with numerous individual movements expected to operate at LOS F. Poor operations are attributed to the high volume of traffic served by the intersection (lack of capacity) and the signal operating split phased for the north and south movements.
- If future traffic volumes materialize, it is recommended to consider the following improvements to improve operations:
- Provide dual eastbound left turn lanes with 350 ' of storage.
- Provide dedicated northbound left-turn lane with 100 ' of storage.
- Provide dedicated westbound right-turn lane with 230' of storage.
- Update signal timings.
- These improvements would be expected to improve overall operations to a LOS E during the AM and PM peak hour periods. Individual movements would be expected to operate at LOS E or better during both peak periods, with $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue lengths contained within available storage.

All movements at the unsignalized intersections are expected to operate at LOS C or better during both peak hour periods, similar to existing plus approved plus proposed development conditions.

Merge analysis was performed for the Johnson Drive to Shawnee Mission Parkway ramp using the methodologies described in Section 3.5. Results of the analysis indicate that the merge section is expected to operate acceptably at LOS C and D during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Future operations are based on an increase in background traffic growth based on historical traffic volumes. These volumes may materialize differently due to changes in development or modifications to the roadway network. Operations of study intersections should be monitored to determine if volumes materialize and roadway improvements made based on actual conditions. Poor operations indicated during the future scenario can be attributed to background traffic growth and is not specifically attributed to trips associated with the proposed development.

The future year conditions capacity analysis summary is illustrated in Figure 14. Detailed intersection and merge analysis results may be found in Appendix E.
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## 6. SUMMARY

This report summarizes analysis conducted considering approved and proposed development located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive in Mission, Kansas.

### 6.1. Conclusions

The general findings to note for the traffic impact study include the following:

1. Reviewing existing plus approved development conditions, study intersections are expected to operate at acceptable levels of service.
2. Based on the 2017 study the signal at Roeland Drive and Martway Street does not warrant a signal under Warrant 3 criteria. It was recommended in the previous study to keep the signal in place to provide pedestrian accommodations for the Rock Creek Trail. The intersection was analyzed as signalized because the signal will be operational after the construction of the approved development.
3. After development of the site, traffic operations at the study intersections are not expected to be significantly impacted.
4. The site should be designed to accommodate truck traffic at Drives 5 and 6. This includes providing adequate corner radii at Drives 5, 6, and the northbound leg of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive. A southbound 100' right turn lane should also be provided at Drive 5. The parking lot that is currently shown on the site plan should be designed to allow truck traffic the ability to maneuver within the site.
5. Future year 2038 analysis indicates that the study intersections are expected to operate with longer queue lengths and delays. These volumes may materialize differently due to changes in development or modifications to the roadway network. Operations of study intersections should be monitored to determine if volumes materialize and roadway improvements are made based on actual conditions. Poor operations indicated during the future scenario can be attributed to background traffic growth and is not specifically attributed to trips associated with the proposed development.

### 6.2. Recommendations

Based on review and analysis of the approved and proposed development, the following improvements are recommended in addition to the approved improvements associated with the residential and retail development:

## Existing plus Approved Conditions

- No additional improvements are recommended in addition to the approved improvements.


## Existing plus Approved plus Proposed Development Conditions

- Increase the eastbound left-turn lane at Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive by 60 ' from 330 ' to 390 ' to meet KDOT required turn lane length.
- Re-time signals at the intersections of Shawnee Mission Parkway with Roeland Drive and Roe Avenue with Johnson Drive to accommodate development trips.
- Re-stripe the north leg of the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive to provide a dedicated southbound left-turn lane, shared through/left-turn lane, and dedicated southbound right-turn lane.
- Modify the curb radius in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive to support large trucks. Plans are currently being completed by the design team, thus exact curb radius and anticipated design vehicle information is not available at this time. Intersection design should meet requirements of the maintaining agency (City or State).
- The existing pavement markings for the outside through lane along Shawnee Mission Parkway at Roeland Drive should be restriped to provide an appropriate taper for the existing outside westbound lane. Turn lane including taper should be 350 ' in length to accommodate right-turn vehicles decelerating from 45 mph .
- Extend the median along Roe Avenue to limit right-in/right-out access at Drives 5 and 6.
- Provide appropriate corner radii at Drives 5 and 6 to accommodate truck traffic.
- Provide a 100' southbound right-turn lane at Drive 5 along Roe Avenue.
- Minimum throat distance of 75 ' should be provided at each proposed drive to allow for vehicles to stack internal the site without effecting vehicles maneuvering within the site.
- Pedestrian accommodations should be provided along the north and west legs at the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive. Accommodations should conform with ADA standards; this includes adequate ramp design with detectable warnings and vibrotactile push buttons.


## Future Year 2038 Conditions

- If volumes materialize in the future, it is recommended to consider the following improvements to improve operations at the intersection of Shawnee Mission Parkway and Roeland Drive:
- Provide dual eastbound left turn lanes with 350 ' of storage.
- Provide dedicated northbound left-turn lane with 100 ' of storage.
- Provide dedicated westbound right-turn lane with 230 ' of storage.
- Update signal timings.


# APPENDIX A 

Data Collection

Count Data

## Turning Movement Data




Turning Movement Data Plot

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (7:30 AM)

| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7:30 AM | 45 | 96 | 17 | 0 | 158 | 1 | 39 | 7 | 0 | 47 | 17 | 159 | 7 | 0 | 183 | 7 | 38 | 45 | 0 | 90 | 478 |
| 7:45 AM | 34 | 96 | 24 | 0 | 154 | 1 | 47 | 6 | 0 | 54 | 16 | 174 | 23 | 0 | 213 | 3 | 45 | 44 | 0 | 92 | 513 |
| 8:00 AM | 41 | 89 | 20 | 0 | 150 | 7 | 53 | 5 | 0 | 65 | 2 | 192 | 13 | 0 | 207 | 9 | 41 | 47 | 0 | 97 | 519 |
| 8:15 AM | 37 | 79 | 22 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 47 | 6 | 0 | 53 | 18 | 133 | 16 | 0 | 167 | 4 | 50 | 27 | 0 | 81 | 439 |
| Total | 157 | 360 | 83 | 0 | 600 | 9 | 186 | 24 | 0 | 219 | 53 | 658 | 59 | 0 | 770 | 23 | 174 | 163 | 0 | 360 | 1949 |
| Approach \% | 26.2 | 60.0 | 13.8 | 0.0 | - | 4.1 | 84.9 | 11.0 | 0.0 | - | 6.9 | 85.5 | 7.7 | 0.0 | - | 6.4 | 48.3 | 45.3 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 8.1 | 18.5 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 30.8 | 0.5 | 9.5 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 11.2 | 2.7 | 33.8 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 39.5 | 1.2 | 8.9 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 18.5 | - |
| PHF | 0.872 | 0.938 | 0.865 | 0.000 | 0.949 | 0.321 | 0.877 | 0.857 | 0.000 | 0.842 | 0.736 | 0.857 | 0.641 | 0.000 | 0.904 | 0.639 | 0.870 | 0.867 | 0.000 | 0.928 | 0.939 |
| Lights | 146 | 337 | 74 | 0 | 557 | 9 | 181 | 24 | 0 | 214 | 52 | 654 | 57 | 0 | 763 | 22 | 172 | 156 | 0 | 350 | 1884 |
| \% Lights | 93.0 | 93.6 | 89.2 | - | 92.8 | 100.0 | 97.3 | 100.0 | - | 97.7 | 98.1 | 99.4 | 96.6 | - | 99.1 | 95.7 | 98.9 | 95.7 | - | 97.2 | 96.7 |
| Mediums | 8 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 57 |
| \% Mediums | 5.1 | 5.3 | 10.8 | - | 6.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | - | 2.3 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 3.4 | - | 0.9 | 4.3 | 1.1 | 3.7 | - | 2.5 | 2.9 |
| Articulated Trucks | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 1.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 | - | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | - | 0.3 | 0.4 |



Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (7:30 AM)

## Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

| Start Time | Roe Ave Southbound |  |  |  |  | Ramps on/off Shawnee Mission Pkwy Westbound |  |  |  |  | Roe Ave Northbound |  |  |  |  | Johnson Dr <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 5:00 PM | 81 | 105 | 11 | 0 | 197 | 5 | 74 | 12 | 0 | 91 | 8 | 105 | 27 | 1 | 141 | 23 | 69 | 82 | 0 | 174 | 603 |
| 5:15 PM | 74 | 156 | 14 | 0 | 244 | 10 | 58 | 14 | 0 | 82 | 13 | 146 | 18 | 0 | 177 | 25 | 72 | 70 | 0 | 167 | 670 |
| 5:30 PM | 53 | 140 | 20 | 0 | 213 | 7 | 62 | 17 | 2 | 88 | 18 | 137 | 18 | 0 | 173 | 15 | 55 | 45 | 0 | 115 | 589 |
| 5:45 PM | 78 | 123 | 13 | 0 | 214 | 3 | 62 | 9 | 0 | 74 | 13 | 110 | 18 | 0 | 141 | 17 | 68 | 51 | 1 | 137 | 566 |
| Total | 286 | 524 | 58 | 0 | 868 | 25 | 256 | 52 | 2 | 335 | 52 | 498 | 81 | 1 | 632 | 80 | 264 | 248 | 1 | 593 | 2428 |
| Approach \% | 32.9 | 60.4 | 6.7 | 0.0 | - | 7.5 | 76.4 | 15.5 | 0.6 | - | 8.2 | 78.8 | 12.8 | 0.2 | - | 13.5 | 44.5 | 41.8 | 0.2 | - | - |
| Total \% | 11.8 | 21.6 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 35.7 | 1.0 | 10.5 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 13.8 | 2.1 | 20.5 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 26.0 | 3.3 | 10.9 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 24.4 | - |
| PHF | 0.883 | 0.840 | 0.725 | 0.000 | 0.889 | 0.625 | 0.865 | 0.765 | 0.250 | 0.920 | 0.722 | 0.853 | 0.750 | 0.250 | 0.893 | 0.800 | 0.917 | 0.756 | 0.250 | 0.852 | 0.906 |
| Lights | 277 | 524 | 53 | 0 | 854 | 25 | 254 | 52 | 2 | 333 | 52 | 493 | 81 | 1 | 627 | 80 | 258 | 242 | 1 | 581 | 2395 |
| \% Lights | 96.9 | 100.0 | 91.4 | - | 98.4 | 100.0 | 99.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.4 | 100.0 | 99.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.2 | 100.0 | 97.7 | 97.6 | 100.0 | 98.0 | 98.6 |
| Mediums | 9 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 30 |
| \% Mediums | 3.1 | 0.0 | 8.6 | - | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 1.2 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |



Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (5:00 PM)

Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Ash Dr Southbound |  |  |  | Johnson Dr <br> Westbound |  |  |  | Johnson Dr <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 75 | 0 | 76 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 126 |
| 7:15 AM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 61 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 124 |
| 7:30 AM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 88 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 172 |
| 7:45 AM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 99 | 0 | 100 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 189 |
| Hourly Total | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 323 | 0 | 325 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 274 | 611 |
| 8:00 AM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 103 | 0 | 104 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 188 |
| 8:15 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 94 | 0 | 95 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 182 |
| 8:30 AM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 85 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 170 |
| 8:45 AM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 74 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 158 |
| Hourly Total | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 356 | 0 | 358 | 330 | 0 | 0 | 330 | 698 |
| *** BREAK *** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4:30 PM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 136 | 0 | 137 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 253 |
| 4:45 PM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 157 | 0 | 163 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 290 |
| Hourly Total | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 293 | 0 | 300 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 235 | 543 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 165 | 0 | 177 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 339 |
| 5:15 PM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 157 | 0 | 158 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 314 |
| 5:30 PM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 119 | 0 | 124 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 249 |
| 5:45 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 152 | 0 | 155 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 286 |
| Hourly Total | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 21 | 593 | 0 | 614 | 563 | 0 | 0 | 563 | 1188 |
| 6:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 115 | 0 | 117 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 234 |
| 6:15 PM | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 106 | 0 | 111 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 227 |
| Grand Total | 48 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 39 | 1786 | 0 | 1825 | 1628 | 0 | 0 | 1628 | 3501 |
| Approach \% | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 2.1 | 97.9 | 0.0 | - | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 51.0 | 0.0 | 52.1 | 46.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 46.5 | - |
| Lights | 48 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 39 | 1734 | 0 | 1773 | 1589 | 0 | 0 | 1589 | 3410 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | - | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 97.1 | - | 97.2 | 97.6 | - | - | 97.6 | 97.4 |
| Mediums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 50 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 88 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | - | 2.7 | 2.3 | - | - | 2.3 | 2.5 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.1 |



Turning Movement Data Plot

Count Name: Johnson Dr \& Roeland Dr
Overland Park, Kansas, United States 66213

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (7:30 AM)

| Start Time | Ash Dr Southbound |  |  |  | Johnson Dr <br> Westbound |  |  |  | Johnson Dr Eastbound |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 7:30 AM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 88 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 172 |
| 7:45 AM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 99 | 0 | 100 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 189 |
| 8:00 AM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 103 | 0 | 104 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 188 |
| 8:15 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 94 | 0 | 95 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 182 |
| Total | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 384 | 0 | 387 | 331 | 0 | 0 | 331 | 731 |
| Approach \% | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.8 | 99.2 | 0.0 | - | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 52.5 | 0.0 | 52.9 | 45.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 45.3 | - |
| PHF | 0.650 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.650 | 0.750 | 0.932 | 0.000 | 0.930 | 0.962 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.962 | 0.967 |
| Lights | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 370 | 0 | 373 | 324 | 0 | 0 | 324 | 710 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | - | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 96.4 | - | 96.4 | 97.9 | - | - | 97.9 | 97.1 |
| Mediums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 20 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | 2.1 | - | - | 2.1 | 2.7 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | - | 0.3 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.1 |



Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (7:30 AM)

Count Name: Johnson Dr \& Roeland Dr
Overland Park, Kansas, United States 66213

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (4:30 PM)

| Start Time | Ash Dr Southbound |  |  |  | Johnson Dr Westbound |  |  |  | Johnson Dr <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 4:30 PM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 136 | 0 | 137 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 253 |
| 4:45 PM | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 157 | 0 | 163 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 290 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 165 | 0 | 177 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 339 |
| 5:15 PM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 157 | 0 | 158 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 314 |
| Total | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 20 | 615 | 0 | 635 | 548 | 0 | 0 | 548 | 1196 |
| Approach \% | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 3.1 | 96.9 | 0.0 | - | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 51.4 | 0.0 | 53.1 | 45.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 45.8 | - |
| PHF | 0.650 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.650 | 0.417 | 0.932 | 0.000 | 0.897 | 0.851 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.851 | 0.882 |
| Lights | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 20 | 606 | 0 | 626 | 540 | 0 | 0 | 540 | 1179 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | - | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.5 | - | 98.6 | 98.5 | - | - | 98.5 | 98.6 |
| Mediums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 17 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | - | 1.4 | 1.5 | - | - | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |



Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (4:30 PM)

Count Name: Johnson Dr \& Roeland Dr

Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Roeland Dr <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Turn | ove |  |  | Martway St <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 19 |
| 7:15 AM | 4 | 15 | 0 | 19 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 44 |
| 7:30 AM | 2 | 22 | 0 | 24 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 41 |
| 7:45 AM | 3 | 12 | 0 | 15 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 40 |
| Hourly Total | 9 | 59 | 0 | 68 | 39 | 13 | 0 | 52 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 24 | 144 |
| 8:00 AM | 3 | 21 | 0 | 24 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 16 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 48 |
| 8:15 AM | 3 | 12 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 44 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 39 |
| 8:45 AM | 5 | 15 | 0 | 20 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 12 | 52 |
| Hourly Total | 11 | 55 | 0 | 66 | 39 | 37 | 0 | 76 | 17 | 24 | 0 | 41 | 183 |
| *** BREAK *** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4:30 PM | 7 | 16 | 0 | 23 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 24 | 63 |
| 4:45 PM | 7 | 19 | 0 | 26 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 31 | 20 | 8 | 0 | 28 | 85 |
| Hourly Total | 14 | 35 | 0 | 49 | 31 | 16 | 0 | 47 | 29 | 23 | 0 | 52 | 148 |
| 5:00 PM | 5 | 12 | 0 | 17 | 22 | 12 | 0 | 34 | 18 | 23 | 0 | 41 | 92 |
| 5:15 PM | 13 | 18 | 0 | 31 | 20 | 12 | 0 | 32 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 38 | 101 |
| 5:30 PM | 9 | 15 | 0 | 24 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 19 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 25 | 68 |
| 5:45 PM | 15 | 15 | 0 | 30 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 24 | 14 | 18 | 0 | 32 | 86 |
| Hourly Total | 42 | 60 | 0 | 102 | 72 | 37 | 0 | 109 | 63 | 73 | 0 | 136 | 347 |
| 6:00 PM | 11 | 21 | 0 | 32 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 22 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 18 | 72 |
| 6:15 PM | 2 | 17 | 0 | 19 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 22 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 15 | 56 |
| Grand Total | 89 | 247 | 0 | 336 | 211 | 117 | 0 | 328 | 138 | 148 | 0 | 286 | 950 |
| Approach \% | 26.5 | 73.5 | 0.0 | - | 64.3 | 35.7 | 0.0 | - | 48.3 | 51.7 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 9.4 | 26.0 | 0.0 | 35.4 | 22.2 | 12.3 | 0.0 | 34.5 | 14.5 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 30.1 | - |
| Lights | 88 | 243 | 0 | 331 | 209 | 115 | 0 | 324 | 135 | 143 | 0 | 278 | 933 |
| \% Lights | 98.9 | 98.4 | - | 98.5 | 99.1 | 98.3 | - | 98.8 | 97.8 | 96.6 | - | 97.2 | 98.2 |
| Mediums | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 15 |
| \% Mediums | 1.1 | 1.2 | - | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.7 | - | 1.2 | 2.2 | 2.7 | - | 2.4 | 1.6 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.4 | - | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | - | 0.3 | 0.2 |



Turning Movement Data Plot

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (8:00 AM)

| Start Time | Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (8:00 AM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Roeland Dr <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Roeland Dr <br> Northbound |  |  |  | Martway St Eastbound |  |  |  | Int. Total |
|  | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 8:00 AM | 3 | 21 | 0 | 24 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 16 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 48 |
| 8:15 AM | 3 | 12 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 44 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 39 |
| 8:45 AM | 5 | 15 | 0 | 20 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 12 | 52 |
| Total | 11 | 55 | 0 | 66 | 39 | 37 | 0 | 76 | 17 | 24 | 0 | 41 | 183 |
| Approach \% | 16.7 | 83.3 | 0.0 | - | 51.3 | 48.7 | 0.0 | - | 41.5 | 58.5 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 6.0 | 30.1 | 0.0 | 36.1 | 21.3 | 20.2 | 0.0 | 41.5 | 9.3 | 13.1 | 0.0 | 22.4 | - |
| PHF | 0.550 | 0.655 | 0.000 | 0.688 | 0.813 | 0.841 | 0.000 | 0.905 | 0.850 | 0.857 | 0.000 | 0.854 | 0.880 |
| Lights | 11 | 53 | 0 | 64 | 38 | 37 | 0 | 75 | 16 | 22 | 0 | 38 | 177 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 96.4 | - | 97.0 | 97.4 | 100.0 | - | 98.7 | 94.1 | 91.7 | - | 92.7 | 96.7 |
| Mediums | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | 3.6 | - | 3.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 | - | 1.3 | 5.9 | 4.2 | - | 4.9 | 2.7 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 | - | 2.4 | 0.5 |



Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (8:00 AM)

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

| Start Time | Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Roeland Dr <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Roeland Dr <br> Northbound |  |  |  | Martway St <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | Int. Total |
|  | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 5:00 PM | 5 | 12 | 0 | 17 | 22 | 12 | 0 | 34 | 18 | 23 | 0 | 41 | 92 |
| 5:15 PM | 13 | 18 | 0 | 31 | 20 | 12 | 0 | 32 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 38 | 101 |
| 5:30 PM | 9 | 15 | 0 | 24 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 19 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 25 | 68 |
| 5:45 PM | 15 | 15 | 0 | 30 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 24 | 14 | 18 | 0 | 32 | 86 |
| Total | 42 | 60 | 0 | 102 | 72 | 37 | 0 | 109 | 63 | 73 | 0 | 136 | 347 |
| Approach \% | 41.2 | 58.8 | 0.0 | - | 66.1 | 33.9 | 0.0 | - | 46.3 | 53.7 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 12.1 | 17.3 | 0.0 | 29.4 | 20.7 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 31.4 | 18.2 | 21.0 | 0.0 | 39.2 | - |
| PHF | 0.700 | 0.833 | 0.000 | 0.823 | 0.818 | 0.771 | 0.000 | 0.801 | 0.829 | 0.793 | 0.000 | 0.829 | 0.859 |
| Lights | 41 | 60 | 0 | 101 | 72 | 35 | 0 | 107 | 63 | 72 | 0 | 135 | 343 |
| \% Lights | 97.6 | 100.0 | - | 99.0 | 100.0 | 94.6 | - | 98.2 | 100.0 | 98.6 | - | 99.3 | 98.8 |
| Mediums | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| \% Mediums | 2.4 | 0.0 | - | 1.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | - | 1.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | - | 0.7 | 1.2 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |



Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (5:00 PM)

Turning Movement Data



Turning Movement Data Plot

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (7:30 AM)

| Start Time | Shawnee Mission Pkwy <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  | Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (7:30 AM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Roeland Dr Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Roeland Dr <br> Westbound |  |  |  |  | Shawnee Mission Pkwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 7:30 AM | 4 | 288 | 1 | 0 | 293 | 2 | 3 | 25 | 0 | 30 | 28 | 448 | 2 | 1 | 479 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 828 |
| 7:45 AM | 7 | 236 | 1 | 0 | 244 | 3 | 5 | 19 | 0 | 27 | 38 | 452 | 8 | 0 | 498 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 789 |
| 8:00 AM | 5 | 256 | 1 | 0 | 262 | 2 | 7 | 20 | 0 | 29 | 29 | 396 | 6 | 2 | 433 | 20 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 28 | 752 |
| 8:15 AM | 5 | 188 | 2 | 0 | 195 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 27 | 34 | 426 | 4 | 0 | 464 | 13 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 19 | 705 |
| Total | 21 | 968 | 5 | 0 | 994 | 9 | 25 | 79 | 0 | 113 | 129 | 1722 | 20 | 3 | 1874 | 67 | 11 | 15 | 0 | 93 | 3074 |
| Approach \% | 2.1 | 97.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | - | 8.0 | 22.1 | 69.9 | 0.0 | - | 6.9 | 91.9 | 1.1 | 0.2 | - | 72.0 | 11.8 | 16.1 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 0.7 | 31.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 32.3 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 56.0 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 61.0 | 2.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 3.0 | - |
| PHF | 0.750 | 0.840 | 0.625 | 0.000 | 0.848 | 0.750 | 0.625 | 0.790 | 0.000 | 0.942 | 0.849 | 0.952 | 0.625 | 0.375 | 0.941 | 0.838 | 0.550 | 0.625 | 0.000 | 0.830 | 0.928 |
| Lights | 21 | 956 | 5 | 0 | 982 | 9 | 24 | 77 | 0 | 110 | 119 | 1703 | 15 | 3 | 1840 | 60 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 84 | 3016 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 98.8 | 100.0 | - | 98.8 | 100.0 | 96.0 | 97.5 | - | 97.3 | 92.2 | 98.9 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 98.2 | 89.6 | 81.8 | 100.0 | - | 90.3 | 98.1 |
| Mediums | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 29 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 49 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | - | 1.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 2.5 | - | 2.7 | 7.0 | 1.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 7.5 | 18.2 | 0.0 | - | 7.5 | 1.6 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | - | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 2.2 | 0.3 |



Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (7:30 AM)

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (4:45 PM)

| Start Time | Shawnee Mission PkwySouthbound |  |  |  |  | Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (4:45 PM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Roeland Dr Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Roeland Dr Westbound |  |  |  |  | Shawnee Mission PkwyNorthbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 4:45 PM | 9 | 390 | 6 | 0 | 405 | 3 | 6 | 22 | 0 | 31 | 16 | 289 | 9 | 0 | 314 | 9 | 21 | 10 | 0 | 40 | 790 |
| 5:00 PM | 12 | 413 | 7 | 0 | 432 | 0 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 25 | 26 | 299 | 11 | 0 | 336 | 8 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 27 | 820 |
| 5:15 PM | 11 | 380 | 3 | 0 | 394 | 2 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 26 | 27 | 312 | 13 | 0 | 352 | 10 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 34 | 806 |
| 5:30 PM | 6 | 388 | 8 | 0 | 402 | 2 | 6 | 22 | 0 | 30 | 34 | 274 | 5 | 1 | 314 | 8 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 29 | 775 |
| Total | 38 | 1571 | 24 | 0 | 1633 | 7 | 37 | 68 | 0 | 112 | 103 | 1174 | 38 | 1 | 1316 | 35 | 66 | 29 | 0 | 130 | 3191 |
| Approach \% | 2.3 | 96.2 | 1.5 | 0.0 | - | 6.3 | 33.0 | 60.7 | 0.0 | - | 7.8 | 89.2 | 2.9 | 0.1 | - | 26.9 | 50.8 | 22.3 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 1.2 | 49.2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 51.2 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 36.8 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 41.2 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 4.1 | - |
| PHF | 0.792 | 0.951 | 0.750 | 0.000 | 0.945 | 0.583 | 0.712 | 0.773 | 0.000 | 0.903 | 0.757 | 0.941 | 0.731 | 0.250 | 0.935 | 0.875 | 0.786 | 0.725 | 0.000 | 0.813 | 0.973 |
| Lights | 37 | 1559 | 24 | 0 | 1620 | 7 | 37 | 66 | 0 | 110 | 103 | 1170 | 38 | 1 | 1312 | 35 | 65 | 29 | 0 | 129 | 3171 |
| \% Lights | 97.4 | 99.2 | 100.0 | - | 99.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 97.1 | - | 98.2 | 100.0 | 99.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.7 | 100.0 | 98.5 | 100.0 | - | 99.2 | 99.4 |
| Mediums | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 |
| \% Mediums | 2.6 | 0.6 | 0.0 | - | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | - | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | - | 0.8 | 0.5 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | - | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.1 |



Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (4:45 PM)

Count Name: Roeland Dr \& Shawnee Mission
Pkwy
Start Date: 10/04/2018

## Turning Movement Data




Turning Movement Data Plot

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (7:30 AM)

| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7:30 AM | 45 | 96 | 17 | 0 | 158 | 1 | 39 | 7 | 0 | 47 | 17 | 159 | 7 | 0 | 183 | 7 | 38 | 45 | 0 | 90 | 478 |
| 7:45 AM | 34 | 96 | 24 | 0 | 154 | 1 | 47 | 6 | 0 | 54 | 16 | 174 | 23 | 0 | 213 | 3 | 45 | 44 | 0 | 92 | 513 |
| 8:00 AM | 41 | 89 | 20 | 0 | 150 | 7 | 53 | 5 | 0 | 65 | 2 | 192 | 13 | 0 | 207 | 9 | 41 | 47 | 0 | 97 | 519 |
| 8:15 AM | 37 | 79 | 22 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 47 | 6 | 0 | 53 | 18 | 133 | 16 | 0 | 167 | 4 | 50 | 27 | 0 | 81 | 439 |
| Total | 157 | 360 | 83 | 0 | 600 | 9 | 186 | 24 | 0 | 219 | 53 | 658 | 59 | 0 | 770 | 23 | 174 | 163 | 0 | 360 | 1949 |
| Approach \% | 26.2 | 60.0 | 13.8 | 0.0 | - | 4.1 | 84.9 | 11.0 | 0.0 | - | 6.9 | 85.5 | 7.7 | 0.0 | - | 6.4 | 48.3 | 45.3 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 8.1 | 18.5 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 30.8 | 0.5 | 9.5 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 11.2 | 2.7 | 33.8 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 39.5 | 1.2 | 8.9 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 18.5 | - |
| PHF | 0.872 | 0.938 | 0.865 | 0.000 | 0.949 | 0.321 | 0.877 | 0.857 | 0.000 | 0.842 | 0.736 | 0.857 | 0.641 | 0.000 | 0.904 | 0.639 | 0.870 | 0.867 | 0.000 | 0.928 | 0.939 |
| Lights | 146 | 337 | 74 | 0 | 557 | 9 | 181 | 24 | 0 | 214 | 52 | 654 | 57 | 0 | 763 | 22 | 172 | 156 | 0 | 350 | 1884 |
| \% Lights | 93.0 | 93.6 | 89.2 | - | 92.8 | 100.0 | 97.3 | 100.0 | - | 97.7 | 98.1 | 99.4 | 96.6 | - | 99.1 | 95.7 | 98.9 | 95.7 | - | 97.2 | 96.7 |
| Mediums | 8 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 57 |
| \% Mediums | 5.1 | 5.3 | 10.8 | - | 6.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | - | 2.3 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 3.4 | - | 0.9 | 4.3 | 1.1 | 3.7 | - | 2.5 | 2.9 |
| Articulated Trucks | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 1.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 | - | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | - | 0.3 | 0.4 |



Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (7:30 AM)

## Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

| Start Time | Roe Ave Southbound |  |  |  |  | Ramps on/off Shawnee Mission Pkwy Westbound |  |  |  |  | Roe Ave Northbound |  |  |  |  | Johnson Dr <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 5:00 PM | 81 | 105 | 11 | 0 | 197 | 5 | 74 | 12 | 0 | 91 | 8 | 105 | 27 | 1 | 141 | 23 | 69 | 82 | 0 | 174 | 603 |
| 5:15 PM | 74 | 156 | 14 | 0 | 244 | 10 | 58 | 14 | 0 | 82 | 13 | 146 | 18 | 0 | 177 | 25 | 72 | 70 | 0 | 167 | 670 |
| 5:30 PM | 53 | 140 | 20 | 0 | 213 | 7 | 62 | 17 | 2 | 88 | 18 | 137 | 18 | 0 | 173 | 15 | 55 | 45 | 0 | 115 | 589 |
| 5:45 PM | 78 | 123 | 13 | 0 | 214 | 3 | 62 | 9 | 0 | 74 | 13 | 110 | 18 | 0 | 141 | 17 | 68 | 51 | 1 | 137 | 566 |
| Total | 286 | 524 | 58 | 0 | 868 | 25 | 256 | 52 | 2 | 335 | 52 | 498 | 81 | 1 | 632 | 80 | 264 | 248 | 1 | 593 | 2428 |
| Approach \% | 32.9 | 60.4 | 6.7 | 0.0 | - | 7.5 | 76.4 | 15.5 | 0.6 | - | 8.2 | 78.8 | 12.8 | 0.2 | - | 13.5 | 44.5 | 41.8 | 0.2 | - | - |
| Total \% | 11.8 | 21.6 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 35.7 | 1.0 | 10.5 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 13.8 | 2.1 | 20.5 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 26.0 | 3.3 | 10.9 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 24.4 | - |
| PHF | 0.883 | 0.840 | 0.725 | 0.000 | 0.889 | 0.625 | 0.865 | 0.765 | 0.250 | 0.920 | 0.722 | 0.853 | 0.750 | 0.250 | 0.893 | 0.800 | 0.917 | 0.756 | 0.250 | 0.852 | 0.906 |
| Lights | 277 | 524 | 53 | 0 | 854 | 25 | 254 | 52 | 2 | 333 | 52 | 493 | 81 | 1 | 627 | 80 | 258 | 242 | 1 | 581 | 2395 |
| \% Lights | 96.9 | 100.0 | 91.4 | - | 98.4 | 100.0 | 99.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.4 | 100.0 | 99.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.2 | 100.0 | 97.7 | 97.6 | 100.0 | 98.0 | 98.6 |
| Mediums | 9 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 30 |
| \% Mediums | 3.1 | 0.0 | 8.6 | - | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 1.2 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |



Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (5:00 PM)

## Signal Timings

* Appendix D


## Configuration Submenu

MM-1-1-1 Phase Ring Assignment (PRI = Priority)


* Appendix D


## Controller Submenu

MM-2-1 Controller Timing Data, sheet 1 of 2


## MM-2-4 Guaranteed Minimum Times

| OL/PHASE | A01 | B02 | C03 | D04 | E05 | F06 | c07 | H08 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MIN GRN | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | $\leqslant$ | 5 | 5 |
| WALK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED CLR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yellow | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| RED CLR | $\not \subset$ | ¢ | $\phi$ | $\phi$ | $\phi$ | \% | © | 6 |
| OVL. GRN | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | + | 5 | 5 |
| OL/PHASE | 109 | 110 | K11 | 112 | M13 | N14 | 015 | P16 |
| MIN GRN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WALK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED CLR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| YELLOW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RED CLR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OVL. GRN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## MM-2-5 Start/Flash Data

| START UP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3. | 4 | 5 | 6. | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 111 | 122 | 13 | 14 | 145 | 16 |
| PHASE |  | $y$ |  |  |  | $y$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | A | B | 6 | D | E | F | C | 1 | 1 | S | K | 4 | N | N | 0 | P |
| OVERLAP | X | x | < | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FLASH>MON. | NO |  |  | FLASH TIME |  |  | 4 |  |  | ALL RED TIME |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| PWR START SEQ. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

AUTOMATIC FLASH

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11. | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ENTRY |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EXIT |  | x |  |  |  | y |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OVERLAP | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | 11 | +10 | ¢ | K | 1 | V | N | 0 | P |
| EXIT | X | X | $x$ | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FLASH>MON. | do |  |  | EXIT FLASH |  |  | W |  |  | MIN FLASH |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| MINIMUM RECALL | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CYCLE THROUGH PHASES |  |  |  |  | Me |  |

## MM-2-8 Phase Recall Options

| TIMING PLAN NUMBER [1] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 3 | \|\% | 5 | 6.1 | 17 | 18 | 1.9 | 10 | 141 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| LOCK DET INPUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL. |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | $\chi$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX TIME RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOFT RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO REST IN PHASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADDED INIT CALC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIMING PLAN NUMBER [2] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - PHASE, | 1. | 2 | 3 | 14 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8. | 9 | 101 | 14 | 12 | 131 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| LOCK DET INPUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX TIME RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOFT RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO RESTIN PHASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADDED INIT CALC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIMING PLAN NUMBER [3] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 131 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| LOCK DET INPUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX TIME RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOFT RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO REST IN PHASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADDED INIT CALC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIMING PLAN NUMBER [4] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11. | 12 | 13 | 14. | 15 | 16 |
| LOCK DET INPUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX TIME RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOFT RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO REST IN PHASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADDED INIT CALC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Coordinator Submenu

MM-3-1 Coordinator Options

| COORD OPTIONS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MANUAL PATTERN | A\%\% | ECPI COORD | $1 \leq 5$ |
| SYSTEM SOURCE | TOC | SYSTEM FORMAT | 670 |
| SPLITS IN | 0 | OFFSETIN | fee's |
| TRANSITION | Smicter | MAX SELECT | may 702 |
| DWELL/ADD TIME | 6 | ENABLE MAN SYNC | ,10 |
| DLY COORD WK-LZ | No | FORCE OFF | Float |
| OFFSET REF | Craty | CAL USE PED TM | $4 \leq 5$ |
| PED RECALL | No | PED RESERVE | NO |
| LOCAL ZERO OVRD | No | FO ADD INI GRN | No |
| RE-SYNC COUNT | 8 | MULTISYNC | No |

## MM-3-2 Coordinator Pattern, sheet 1 of 2
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## MM-3-3 Split Pattern, sheet 1 of 4

| SPLIT PATTERN NUMBER |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PHASE |  | 1. |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | 6. |  | 7. |  | 8 |
| SPLIT |  | 15 |  | 35 |  | 15 |  | 35 |  | 15 |  | 35 |  | 15 |  | 35 |
| PHASE |  | 9 |  | 10 |  | 11 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 15. |  | 16 |
| SPLIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| COORD |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OMIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| SPLIT PATTERN NUMBER |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PHASE |  | 1. |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | 6. |  | 7 |  | 8 |
| SPLIT |  | 18 |  | 19 |  | 18 |  | 45 |  | 13 |  | 24 |  | 17 |  | 46 |
| PHASE |  | 9. |  | 10. |  | 11. |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 15 |  | 16. |
| SPLIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14. | 15 | 16 |
| COORD |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OMIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## MM-3-3 Split Pattern, sheet 2 of 4

| SPLIT PATTERN NUMBER |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PHASE |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4. |  | 5 |  | 6 \% |  | 7. |  | 8 |
| SPLIT |  | 19 |  | 24 |  | 15 |  | 42 |  | 14 |  | 29 |  | 18 |  | 39 |
| PHASE |  | 9 |  | 10 |  | 11. |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 15 |  | 16 |
| SPLIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PHASE | 1. | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7. | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16. |
| COORD |  |  |  | $X$ |  |  |  | k |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OMIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Preemptor Submenu

## MM-4-1 Preemptor, sheet 1 of 2
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## MM-4-1 Preemptor, sheet 2 of 2
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## Preemptor Submenu

MM-4-1 Preemptor, sheet 1 of 2
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## MM-4-2 Low Priority Preemptor Selection

| ENABLE PREEMPT FILTERING \& TSP/SCP |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FILTERED INPUT | SOLD | PUESING |
| 1 | Ayfass | $B P$ |
| 2 | ByPASS | 3 O |
| 3 | Pree 3 | TSp 1 |
| 4 | Pre 4 | TSP 2 |
| 5 | Pre 5 | Pex 9 |
| 6 | $P \mathrm{C}$ | Pre 10 |
| 7 | $\beta P$ | $3 P$ |
| 8 | AP | 3 P |
| 9 | $B P$ | $3 P$ |
| 10 | $\beta 6$ | $B P$ |

MM-4-3 TSP/SCP Plan (Optional)

| TSP/SCP PLAN | 1 | 2 2, 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TSP/SCP ENABLED | yes | Yes |  |  |  |
| SIGNAL TYPE (S or P) | $p$ | $\rho$ |  |  |  |
| DETECTOR LOCK | $x$ | $X$ |  |  |  |
| DELAY TIME | $\phi$ | 4 |  |  |  |
| MAX PRESENCE | $1 * 0$ | 190 |  |  |  |
| PREEMPT ENABLES RESERVICE |  | \% |  |  |  |
| NO DELAY IN TSP PHASES | * | - |  |  |  |
| ACTION SPECIAL FUNCTION INHIBIT | 4 | $\phi$ |  |  |  |
| RESERVICE CYCLES | 31 | B1 |  |  |  |
| BUS HEADING (NB, SB, EB, WB) | * | ) |  |  |  |
| MODE (TSP or SCP) | 15 | FREE DEFAULT PTN | 120 |  |  |
| HEADWAY ALLOWANCE | $\phi$ |  |  |  |  |

- TSP/SCP PHASE -

| VEH/PED | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4. | 5 | 6. | 7. | 8 | 9 | 10. | 11. | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TSP/SCP1 |  |  | 20 |  | \% | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TSP/SCP2 |  | 5 | \% |  | 世 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TSP/SCP3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TSP/SCP4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TSP/SCP5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TSP/SCP6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## MM-4-4 TSP/SCP Split Pattern (Optional)



$$
\begin{gathered}
2 \\
\phi \quad 6 \quad \phi \quad 72 \\
1819183811 \\
3 \\
3 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$
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## Time Base Submenu

MM-5-1 Clock/Calendar Data

| Are the Date and Time set OK? (Yes, No) |  | STANDARD TIME FROM GMT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MANUAL ACTION PLAN |  | SYNC REFERENCE |  |
| SYNC REFERENCE TIME |  | DAYLIGHT SAVINGS |  |
| TIME RESET INPUT TIME SET |  |  |  |

MM-5-2 Action Plan, sheet 1 of 4


## MM-5-2 Action Plan, sheet 2 of 4
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MM-5-2 Action Plan, sheet 3 of 4

| ACTION PLAN | 3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PATTERN | 3 | SYSTEM OVERRIDE | N\% |
| TIMING PLAN | / | SEQUENCE | $\rangle$ |
| VEHICLE DETECTOR PLAN | $\psi^{*}$ | DETECTOR LOG | More |
| FLASH | $\cdots$ | RED REST | No |
| VEHICLE DET DIAGNOSTIC PLAN | w | PED DET DIAGNOSTIC PLAN | 0 |
| DIMMING ENABLE | Md |  |  |


| PHASE | 1. | 2 | 3. | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8. | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WALK 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH EXT 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CS INHIBIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PHASE OMIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPEC FUNCTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (1-8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AUX FUNCTION |  |  |  | (1-3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |  |
| LP 1-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LP 16-30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LP 31-45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LP 46-60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LP 61-75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LP 76-90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LP 91-100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Program Reference Card
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MM-5-3 Day Plan, sheet 1 of 2

| DAY PLAN \# | / |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EVENT \# | ACTION PLAN | START TIME | EVENT \# | ACTION PLAN \# | START TIME |
| 1 | / | क) : 1 | 26 |  | : |
| 2 | 3 | Q $0^{2}$ | 27 |  | : |
| 3 | 1 | ¢ $\square^{2}$ | 28 |  | : |
| 4 | 3 | \% $\square^{\circ}$ | 29 |  | : |
| 5 | 1 | $4^{*}: \mathrm{V}^{3}$ | 30 |  | : |
| 6 |  | : | 31 |  | : |
| 7 |  | : | 32 |  | : |
| 8 |  | : | 33 |  | : |
| 9 |  | . | 34 |  | : |
| 10 |  | : | 35 |  | : |
| 11 |  | : | 36 |  | : |
| 12 |  | - | 37 |  | : |
| 13 |  | $\cdot$ | 38 |  | : |
| 14 |  | , | 39 |  | : |
| 15 |  | : | 40 |  | : |
| 16 |  | : | 41 |  | : |
| 17 |  | : | 42 |  | : |
| 18 |  | : | 43 |  | $\cdot$ |
| 19 |  | - | 44 |  | : |
| 20 |  | : | 45 |  | : |
| 21 |  | : | 46 |  | : |
| 22 |  | : | 47 |  | : |
| 23 |  | : | 48 |  | : |
| 24 |  | . | 49 |  | : |
| 25 |  | : | 50 |  | : |

MM-5-3 Day Plan, sheet 2 of 2

| DAY PLAN \# | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EVENT \# | ACTION PLAN | START TIME | EVENT \# | ACTION PLAN\# | START TME |
| 1 | L | Cta | 26 |  | : |
| 2 |  | : | 27 |  | : |
| 3 |  | : | 28 |  | : |
| 4 |  | : | 29 |  | : |
| 5 |  | : | 30 |  | : |
| 6 |  | : | 31 |  | : |
| 7 |  | - | 32 |  | ; |
| 8 |  | : | 33 |  | : |
| 9 |  | : | 34 |  | : |
| 10 |  | : | 35 |  | : |
| 11 |  | : | 36 |  | : |
| 12 |  | : | 37 |  | : |
| 13 |  | : | 38 |  | : |
| 14 |  | : | 39 |  | . |
| 15 |  | : | 40 |  | : |
| 16 |  | : | 41 |  | : |
| 17 |  | : | 42 |  | : |
| 18 |  | : | 43 |  | : |
| 19 |  | : | 44 |  | : |
| 20 |  | : | 45 |  | : |
| 21 |  | : | 46 |  | : |
| 22 |  | : | 47 |  | : |
| 23 |  | : | 48 |  | . |
| 24 |  | : | 49 |  | : |
| 25 |  | : | 50 |  | : |
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## MM-5-4 Schedule, sheet 1 of 3



| SCHEDULE NUMBER |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DAY PLAN NuMber |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONTH | J | F | M | A | M | J | J | A | S | 0 | N | D |
|  | X $\times$ |  | X | X | X |  | x | > | x | < | x | p |
| DAY OF WEEK (DOW) | SUN |  | MON | TUE |  | WED |  | THU |  | FRI | SAT |  |
|  | $\chi$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | < |
| DAY OF MONTH (DOM) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|  | x | X | X | X | X | x |  | X | \% | \% | $\cdots$ | ¢ |
|  | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |  | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |
|  | X | 1 | ¢ | x | < | L |  | x | $k$ | x | $\bigcirc$ | \% |
|  | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |  | 29 | 30 | 31 |  |  |
|  | X | V | K | \% | < | X |  | V | X | * |  |  |

## APPENDIX B

## Existing Plus Approved Development

Crash Data

Total Crashes per KDOT Summary

| Year | Roeland Drive |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | 2013 |
|  | 2014 |
|  | 2015 |
|  | 2016 |
| Total* | 10 |
|  | 2017 |

*2018 \& 2019 Excluded from crash rate due to incomplete/unofficial data (per KDOT)
Sorted Crash Data After Review ("Random" Crashes Removed)

| Year | Roeland Drive |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2013 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 5 |
|  | 2015 | 2 |
|  | 2016 | 3 |
|  | 2017 | 0 |
| Total* |  | 0 |

*2018 \& 2019 Excluded from crash rate due to incomplete/unofficial data (per KDOT)
Examples of "random" crashes include those deemed to be caused by:
alcohol impairment, animals, construction, inclement weather, a previous crash emergency vehicle, vehicle malfunction, or medical complications.

| CWOV |
| :--- |
| Rear End |
| Rear End |
| Rear End |
| Angle - Side Impact |
| Rear End |
| Rear End |
| Rear End |
| Rear End |
| Rear End |
| Rear End |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

## Rear End Angle - Side Impact

9 1

SHAWNEE MISSION PARKWAY \& ROELAND DRIVE 2013 TO 2017



|  | Intersection |  | Total Entering Vehicles (TEV/day) | Ten Million Entering Vehicles (TMEV/5 years) | 2013-2017 Total | Intersection Crash Rate (crashes/TMEV) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Street | Street |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | US-73 | Roeland Drive | 38,360 | 7.0 | 10 | 1.43 |

Note: Crash rate only includes crashes occuring from 2013-2017. Crashes that were considered "random" were not included in the crash rate calculation

## Signal Warrants
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## Configuration Submenu

MM-1-1-1 Phase Ring Assignment (PRI = Priority)
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## Controller Submenu

MM-2-1 Controller Timing Data, sheet 1 of 2


## MM-2-4 Guaranteed Minimum Times

| OL/PHASE | A01 | B02 | C03 | D04 | E05 | F06 | c07 | H08 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MIN GRN | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | $\leqslant$ | 5 | 5 |
| WALK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED CLR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yellow | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| RED CLR | $\not \subset$ | ¢ | $\phi$ | $\phi$ | $\phi$ | \% | © | 6 |
| OVL. GRN | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | + | 5 | 5 |
| OL/PHASE | 109 | 110 | K11 | 112 | M13 | N14 | 015 | P16 |
| MIN GRN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WALK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED CLR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| YELLOW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RED CLR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OVL. GRN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## MM-2-5 Start/Flash Data

| START UP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3. | 4 | 5 | 6. | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 111 | 122 | 13 | 14 | 145 | 16 |
| PHASE |  | $y$ |  |  |  | $y$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | A | B | 6 | D | E | F | C | 1 | 1 | S | K | 4 | N | N | 0 | P |
| OVERLAP | X | x | < | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FLASH>MON. | NO |  |  | FLASH TIME |  |  | 4 |  |  | ALL RED TIME |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| PWR START SEQ. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

AUTOMATIC FLASH

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11. | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ENTRY |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EXIT |  | x |  |  |  | y |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OVERLAP | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | 11 | +10 | ¢ | K | 1 | V | N | 0 | P |
| EXIT | X | X | $x$ | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FLASH>MON. | do |  |  | EXIT FLASH |  |  | W |  |  | MIN FLASH |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| MINIMUM RECALL | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CYCLE THROUGH PHASES |  |  |  |  | Me |  |

## MM-2-8 Phase Recall Options

| TIMING PLAN NUMBER [1] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 3 | \|\% | 5 | 6.1 | 17 | 18 | 1.9 | 10 | 141 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| LOCK DET INPUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL. |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | $\chi$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX TIME RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOFT RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO REST IN PHASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADDED INIT CALC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIMING PLAN NUMBER [2] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - PHASE, | 1. | 2 | 3 | 14 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8. | 9 | 101 | 14 | 12 | 131 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| LOCK DET INPUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX TIME RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOFT RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO RESTIN PHASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADDED INIT CALC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIMING PLAN NUMBER [3] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 131 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| LOCK DET INPUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX TIME RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOFT RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO REST IN PHASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADDED INIT CALC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIMING PLAN NUMBER [4] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11. | 12 | 13 | 14. | 15 | 16 |
| LOCK DET INPUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX TIME RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOFT RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO REST IN PHASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADDED INIT CALC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Coordinator Submenu

MM-3-1 Coordinator Options

| COORD OPTIONS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MANUAL PATTERN | A\%\% | ECPI COORD | $1 \leq 5$ |
| SYSTEM SOURCE | TOC | SYSTEM FORMAT | 670 |
| SPLITS IN | 0 | OFFSETIN | fee's |
| TRANSITION | Smicter | MAX SELECT | may 702 |
| DWELL/ADD TIME | 6 | ENABLE MAN SYNC | ,10 |
| DLY COORD WK-LZ | No | FORCE OFF | Float |
| OFFSET REF | Craty | CAL USE PED TM | $4 \leq 5$ |
| PED RECALL | No | PED RESERVE | NO |
| LOCAL ZERO OVRD | No | FO ADD INI GRN | No |
| RE-SYNC COUNT | 8 | MULTISYNC | No |

## MM-3-2 Coordinator Pattern, sheet 1 of 2
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MM-3-2 Coordinator Pattern, sheet 1 of 2


## MM-3-3 Split Pattern, sheet 1 of 4

| SPLIT PATTERN NUMBER |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PHASE |  | 1. |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | 6. |  | 7. |  | 8 |
| SPLIT |  | 15 |  | 35 |  | 15 |  | 35 |  | 15 |  | 35 |  | 15 |  | 35 |
| PHASE |  | 9 |  | 10 |  | 11 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 15. |  | 16 |
| SPLIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6. | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| COORD |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OMIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| SPLIT PATTERN NUMBER |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PHASE |  | 1. |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | 6. |  | 7 |  | 8 |
| SPLIT |  | 18 |  | 19 |  | 18 |  | 45 |  | 13 |  | 24 |  | 17 |  | 46 |
| PHASE |  | 9. |  | 10. |  | 11. |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 15 |  | 16. |
| SPLIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14. | 15 | 16 |
| COORD |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OMIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## MM-3-3 Split Pattern, sheet 2 of 4

| SPLIT PATTERN NUMBER |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PHASE |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4. |  | 5 |  | 6 \% |  | 7. |  | 8 |
| SPLIT |  | 19 |  | 24 |  | 15 |  | 42 |  | 14 |  | 29 |  | 18 |  | 39 |
| PHASE |  | 9 |  | 10 |  | 11. |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  | 15 |  | 16 |
| SPLIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PHASE | 1. | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7. | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16. |
| COORD |  |  |  | $X$ |  |  |  | k |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OMIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Preemptor Submenu

## MM-4-1 Preemptor, sheet 1 of 2



## Preemptor Submenu

## MM-4-1 Preemptor, sheet 1 of 2



## MM-4-1 Preemptor, sheet 2 of 2
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## Preemptor Submenu

MM-4-1 Preemptor, sheet 1 of 2
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## MM-4-2 Low Priority Preemptor Selection

| ENABLE PREEMPT FILTERING \& TSP/SCP |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FILTERED INPUT | SOLD | PUESING |
| 1 | Ayfass | $B P$ |
| 2 | ByPASS | 3 O |
| 3 | Pree 3 | TSp 1 |
| 4 | Pre 4 | TSP 2 |
| 5 | Pre 5 | Pex 9 |
| 6 | $P \mathrm{C}$ | Pre 10 |
| 7 | $\beta P$ | $3 P$ |
| 8 | AP | 3 P |
| 9 | $B P$ | $3 P$ |
| 10 | $\beta 6$ | $B P$ |

MM-4-3 TSP/SCP Plan (Optional)

| TSP/SCP PLAN | 1 | 2 2, 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TSP/SCP ENABLED | yes | Yes |  |  |  |
| SIGNAL TYPE (S or P) | $p$ | $\rho$ |  |  |  |
| DETECTOR LOCK | $x$ | $X$ |  |  |  |
| DELAY TIME | $\phi$ | 4 |  |  |  |
| MAX PRESENCE | $1 * 0$ | 190 |  |  |  |
| PREEMPT ENABLES RESERVICE |  | \% |  |  |  |
| NO DELAY IN TSP PHASES | * | - |  |  |  |
| ACTION SPECIAL FUNCTION INHIBIT | 4 | $\phi$ |  |  |  |
| RESERVICE CYCLES | 31 | B1 |  |  |  |
| BUS HEADING (NB, SB, EB, WB) | * | ) |  |  |  |
| MODE (TSP or SCP) | 15 | FREE DEFAULT PTN | 120 |  |  |
| HEADWAY ALLOWANCE | $\phi$ |  |  |  |  |

- TSP/SCP PHASE -

| VEH/PED | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4. | 5 | 6. | 7. | 8 | 9 | 10. | 11. | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TSP/SCP1 |  |  | 20 |  | \% | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TSP/SCP2 |  | 5 | \% |  | 世 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TSP/SCP3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TSP/SCP4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TSP/SCP5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TSP/SCP6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## MM-4-4 TSP/SCP Split Pattern (Optional)



$$
\begin{gathered}
2 \\
\phi \quad 6 \quad \phi \quad 72 \\
1819183811 \\
3 \\
3 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$
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## Time Base Submenu

MM-5-1 Clock/Calendar Data

| Are the Date and Time set OK? (Yes, No) |  | STANDARD TIME FROM GMT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MANUAL ACTION PLAN |  | SYNC REFERENCE |  |
| SYNC REFERENCE TIME |  | DAYLIGHT SAVINGS |  |
| TIME RESET INPUT TIME SET |  |  |  |

MM-5-2 Action Plan, sheet 1 of 4


## MM-5-2 Action Plan, sheet 2 of 4
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MM-5-2 Action Plan, sheet 3 of 4

| ACTION PLAN | 3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PATTERN | 3 | SYSTEM OVERRIDE | N\% |
| TIMING PLAN | / | SEQUENCE | $\rangle$ |
| VEHICLE DETECTOR PLAN | $\psi^{*}$ | DETECTOR LOG | More |
| FLASH | $\cdots$ | RED REST | No |
| VEHICLE DET DIAGNOSTIC PLAN | w | PED DET DIAGNOSTIC PLAN | 0 |
| DIMMING ENABLE | Md |  |  |


| PHASE | 1. | 2 | 3. | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8. | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PED RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WALK 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH EXT 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEH RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX RECALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAX 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CS INHIBIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PHASE OMIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPEC FUNCTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (1-8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AUX FUNCTION |  |  |  | (1-3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |  |
| LP 1-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LP 16-30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LP 31-45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LP 46-60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LP 61-75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LP 76-90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LP 91-100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Program Reference Card
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MM-5-3 Day Plan, sheet 1 of 2

| DAY PLAN \# | / |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EVENT \# | ACTION PLAN | START TIME | EVENT \# | ACTION PLAN \# | START TIME |
| 1 | / | क) : 1 | 26 |  | : |
| 2 | 3 | Q $0^{2}$ | 27 |  | : |
| 3 | 1 | ¢ $\square^{2}$ | 28 |  | : |
| 4 | 3 | \% $\square^{\circ}$ | 29 |  | : |
| 5 | 1 | $4^{*}: \mathrm{V}^{3}$ | 30 |  | : |
| 6 |  | : | 31 |  | : |
| 7 |  | : | 32 |  | : |
| 8 |  | : | 33 |  | : |
| 9 |  | . | 34 |  | : |
| 10 |  | : | 35 |  | : |
| 11 |  | : | 36 |  | : |
| 12 |  | - | 37 |  | : |
| 13 |  | $\cdot$ | 38 |  | : |
| 14 |  | , | 39 |  | : |
| 15 |  | : | 40 |  | : |
| 16 |  | : | 41 |  | : |
| 17 |  | : | 42 |  | : |
| 18 |  | : | 43 |  | $\cdot$ |
| 19 |  | - | 44 |  | : |
| 20 |  | : | 45 |  | : |
| 21 |  | : | 46 |  | : |
| 22 |  | : | 47 |  | : |
| 23 |  | : | 48 |  | : |
| 24 |  | . | 49 |  | : |
| 25 |  | : | 50 |  | : |

MM-5-3 Day Plan, sheet 2 of 2

| DAY PLAN \# | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EVENT \# | ACTION PLAN | START TIME | EVENT \# | ACTION PLAN\# | START TME |
| 1 | L | Cta | 26 |  | : |
| 2 |  | : | 27 |  | : |
| 3 |  | : | 28 |  | : |
| 4 |  | : | 29 |  | : |
| 5 |  | : | 30 |  | : |
| 6 |  | : | 31 |  | : |
| 7 |  | - | 32 |  | ; |
| 8 |  | : | 33 |  | : |
| 9 |  | : | 34 |  | : |
| 10 |  | : | 35 |  | : |
| 11 |  | : | 36 |  | : |
| 12 |  | : | 37 |  | : |
| 13 |  | : | 38 |  | : |
| 14 |  | : | 39 |  | . |
| 15 |  | : | 40 |  | : |
| 16 |  | : | 41 |  | : |
| 17 |  | : | 42 |  | : |
| 18 |  | : | 43 |  | : |
| 19 |  | : | 44 |  | : |
| 20 |  | : | 45 |  | : |
| 21 |  | : | 46 |  | : |
| 22 |  | : | 47 |  | : |
| 23 |  | : | 48 |  | . |
| 24 |  | : | 49 |  | : |
| 25 |  | : | 50 |  | : |

- Appendix D


## MM-5-4 Schedule, sheet 1 of 3



| SCHEDULE NUMBER |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DAY PLAN NuMber |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONTH | J | F | M | A | M | J | J | A | S | 0 | N | D |
|  | X $\times$ |  | X | X | X |  | x | > | x | < | x | p |
| DAY OF WEEK (DOW) | SUN |  | MON | TUE |  | WED |  | THU |  | FRI | SAT |  |
|  | $\chi$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | < |
| DAY OF MONTH (DOM) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|  | x | X | X | X | X | x |  | X | \% | \% | $\cdots$ | ¢ |
|  | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |  | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |
|  | X | 1 | ¢ | x | < | L |  | x | $k$ | x | $\bigcirc$ | \% |
|  | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |  | 29 | 30 | 31 |  |  |
|  | X | V | K | \% | < | X |  | V | X | * |  |  |

## Trip Generation

# Land Use: 220 Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) 

## Description

Low-rise multifamily housing includes apartments, townhouses, and condominiums located within the same building with at least three other dwelling units and that have one or two levels (floors). Multifamily housing (mid-rise) (Land Use 221), multifamily housing (high-rise) (Land Use 222), and off-campus student apartment (Land Use 225) are related land uses.

## Additional Data

In prior editions of Trip Generation Manual, the low-rise multifamily housing sites were further divided into rental and condominium categories. An investigation of vehicle trip data found no clear differences in trip making patterns between the rental and condominium sites within the ITE database. As more data are compiled for future editions, this land use classification can be reinvestigated.

For the three sites for which both the number of residents and the number of occupied dwelling units were available, there were an average of 2.72 residents per occupied dwelling unit.

For the two sites for which the numbers of both total dwelling units and occupied dwelling units were available, an average of 96.2 percent of the total dwelling units were occupied.

This land use included data from a wide variety of units with different sizes, price ranges, locations, and ages. Consequently, there was a wide variation in trips generated within this category. Other factors, such as geographic location and type of adjacent and nearby development, may also have had an effect on the site trip generation.

Time-of-day distribution data for this land use are presented in Appendix A. For the 10 general urban/suburban sites with data, the overall highest vehicle volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between $7: 15$ and $8: 15 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. and 4:45 and 5:45 p.m., respectively. For the one site with Saturday data, the overall highest vehicle volume was counted between 9:45 and 10:45 a.m. For the one site with Sunday data, the overall highest vehicle volume was counted between 11:45 a.m. and 12:45 p.m.

For the one dense multi-use urban site with 24 -hour count data, the overall highest vehicle volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m. and 6:15 and 7:15 p.m., respectively.

For the three sites for which data were provided for both occupied dwelling units and residents, there was an average of 2.72 residents per occupied dwelling unit.

The average numbers of person trips per vehicle trip at the five general urban/suburban sites at which both person trip and vehicle trip data were collected were as follows:

- 1.13 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 7 and 9 a.m.
- 1.21 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 4 and 6 p.m.

The sites were surveyed in the 1980s, the 1990s, the 2000s, and the 2010s in British Columbia (CAN), California, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Ontario, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Washington.

It is expected that the number of bedrooms and number of residents are likely correlated to the number of trips generated by a residential site. Many of the studies included in this land use did not indicate the total number of bedrooms. To assist in the future analysis of this land use, it is important that this information be collected and included in trip generation data submissions.

## Source Numbers

$168,187,188,204,211,300,305,306,319,320,321,357,390,412,418,525,530,571,579,583$, 864, 868, 869, 870, 896, 903, 918, 946, 947, 948, 951

## Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) <br> (220)

## Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units

On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.

## Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban

Number of Studies: 42
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 199
Directional Distribution: 23\% entering, $77 \%$ exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.46 | $0.18-0.74$ | 0.12 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) <br> (220)

## Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units

On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 50
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 187
Directional Distribution: 63\% entering, 37\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.56 | $0.18-1.25$ | 0.16 |

Data Plot and Equation


# Land Use: 820 Shopping Center 

## Description

A shopping center is an integrated group of commercial establishments that is planned, developed, owned, and managed as a unit. A shopping center's composition is related to its market area in terms of size, location, and type of store. A shopping center also provides on-site parking facilities sufficient to serve its own parking demands. Factory outlet center (Land Use 823) is a related use

## Additional Data

Shopping centers, including neighborhood centers, community centers, regional centers, and super regional centers, were surveyed for this land use. Some of these centers contained non-merchandising facilities, such as office buildings, movie theaters, restaurants, post offices, banks, health clubs, and recreational facilities (for example, ice skating rinks or indoor miniature golf courses).

Many shopping centers, in addition to the integrated unit of shops in one building or enclosed around a mall, include outparcels (peripheral buildings or pads located on the perimeter of the center adjacent to the streets and major access points). These buildings are typically drive-in banks, retail stores, restaurants, or small offices. Although the data herein do not indicate which of the centers studied included peripheral buildings, it can be assumed that some of the data show their effect.

The vehicle trips generated at a shopping center are based upon the total GLA of the center. In cases of smaller centers without an enclosed mall or peripheral buildings, the GLA could be the same as the gross floor area of the building.

Time-of-day distribution data for this land use are presented in Appendix A. For the 10 general urban/ suburban sites with data, the overall highest vehicle volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 11:45 a.m. and 12:45 p.m. and 12:15 and 1:15 p.m., respectively.

The average numbers of person trips per vehicle trip at the 27 general urban/suburban sites at which both person trip and vehicle trip data were collected were as follows:

- 1.31 during Weekday, AM Peak Hour of Generator
- 1.43 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 4 and 6 p.m.
- 1.46 during Weekday, PM Peak Hour of Generator

The sites were surveyed in the 1980s, the 1990s, the 2000s, and the 2010s in Alberta (CAN), British Columbia (CAN), California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

## Source Numbers

$105,110,154,156,159,186,190,198,199,202,204,211,213,239,251,259,260,269,294,295$,
$299,300,301,304,305,307,308,309,310,311,314,315,316,317,319,358,365,376,385,390$,
$400,404,414,420,423,428,437,440,442,444,446,507,562,580,598,629,658,702,715,728$,
868, 870, 871, 880, 899, 908, 912, 915, 926, 936, 944, 946, 960, 961, 962, 973, 974, 978

## Shopping Center (820)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.

## Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban

Number of Studies: 84
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA: 351
Directional Distribution: 62\% entering, 38\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.94 | $0.18-23.74$ | 0.87 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Shopping Center (820)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 261
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA: 327
Directional Distribution: 48\% entering, 52\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.81 | $0.74-18.69$ | 2.04 |

Data Plot and Equation


Daily Trip Generation

| ITE <br> Code/Page | Land Use |  |  | Trip Gen. Avg. Rate/Eq. | Daily | Trip Distribution |  | Daily Trips |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Size |  |  | Trips | Enter | Exit | Enter | Exit |
|  |  | Approved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 220 | Apartment | 168 | DU | Equation | 1230 | 50\% | 50\% | 615 | 615 |
| 820 | Shopping Center | 54,594 | SF | Equation | 3984 | 50\% | 50\% | 1,992 | 1,992 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 5,214 |  |  | 2,607 | 2,607 |

AM Peak Hour Trip Generation (Adjacent Street)


PM Peak Hour Trip Generation (Adjacent Street)

|  |  | Size |  | Trip Gen. Avg. Rate/Eq. | PM Peak Hour Trips | Trip Distribution |  | PM Peak Hour Trips |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code/Page | Land Use |  |  | Enter |  | Exit | Enter |  |
| Approved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 220 | Apartment | 168 | DU |  | Equation | 94 | 63\% | 37\% | 60 | 34 |
| 820 | Shopping Center | 54594 | SF | Equation | 348 | 48\% | 52\% | 168 | 180 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 442 |  |  | 228 | 214 |
| Total (w/ Internal Capture Reduction) |  |  |  |  | 358 |  |  | 186 | 172 |
| Pass-by Reduction |  |  |  |  | 122 |  |  | 57 | 61 |
| Total (w/ Pass-by) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 129 | 111 |


| NCHRP 8-51 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Project Name: | Mission Gateway | Organization: |  |
| Project Location: | Mission, KS | Performed By: | OIsson |
| Scenario Description: | Existing + Approved | DCM |  |
| Analysis Year: | 2018 | Checked By: |  |
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour | Date: |  |


| Land Use | Development Data (For Information Only) |  |  | Estimated Vehicle-Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ITE LUCs ${ }^{1}$ | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Retail |  |  |  | 180 | 112 | 68 |
| Restaurant |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  | 79 | 19 | 60 |
| Hotel |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 259 | 131 | 128 |


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


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


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


| Table 5-A: Computations Summary |  |  |  | Table 6-A: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| All Person-Trips | 259 | 131 | 128 | Office | N/A | N/A |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | Retail | 1\% | 0\% |
|  |  |  |  | Restaurant | N/A | N/A |
| External Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{3}$ | 257 | 130 | 127 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A |
| External Transit-Trips ${ }^{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Residential | 0\% | 2\% |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ${ }^{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A |

[^1]${ }^{4}$ Person-Trips
*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.
Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas Transportation Institute

| NCHRP 8-51 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Project Name: | Mission Gateway |  | Organization: |
| Project Location: | Mission, KS | Performed By: | Olsson |
| Scenario Description: | Approved Development | Date: | TCM |
| Analysis Year: | 2018 | Checked By: |  |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour | Date: |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| Table 1-P: Base Vehicle-Trip Generation Estimates (Single-Use Site Estimate) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Development Data (For Information Only) |  |  | Estimated Vehicle-Trips |  |  |
|  | ITE LUCs ${ }^{1}$ | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Retail | 820 | 54,594 | SQF | 348 | 168 | 180 |
| Restaurant |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Residential | 220 | 168 | DU | 94 | 60 | 34 |
| Hotel |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 442 | 228 | 214 |


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


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


| Table 4-P: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |  |  |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Retail | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 |  |  |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Residential | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |


| Table 5-P: Computations Summary |  |  |  | Table 6-P: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| All Person-Trips | 442 | 228 | 214 | Office | N/A | N/A |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 19\% | 18\% | 20\% | Retail | 8\% | 16\% |
|  |  |  |  | Restaurant | N/A | N/A |
| External Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{3}$ | 358 | 186 | 172 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A |
| External Transit-Trips ${ }^{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Residential | 47\% | 41\% |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ${ }^{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A |

[^2]
## ${ }^{4}$ Person-Trips

*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.
Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas Transportation Institute






Capacity Analysis

Queues
3: Roe Avenue \& Johnson Drive/Johnson Drive WB

|  | $\prime$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ | * | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 201 | 271 | 28 | 254 | 113 | 765 | 72 | 97 | 383 | 195 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.53 | 0.37 | 0.22 | 0.59 | 0.20 | 0.45 | 0.09 | 0.25 | 0.24 | 0.24 |
| Control Delay | 46.7 | 32.7 | 47.4 | 45.5 | 11.2 | 20.4 | 0.2 | 11.7 | 19.1 | 3.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 46.7 | 32.7 | 47.4 | 45.5 | 11.2 | 20.4 | 0.2 | 11.7 | 19.1 | 3.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 63 | 74 | 17 | 77 | 30 | 173 | 0 | 25 | 77 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 92 | 106 | 42 | 113 | 43 | 246 | 0 | 51 | 127 | 41 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 512 |  | 629 |  | 477 |  |  | 492 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 245 |  | 130 |  | 150 |  | 25 | 150 |  | 250 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 429 | 744 | 134 | 476 | 604 | 1700 | 845 | 469 | 1598 | 821 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.47 | 0.36 | 0.21 | 0.53 | 0.19 | 0.45 | 0.09 | 0.21 | 0.24 | 0.24 |

[^3]| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ＊＊ | 性 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 个 $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 个 $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 175 | 187 | 36 | 24 | 199 | 9 | 72 | 658 | 53 | 83 | 360 | 170 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 175 | 187 | 36 | 24 | 199 | 9 | 72 | 658 | 53 | 83 | 360 | 170 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 201 | 215 | 56 | 28 | 226 | 28 | 112 | 765 | 0 | 97 | 383 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.64 | 0.86 | 0.88 | 0.32 | 0.64 | 0.86 | 0.74 | 0.86 | 0.94 | 0.87 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 273 | 412 | 105 | 48 | 302 | 37 | 640 | 1906 |  | 459 | 1913 |  |
| Arrive On Green | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.54 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3456 | 2805 | 714 | 1781 | 3187 | 390 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 201 | 134 | 137 | 28 | 125 | 129 | 112 | 765 | 0 | 97 | 383 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1728 | 1777 | 1742 | 1781 | 1777 | 1800 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 5.7 | 7.0 | 7.3 | 1.6 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 2.8 | 12.7 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 5.6 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 5.7 | 7.0 | 7.3 | 1.6 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 2.8 | 12.7 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 5.6 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.41 | 1.00 |  | 0.22 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 273 | 261 | 256 | 48 | 168 | 171 | 640 | 1906 |  | 459 | 1913 |  |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.74 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 0.58 | 0.74 | 0.76 | 0.18 | 0.40 |  | 0.21 | 0.20 |  |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 415 | 320 | 314 | 125 | 231 | 234 | 751 | 1906 |  | 584 | 1913 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 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 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 45.0 | 39.4 | 39.5 | 48.1 | 44.1 | 44.1 | 9.4 | 13.7 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 11.9 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 3.8 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 10.6 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 2.6 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 48.9 | 41.0 | 41.2 | 58.7 | 52.1 | 53.2 | 9.5 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 10. | 12. | 0.0 |


| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 48.9 | 41.0 | 41.2 | 58.7 | 52.1 | 53.2 | 9.5 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 12.2 | 0.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | D | D | D | E | D | D | A | B |  | A | B |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 472 |  |  | 282 |  |  | 877 | A |  | 480 | A |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 44.4 |  |  | 53.2 |  |  | 13.7 |  |  | 11.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 13.9 | 15.5 | 11.0 | 59.6 | 8.7 | 20.7 | 10.8 | 59.8 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | 6.0 | 6.0 | $* 5.4$ | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 12.0 | 13.0 | $* 13$ | 39.0 | 7.0 | 18.0 | 11.0 | 40.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋1）），s | 7.7 | 9.0 | 4.3 | 14.7 | 3.6 | 9.3 | 4.8 | 7.6 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 2.6 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 25.4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

## Notes

＊HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，SBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \% | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 8 | 338 | 25 | 62 | 383 | 4 | 36 | 50 | 72 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.01 | 0.30 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.12 | 0.24 |
| Control Delay | 7.0 | 14.0 | 0.1 | 6.7 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 15.8 | 6.9 | 18.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 7.0 | 14.0 | 0.1 | 6.7 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 15.8 | 6.9 | 18.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 1 | 66 | 0 | 5 | 37 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 10 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 2 | 178 | 0 | 25 | 199 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 38 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 180 |  |  | 509 |  |  | 267 | 783 |
| Turn Bay Length (t) | 100 |  | 100 | 130 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 738 | 1673 | 1436 | 724 | 1673 | 1436 | 405 | 880 | 397 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.01 | 0.20 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.18 |

[^4]| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | , | 324 | 17 | 53 | 352 | 1 | 18 | 3 | 44 | 6 | 23 | 21 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 2 | 324 | 17 | 53 | 352 | 1 | 18 | 3 | 44 | 6 | 23 | 21 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 8 | 338 | 25 | 62 | 383 | 4 | 36 | 4 | 46 | 12 | 32 | 28 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.25 | 0.96 | 0.67 | 0.86 | 0.92 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.75 | 0.95 | 0.50 | 0.72 | 0.75 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 359 | 502 | 426 | 421 | 618 | 523 | 521 | 37 | 420 | 125 | 94 | 73 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.07 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.05 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 128 | 1476 | 183 | 846 | 655 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 8 | 338 | 25 | 62 | 383 | 4 | 36 | 0 | 50 | 72 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1605 | 1683 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.1 | 6.5 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 6.9 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.1 | 6.5 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 6.9 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.92 | 0.17 |  | 0.39 |
| Lane Grp Cap (c), veh/h | 359 | 502 | 426 | 421 | 618 | 523 | 521 | 0 | 457 | 291 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.02 | 0.67 | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0.62 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 646 | 2183 | 1850 | 598 | 2183 | 1850 | 743 | 0 | 837 | 477 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 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 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 10.7 | 13.2 | 10.9 | 9.6 | 11.4 | 9.1 | 12.8 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 16.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 10.7 | 14.7 | 11.0 | 9.7 | 12.4 | 9.1 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 17.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |


| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 10.7 | 14.7 | 11.0 | 9.7 | 12.4 | 9.1 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 17.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | B | B | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 371 |  |  | 449 |  |  | 86 |  | 17 | 172 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 14.4 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 11.6 |  |  | 17.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ s | 5.5 | 18.3 | 16.5 | 8.0 | 15.8 | 7.0 | 9.5 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 7.0 | 47.0 | 21.0 | 7.0 | 47.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 2.1 | 8.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 8.5 | 2.7 | 3.5 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay
HCM 6th LOS

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 70 | 1174 | 28 | 37 | 2011 | 120 | 148 | 40 | 64 |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.02 | 0.28 | 0.74 | 0.56 | 0.72 | 0.19 | 0.20 |
| Control Delay | 51.7 | 35.2 | 0.0 | 58.0 | 21.7 | 35.6 | 71.0 | 49.8 | 1.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 51.7 | 35.2 | 0.0 | 58.0 | 21.7 | 35.6 | 71.0 | 49.8 | 1.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 52 | 442 | 0 | 27 | 461 | 40 | 110 | 28 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 63 | 434 | m0 | 44 | 553 | 100 | \#176 | 44 | 0 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 682 |  |  | 2401 | 499 |  | 439 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) | 345 |  | 310 | 170 |  |  | 100 |  | 125 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 140 | 2129 | 1583 | 140 | 2701 | 274 | 208 | 219 | 322 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.50 | 0.55 | 0.02 | 0.26 | 0.74 | 0.44 | 0.71 | 0.18 | 0.20 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $m$ Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | ¢ $\uparrow$ | F | ${ }^{7}$ | 惺家 |  |  | ¢ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 44 | 986 | 21 | 23 | 1722 | 168 | 18 | 11 | 67 | 117 | 25 | 48 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 44 | 986 | 21 | 23 | 1722 | 168 | 18 | 11 | 67 | 117 | 25 | 48 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 70 | 1174 | 0 | 37 | 1813 | 198 | 29 | 12 | 79 | 148 | 40 | 64 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.63 | 0.84 | 0.75 | 0.63 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.63 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.79 | 0.63 | 0.75 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 107 | 1910 |  | 200 | 2657 | 289 | 35 | 15 | 95 | 171 | 179 | 152 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.06 | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 | 1781 | 4443 | 483 | 400 | 165 | 1089 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 70 | 1174 | 0 | 37 | 1280 | 731 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 40 | 64 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 | 1781 | 1571 | 1783 | 1654 | 0 | 0 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 4.6 | 27.4 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 33.2 | 33.5 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 2.4 | 4.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 4.6 | 27.4 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 33.2 | 33.5 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 2.4 | 4.6 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.27 | 0.24 |  | 0.66 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 107 | 1910 |  | 200 | 1879 | 1066 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 179 | 152 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.65 | 0.61 |  | 0.18 | 0.68 | 0.69 | 0.83 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.87 | 0.22 | 0.42 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 141 | 1910 |  | 200 | 1879 | 1066 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 179 | 152 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 55.2 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 48.3 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 53.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 53.5 | 50.1 | 51.1 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 2.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.2 | 0.7 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 2.1 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 11.1 | 13.3 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 1.1 | 1.8 |

Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh

| LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh | 57.6 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 48.4 | 18.4 | 20.0 | 64.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 86.8 | 50.4 | 51.8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | E | C |  | D | B | C | E | A | A | F | D | D |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1244 | A |  | 2048 |  |  | 120 |  | 252 |  |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 22.7 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 64.0 |  | 72.1 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 11.7 | 77.3 | 15.0 | 19.0 | 70.0 | 16.0 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.5 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 5.5 | ${ }^{*} 5.5$ | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 9.5 | 64.5 | 15.5 | 9.5 | ${ }^{*} 65$ | 11.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 6.6 | 35.5 | 10.6 | 4.3 | 29.4 | 11.8 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 11.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 5.8 | 0.0 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 25.7 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

## Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

Unsignalized Delay for [EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement W | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 | 4 | F | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 36 | 6 | 164 | 59 | 4 | 154 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 36 | 6 | 164 | 59 | 4 | 154 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control S | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 0 | - | 130 | 75 | - |
| 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 | 39 | 7 | 178 | 64 | 4 | 167 |



Queues
6: Roeland Drive \& Martway Street/Drive 3

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 20 | 20 | 39 | 7 | 44 | 87 | 5 | 112 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.09 |
| Control Delay | 19.3 | 0.0 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 6.0 | 16.2 | 13.3 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 19.3 | 0.0 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 6.0 | 16.2 | 13.3 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 22 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 16 | 21 | 9 | 55 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 773 |  | 54 |  | 238 |  | 267 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 105 |  |  |  | 115 |  | 100 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1420 | 1429 | 491 | 1115 | 1012 | 1783 | 1107 | 1554 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.07 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 18 | 0 | 12 | 36 | 0 | 6 | 29 | 42 | 19 | 5 | 76 | 11 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 18 | 0 | 12 | 36 | 0 | 6 | 29 | 42 | 19 | 5 | 76 | 11 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 20 | 0 | 20 | 39 | 0 | 7 | 44 | 66 | 21 | 5 | 100 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.60 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.76 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 100 | 0 | 89 | 112 | 0 | 100 | 503 | 547 | 174 | 468 | 306 | 37 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 1360 | 433 | 1310 | 1638 | 197 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 20 | 0 | 20 | 39 | 0 | 7 | 44 | 0 | 87 | 5 | 0 | 112 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1792 | 1310 | 0 | 1835 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.24 | 1.00 |  | 0.11 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 100 | 0 | 89 | 112 | 0 | 100 | 503 | 0 | 721 | 468 | 0 | 342 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.33 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1495 | 0 | 1330 | 476 | 0 | 424 | 1225 | 0 | 2952 | 1568 | 0 | 1882 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 14.5 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 14.4 | 0.0 | 14.2 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 11.3 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |

Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh

| LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh | 15.5 | 0.0 | 15.8 | 16.3 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 11.9 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | B | A | B | B | A | B | A | A | A | B | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 40 |  |  | 46 |  |  | 131 |  |  | 117 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 15.6 |  |  | 16.0 |  |  | 6.8 |  |  | 11.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$, s | 7.4 | 18.0 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 11.0 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$, s | * 5.4 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | * 8.6 | 53.0 | 27.0 | 15.0 | 33.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 3.7 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 10.9 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | $B$ |

Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.



Queues
3: Roe Avenue \& Johnson Drive/Johnson Drive WB

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 342 | 413 | 71 | 366 | 127 | 586 | 72 | 79 | 624 | 340 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.71 | 0.50 | 0.48 | 0.68 | 0.33 | 0.41 | 0.10 | 0.51 | 0.47 | 0.42 |
| Control Delay | 49.7 | 31.7 | 54.7 | 45.6 | 15.5 | 24.3 | 0.3 | 55.1 | 26.3 | 4.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 49.7 | 31.7 | 54.7 | 45.6 | 15.5 | 24.3 | 0.3 | 55.1 | 26.3 | 4.6 |
| Queue Length 50th ( ft ) | 106 | 107 | 44 | 113 | 41 | 150 | 0 | 48 | 160 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 130 | 154 | 75 | 150 | 59 | 185 | 0 | 77 | 205 | 55 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 513 |  | 629 |  | 477 |  |  | 492 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 245 |  | 130 |  | 150 |  | 25 | 150 |  | 250 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 495 | 860 | 156 | 635 | 430 | 1469 | 752 | 168 | 1341 | 811 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.69 | 0.48 | 0.46 | 0.58 | 0.30 | 0.40 | 0.10 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.42 |

[^5]| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％${ }^{1+1}$ | 个t |  | \％ | 性 |  | \％ | 个个 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 个个 | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 260 | 275 | 91 | 54 | 280 | 25 | 95 | 498 | 52 | 58 | 524 | 299 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 260 | 275 | 91 | 54 | 280 | 25 | 95 | 498 | 52 | 58 | 524 | 299 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 342 | 299 | 114 | 71 | 326 | 40 | 127 | 586 | 0 | 79 | 624 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.76 | 0.92 | 0.80 | 0.76 | 0.86 | 0.63 | 0.75 | 0.85 | 0.72 | 0.73 | 0.84 | 0.88 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 410 | 501 | 187 | 91 | 416 | 51 | 444 | 1589 |  | 114 | 1611 |  |
| Arrive On Green | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.06 | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.45 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3456 | 2532 | 945 | 1781 | 3189 | 388 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 342 | 208 | 205 | 71 | 180 | 186 | 127 | 586 | 0 | 79 | 624 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1728 | 1777 | 1700 | 1781 | 1777 | 1800 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 9.7 | 10.6 | 11.0 | 3.9 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 3.8 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 11.6 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 9.7 | 10.6 | 11.0 | 3.9 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 3.8 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 11.6 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.56 | 1.00 |  | 0.22 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 410 | 351 | 336 | 91 | 232 | 235 | 444 | 1589 |  | 114 | 1611 |  |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.83 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.29 | 0.37 |  | 0.70 | 0.39 |  |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 449 | 409 | 391 | 143 | 320 | 324 | 555 | 1589 |  | 160 | 1611 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（1） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 43.1 | 36.4 | 36.6 | 46.9 | 42.1 | 42.1 | 13.9 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 45.9 | 18.1 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 11.9 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 13.1 | 8.0 | 8.7 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（ $50 \%$ ），veh／ln | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 2.1 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 1.5 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 4.7 | 0.0 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 55.0 | 38.1 | 38.7 | 60.0 | 50.1 | 50.9 | 14.3 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 53.3 | 18.8 | 0.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | E | D | D | E | D | D | B | B |  | D | B |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 755 |  |  | 437 |  |  | 713 | A |  | 703 | A |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 45.9 |  |  | 52.0 |  |  | 18.1 |  |  | 22.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 17.9 | 19.0 | 12.4 | 50.7 | 11.1 | 25.8 | 11.8 | 51.3 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$ ，s | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 13.0 | 18.0 | 9.0 | 36.0 | 8.0 | 23.0 | 12.0 | 33.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 11.7 | 12.0 | 6.3 | 12.9 | 5.9 | 13.0 | 5.8 | 13.6 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 4.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 33.1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，SBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

Synchro 10 Report
Page 2

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 | $\leftrightarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 48 | 583 | 42 | 79 | 648 | 24 | 42 | 151 | 52 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.11 | 0.53 | 0.04 | 0.16 | 0.59 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.33 | 0.21 |
| Control Delay | 6.3 | 15.4 | 0.1 | 6.5 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 24.5 | 10.4 | 20.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 6.3 | 15.4 | 0.1 | 6.5 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 24.5 | 10.4 | 20.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 8 | 201 | 0 | 13 | 230 | 0 | 13 | 9 | 6 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 16 | 300 | 0 | 25 | 356 | 0 | 41 | 61 | 15 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 180 |  |  | 507 |  |  | 267 | 783 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 100 |  | 100 | 130 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 472 | 1421 | 1242 | 516 | 1421 | 1242 | 352 | 761 | 321 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.10 | 0.41 | 0.03 | 0.15 | 0.46 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.16 |

[^6]|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | \% |  | $\dagger$ | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | 「' | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 36 | 501 | 38 | 62 | 564 | 9 | 35 | 26 | 98 | 2 | 6 | 23 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 36 | 501 | 38 | 62 | 564 | 9 | 35 | 26 | 98 | 2 | 6 | 23 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 48 | 583 | 42 | 79 | 648 | 24 | 42 | 28 | 122 | 4 | 12 | 36 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.91 | 0.78 | 0.87 | 0.38 | 0.83 | 0.93 | 0.80 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.64 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 327 | 765 | 649 | 378 | 802 | 680 | 438 | 75 | 325 | 76 | 46 | 117 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.06 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.08 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.05 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 305 | 1327 | 60 | 443 | 1132 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 48 | 583 | 42 | 79 | 648 | 24 | 42 | 0 | 150 | 52 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1632 | 1636 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.8 | 14.9 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 16.8 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.8 | 14.9 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 16.8 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.81 | 0.08 |  | 0.69 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 327 | 765 | 649 | 378 | 802 | 680 | 438 | 0 | 399 | 239 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.15 | 0.76 | 0.06 | 0.21 | 0.81 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.38 | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 450 | 1582 | 1341 | 467 | 1582 | 1341 | 571 | 0 | 617 | 333 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 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 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 10.5 | 14.1 | 10.0 | 9.9 | 13.9 | 9.2 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 17.5 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 0.3 | 5.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 6.3 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 10.7 | 15.7 | 10.0 | 10.2 | 15.9 | 9.2 | 18.7 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | B | B | B | B | B | A | B | A | B | C | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 673 |  |  | 751 |  |  | 192 |  |  | 52 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 15.0 |  |  | 15.1 |  |  | 18.2 |  |  | 23.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 8.1 | 28.8 |  | 18.6 | 9.2 | 27.7 | 7.9 | 10.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 7.0 | 47.0 |  | 21.0 | 7.0 | 47.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 2.8 | 18.8 |  | 6.2 | 3.3 | 16.9 | 3.1 | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 5.0 |  | 0.7 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 15.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | 7 | $\stackrel{-}{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 145 | 1218 | 136 | 32 | 1741 | 152 | 126 | 84 | 114 |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.84 | 0.59 | 0.09 | 0.24 | 0.72 | 0.70 | 0.67 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Control Delay | 69.3 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 56.9 | 25.7 | 65.9 | 68.6 | 56.2 | 13.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 69.3 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 56.9 | 25.7 | 65.9 | 68.6 | 56.2 | 13.6 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 121 | 30 | 0 | 24 | 401 | 113 | 95 | 62 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | m123 | m399 | m0 | 47 | 535 | 135 | 125 | 97 | 51 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 682 |  |  | 2401 | 499 |  | 439 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 345 |  | 310 | 170 |  |  | 100 |  | 125 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 184 | 2058 | 1583 | 140 | 2404 | 293 | 228 | 240 | 303 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.79 | 0.59 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0.72 | 0.52 | 0.55 | 0.35 | 0.38 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个 $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | 中虳 |  |  | ${ }_{\$}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 106 | 1145 | 103 | 24 | 1542 | 93 | 68 | 37 | 7 | 92 | 66 | 100 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 106 | 1145 | 103 | 24 | 1542 | 93 | 68 | 37 | 7 | 92 | 66 | 100 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 145 | 1218 | 0 | 32 | 1623 | 118 | 88 | 52 | 12 | 126 | 84 | 114 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.73 | 0.94 | 0.76 | 0.75 | 0.95 | 0.79 | 0.77 | 0.71 | 0.58 | 0.73 | 0.79 | 0.88 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 364 | 1673 |  | 319 | 2058 | 150 | 105 | 62 | 14 | 160 | 168 | 143 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.20 | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 | 1781 | 4617 | 335 | 1038 | 613 | 142 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 145 | 1218 | 0 | 32 | 1104 | 637 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 84 | 114 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 | 1781 | 1571 | 1810 | 1793 | 0 | 0 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 8.5 | 33.1 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 36.0 | 36.1 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 5.1 | 8.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 8.5 | 33.1 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 36.0 | 36.1 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 5.1 | 8.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.19 | 0.58 |  | 0.08 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 364 | 1673 |  | 319 | 1401 | 807 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 168 | 143 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.40 | 0.73 |  | 0.10 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.83 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.79 | 0.50 | 0.80 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 364 | 1673 |  | 319 | 1401 | 807 | 291 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 242 | 205 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 41.4 | 25.6 | 0.0 | 41.1 | 28.4 | 28.4 | 52.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 53.5 | 52.0 | 53.5 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.3 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 4.6 | 7.7 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 0.9 | 8.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 3.7 | 13.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 13.6 | 16.4 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 3.7 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 41.6 | 28.4 | 0.0 | 41.2 | 33.0 | 36.1 | 58.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 52.9 | 62.1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | D | C |  | D | C | D | E | A | A | E | D | E |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1363 | A |  | 1773 |  |  | 152 |  | 324 |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 29.8 |  |  | 34.3 |  |  | 58.5 |  |  | 58.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 29.0 | 59.0 | 16.7 | 26.0 | 62.0 | 15.3 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 5.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 12.5 | 53.5 | 19.5 | 9.5 | 56.5 | 15.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 10.5 | 38.1 | 12.0 | 3.8 | 35.1 | 10.5 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 6.9 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.3 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 35.8 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | $D$ |

## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for［EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | 1 | $\mathbf{7}$ | 4 | $\mathbf{7}$ | i | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 75 | 5 | 140 | 92 | 4 | 176 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 75 | 5 | 140 | 92 | 4 | 176 |
| 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 | 0 | - | 130 | 75 | - |
| 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 | 82 | 5 | 152 | 100 | 4 | 191 |



Queues
6: Roeland Drive \& Martway Street/Drive 3

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 81 | 105 | 54 | 5 | 56 | 154 | 5 | 134 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.23 | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.15 |
| Control Delay | 21.0 | 0.3 | 19.7 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 9.0 | 19.4 | 15.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 21.0 | 0.3 | 19.7 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 9.0 | 19.4 | 15.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 23 | , | 14 | 0 | 10 | 24 | 1 | 26 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 56 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 21 | 38 | 9 | 55 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 773 |  | 54 |  | 238 |  | 267 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 105 |  |  |  | 115 |  | 100 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 452 | 974 | 472 | 922 | 685 | 1152 | 614 | 905 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.18 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.15 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 1 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 1 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 73 | 0 | 63 | 50 | 0 | 5 | 37 | 77 | 31 | 5 | 67 | 42 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 73 | 0 | 63 | 50 | 0 | 5 | 37 | 77 | 31 | 5 | 67 | 42 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 81 | 0 | 105 | 54 | 0 | 5 | 56 | 120 | 34 | 5 | 88 | 46 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.60 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.76 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 247 | 0 | 220 | 131 | 0 | 117 | 440 | 518 | 147 | 396 | 188 | 98 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 1402 | 397 | 1233 | 1157 | 605 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 81 | 0 | 105 | 54 | 0 | 5 | 56 | 0 | 154 | 5 | 0 | 134 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1799 | 1233 | 0 | 1762 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 1.5 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 2.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 1.5 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 2.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.22 | 1.00 |  | 0.34 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 247 | 0 | 220 | 131 | 0 | 117 | 440 | 0 | 665 | 396 | 0 | 287 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.48 | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.47 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 435 | 0 | 387 | 464 | 0 | 413 | 652 | 0 | 1025 | 497 | 0 | 430 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 14.3 | 0.0 | 14.6 | 16.3 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 9.9 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 14.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 |

Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh

| LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh | 15.1 | 0.0 | 16.2 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 10.1 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 15.2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | B | A | B | B | A | B | B | A | A | B | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 186 |  |  | 59 |  |  | 210 |  | 139 |  |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 15.7 |  |  | 18.1 |  |  | 8.7 |  |  | 15.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  | B |  |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$, s | 8.1 | 18.6 | 10.1 | 7.6 | 11.0 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$, s | * 5.4 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | *9.6 | 21.0 | 9.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 3.1 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 2.9 | 4.5 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 13.3

HCM 6th LOS B
Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.
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## Merge Analysis

## Project Information

| Analyst | TCM | Date | $5 / 20 / 2019$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | Olsson | Analysis Year | 2019 |
| Jurisdiction | Mission, KS | Time Period Analyzed | PM |
| Project Description | 巴 Johnson Drive On-Ramp to NB Shawnee Mission Parkway |  |  |
| Geometric Data | Freeway | Ramp |  |
|  | 2 | 1 |  |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 45.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Free-Aow Speed (FS), mi/h | 1500 | 150 |  |
| Segment Length (L) / Acceleration Length (LA),ft | Rolling | Rolling |  |
| Terrain Type | - | - |  |
| Percent Grade, \% | Freeway | Right |  |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side |  |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population |  | All Familiar | All Familiar |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weather Type |  | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |  |
| Incident Type |  | No Incident | - |  |
| Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Demand and Capacity |  |  |  |  |
| Demand Volume (Vi) |  | 1228 | 399 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) |  | 0.94 | 0.86 |  |
| Total Trucks, \% |  | 0.02 | 0.02 |  |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% |  | - | - |  |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% |  | - | - |  |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| How Rate (vi),pc/h |  | 1306 | 464 |  |
| Capacity (c), pc/h |  | 4500 | 1900 |  |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) |  | 0.39 | 0.24 |  |
| Speed and Density |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LFQ), ft | - | Number of Outer Lanes on Freeway (No) |  | 0 |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (Ms) |  | 0.336 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | How Outer Lanes (voA), pc/mi/ln |  | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | On-Ramp Influenece Area Speed (SR), mi/h |  | 44.0 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PfM) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (So), mi/h |  | - |
| How in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 1306 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h |  | 44.0 |
| How Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | 1770 | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln |  | 20.1 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | Density in Ramp Influence Area (D) | ), $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ | 18.2 |

## Project Information

| Analyst | TCM | Date | $5 / 20 / 2019$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | Olsson | Analysis Year | 2019 |
| Jurisdiction | Mission, KS | Time Period Analyzed | AM |
| Project Description | 巴 Johnson Drive On-Ramp to NB Shawnee Mission Parkway |  |  |
| Geometric Data | Freeway | Ramp |  |
|  | 2 | 1 |  |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 45.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Free-Aow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 1500 | 150 |  |
| Segment Length (L) / Acceleration Length (LA),ft | Rolling | Rolling |  |
| Terrain Type | - | - |  |
| Percent Grade, \% | Freeway | Right |  |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side |  |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population |  | All Familiar | All Familiar |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weather Type |  | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |  |
| Incident Type |  | No Incident | - |  |
| Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Demand and Capacity |  |  |  |  |
| Demand Volume (Vi) |  | 1168 | 321 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) |  | 0.84 | 0.85 |  |
| Total Trucks, \% |  | 0.02 | 0.02 |  |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% |  | - | - |  |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% |  | - | - |  |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| How Rate (vi),pc/h |  | 1390 | 378 |  |
| Capacity (c), pc/h |  | 4500 | 1900 |  |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) |  | 0.39 | 0.20 |  |
| Speed and Density |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LFQ), ft | - | Number of Outer Lanes on Freeway (No) |  | 0 |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (Ms) |  | 0.336 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | How Outer Lanes (voA), pc/mi/In |  | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | On-Ramp Influenece Area Speed (SR), mi/h |  | 44.0 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PFM) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (SO), mi/h |  | - |
| How in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 1390 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h |  | 44.0 |
| How Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | 1768 | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln |  | 20.1 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | Density in Ramp Influence Area (D) | ), $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ | 18.2 |

# APPENDIX C 

Existing Plus Approved Development Plus
Proposed Development

## Drive Spacing - Influence Area Calculations

Drive $\perp=560$ center 70 stop Dar from $د m \mathrm{I}$ I Roelahd Hr.


- SOOn
 project no.: drawn by:T ( $m$ date:
page 1 of 1


## Signal Warrants

Existing plus Approved plus Proposed Peak Hour Volume Warrant Roeland Drive and Martway Street

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

## Trip Generation

# Land Use: 310 Hotel 

## Description

A hotel is a place of lodging that provides sleeping accommodations and supporting facilities such as restaurants, cocktail lounges, meeting and banquet rooms or convention facilities, limited recreational facilities (pool, fitness room), and/or other retail and service shops. All suites hotel (Land Use 311), business hotel (Land Use 312), motel (Land Use 320), and resort hotel (Land Use 330) are related uses.

## Additional Data

Studies of hotel employment density indicate that, on the average, a hotel will employ 0.9 employees per room. ${ }^{1}$

Twenty-five studies provided information on occupancy rates at the time the studies were conducted. The average occupancy rate for these studies was approximately 82 percent.

Some properties contained in this land use provide guest transportation services such as airport shuttles, limousine service, or golf course shuttle service, which may have an impact on the overall trip generation rates.

Time-of-day distribution data for this land use are presented in Appendix A. For the one center city core site with data, the overall highest vehicle volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 8:30 and 9:30 a.m. and 3:15 and 4:15 p.m., respectively. On Saturday and Sunday, the peak hours were between 5:00 and 6:00 p.m. and 10:15 and 11:15 a.m., respectively.

The sites were surveyed in the 1980s, the 1990s, the 2000s, and the 2010s in California, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington.

For all lodging uses, it is important to collect data on occupied rooms as well as total rooms in order to accurately predict trip generation characteristics for the site.

Trip generation at a hotel may be related to the presence of supporting facilities such as convention facilities, restaurants, meeting/banquet space, and retail facilities. Future data submissions should specify the presence of these amenities. Reporting the level of activity at the supporting facilities such as full, empty, partially active, number of people attending a meeting/banquet during observation may also be useful in further analysis of this land use.

## Source Numbers

170, 260, 262, 277, 280, 301, 306, 357, 422, 507, 577, 728, 867, 872, 925, 951

[^7]
## Hotel (310)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Employees
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.

## Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban

Number of Studies: 11
Avg. Num. of Employees: 183
Directional Distribution: 60\% entering, 40\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Employee

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.67 | $0.33-1.43$ | 0.29 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Hotel (310)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Employees
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 11
Avg. Num. of Employees: 183
Directional Distribution: 54\% entering, 46\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Employee

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.89 | $0.52-1.67$ | 0.38 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Land Use: 431 Miniature Golf Course

## Description

A miniature golf course consists of one or more individual putting courses. It may or may not include a limited game room or refreshment services. This land use is a stand-alone facility and is not part of a larger multipurpose entertainment or recreational facility. Golf course (Land Use 430), golf driving range (Land Use 432), and multipurpose recreational facility (Land Use 435) are related uses.

## Additional Data

The site was surveyed in the 1990s in New Hampshire.

## Source Number

393

## Miniature Golf Course (431)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Holes<br>On a: Weekday,<br>Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.<br>Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban<br>Number of Studies: 1<br>Avg. Num. of Holes: 18<br>Directional Distribution: 33\% entering, $67 \%$ exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Hole

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.33 | $0.33-0.33$ | $*$ |

Data Plot and Equation


## Land Use: 432 Golf Driving Range

## Description

A golf driving range is an outdoor facility that contains driving tees for golfers to practice. The facility may provide individual or small group lessons. Some sites have pro shops and/or small refreshment facilities. Driving ranges affiliated with full-sized golf courses are included in golf course (Land Use 430). Golf course (Land Use 430), miniature golf course (Land Use 431), and multipurpose recreational facility (Land Use 435) are related uses.

## Additional Data

The sites were surveyed in the 1990s in California, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and New York.

## Source Numbers

361, 363, 365, 393, 426, 517

## Golf Driving Range <br> (432)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Tees/Driving Positions
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 1
Avg. Num. of Tees/Driving Positions: 57
Directional Distribution: 61\% entering, 39\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Tee/Driving Position

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.40 | $0.40-0.40$ | $*$ |

Data Plot and Equation


## Golf Driving Range <br> (432)

## Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Tees/Driving Positions

On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 7
Avg. Num. of Tees/Driving Positions: 41
Directional Distribution: 45\% entering, 55\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Tee/Driving Position

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.25 | $0.54-2.80$ | 0.79 |

Data Plot and Equation


# Land Use: 435 Multipurpose Recreational Facility 

## Description

A multipurpose recreational facility contains two or more of the following land uses combined at one site: miniature golf, batting cages, video arcade, bumper boats, go-carts, and golf driving range. Refreshment areas may also be provided. Golf course (Land Use 430), miniature golf course (Land Use 431), golf driving range (Land Use 432), batting cages (Land Use 433), rock climbing gym (Land Use 434), and trampoline park (Land Use 436) are related uses.

## Additional Data

The sites were surveyed in the 1990s and the 2000s in Oregon.

## Specialized Land Use Data

A survey conducted in Pennsylvania in 1998 was submitted for an indoor race track facility containing a go-cart racing track, arcade, laser tag, restaurant, and party function rooms. The trip generation rates for this facility differ considerably from those contained in this land use. The site gross floor area was 118,000 square feet. The counted vehicle trips were as follows:

- 235 on a weekday
- 28 during the weekday, AM peak hour of the generator
- 29 during the weekday, PM peak hour of the generator
- 20 during the weekday, PM peak hour of adjacent street traffic
- 277 on a Saturday
- 34 during the Saturday peak hour of the generator


## Source Numbers

583, 611, 618

## Multipurpose Recreational Facility

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA<br>On a: Weekday,<br>Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.<br>Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban<br>Number of Studies: 3<br>Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 21<br>Directional Distribution: 55\% entering, 45\% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.58 | $2.95-4.06$ | 0.55 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Land Use: 437 <br> Bowling Alley

## Description

A bowling alley is a recreational facility that includes bowling lanes. A small lounge, restaurant and/or snack bar, video games, and pool tables may also be available.

## Additional Data

The sites were surveyed in the 1990s, the 2000s, and the 2010s in Connecticut, Florida, and Texas.

## Source Numbers

400, 721, 945

## Bowling Alley (437)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 1
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 73
Directional Distribution: 95\% entering, 5\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.81 | $0.81-0.81$ | $*$ |

Data Plot and Equation


## Bowling Alley <br> (437)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 5
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 33
Directional Distribution: 65\% entering, 35\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.16 | $0.47-1.82$ | 0.44 |

Data Plot and Equation


# Land Use: 445 Multiplex Movie Theater 

## Description

A multiplex movie theater consists of audience seating, a minimum of 10 screens, a lobby, and a refreshment area. The development generally has one or more of the following amenities: digital sound, tiered stadium seating, and moveable or expandable walls. Theaters included in this category are primarily stand-alone facilities with separate parking and dedicated driveways. All theaters in the category show only first-run movies or movies not previously seen through any other media. They may also have matinee showings. Movie theater (Land Use 444) is a related use.

## Additional Data

Caution should be used when applying these data, as the peaking characteristics for this land use could have a significant impact on trip generation rates. Peaking at movie theaters typically occurred in time periods shorter than an hour. Movie theaters' start and end times may be staggered to reduce peak surging impacts.

Multiplex theaters typically house a smaller number of seats per screen than traditional theaters. For the 19 sites in Land Use 445 with data for both number of movie screens and number of seats, the average number of seats per movie screen was 230 . For the eight sites in Land Use 444 with data for both number of movie screens and number of seats, the average number of seats per movie screen was 343.

The peak hour of the generator for multiplex movie theaters occurred during Friday and Saturday evenings between 6:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m.

For additional information on multiplex movie theaters, refer to the ITE Informational Report, Trip Generation Characteristics of Traditional and Multiplex Movie Theaters. ${ }^{2}$

The sites were surveyed in the 1990s, the 2000s, and the 2010s in California, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

## Source Numbers

$418,433,443,450,451,452,453,455,456,457,458,459,513,618,959$

[^8]
## Multiplex Movie Theater (445)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Friday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 8
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 68
Directional Distribution: 62\% entering, 38\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.91 | $3.07-9.40$ | 2.24 |

Data Plot and Equation


# Land Use: 710 General Office Building 

## Description

A general office building houses multiple tenants; it is a location where affairs of businesses, commercial or industrial organizations, or professional persons or firms are conducted. An office building or buildings may contain a mixture of tenants including professional services, insurance companies, investment brokers, and tenant services, such as a bank or savings and loan institution, a restaurant, or cafeteria and service retail facilities. A general office building with a gross floor area of 5,000 square feet or less is classified as a small office building (Land Use 712). Corporate headquarters building (Land Use 714), single tenant office building (Land Use 715), office park (Land Use 750), research and development center (Land Use 760), and business park (Land Use 770) are additional related uses.

If information is known about individual buildings, it is suggested that the general office building category be used rather than office parks when estimating trip generation for one or more office buildings in a single development. The office park category is more general and should be used when a breakdown of individual or different uses is not known. If the general office building category is used and if additional buildings, such as banks, restaurants, or retail stores are included in the development, the development should be treated as a multiuse project. On the other hand, if the office park category is used, internal trips are already reflected in the data and do not need to be considered.

When the buildings are interrelated (defined by shared parking facilities or the ability to easily walk between buildings) or house one tenant, it is suggested that the total area or employment of all the buildings be used for calculating the trip generation. When the individual buildings are isolated and not related to one another, it is suggested that trip generation be calculated for each building separately and then summed.

## Additional Data

The average building occupancy varied considerably within the studies for which occupancy data were provided. The reported occupied gross floor area was 88 for general urban/suburban sites and 96 percent for the center city core and dense multi-use urban sites.

Time-of-day distribution data for this land use for a weekday, Saturday, and Sunday are presented in Appendix A. For the 16 general urban/suburban sites with data, the overall highest vehicle volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 7:30 and 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 and 5:30 p.m., respectively.

For the three general urban/suburban sites with person trip data, the overall highest volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 8:45 and 9:45 a.m. and 12:45 and 1:45 p.m., respectively. For the three dense multi-use urban sites with person trip data, the overall highest volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 8:30 and 9:30 a.m. and 4:45 and $5: 45$ p.m., respectively. For the four center city core sites with person trip data, the overall highest volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 9:00 and 10:00 a.m. and 12:45 and 1:45 p.m., respectively.

The average numbers of person trips per vehicle trip at the eight center city core sites at which both person trip and vehicle trip data were collected were as follows:

- 2.76 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 7 and 9 a.m.
- 2.90 during Weekday, AM Peak Hour of Generator
- 2.91 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 4 and 6 p.m.
- 3.02 during Weekday, PM Peak Hour of Generator

The average numbers of person trips per vehicle trip at the 18 dense multi-use urban sites at which both person trip and vehicle trip data were collected were as follows:

- 1.47 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 7 and 9 a.m.
- 1.47 during Weekday, AM Peak Hour of Generator
- 1.46 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 4 and 6 p.m.
- 1.53 during Weekday, PM Peak Hour of Generator

The average numbers of person trips per vehicle trip at the 23 general urban/suburban sites at which both person trip and vehicle trip data were collected were as follows:

- 1.30 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 7 and 9 a.m.
- 1.34 during Weekday, AM Peak Hour of Generator
- 1.32 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 4 and 6 p.m.
- 1.41 during Weekday, PM Peak Hour of Generator

The sites were surveyed in the 1980s, the 1990s, the 2000s, and the 2010s in Alberta (CAN), California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Washington.

## Source Numbers

161, 175, 183, 184, 185, 207, 212, 217, 247, 253, 257, 260, 262, 273, 279, 297, 298, 300, 301, 302,
$303,304,321,322,323,324,327,404,407,408,418,419,423,562,734,850,859,862,867,869$,
883, 884, 890, 891, 904, 940, 944, 946, 964, 965, 972

## General Office Building

(710)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.

## Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban

Number of Studies: 35
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 117
Directional Distribution: 86\% entering, 14\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.16 | $0.37-4.23$ | 0.47 |

Data Plot and Equation


## General Office Building

(710)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 32
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 114
Directional Distribution: 16\% entering, $84 \%$ exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.15 | $0.47-3.23$ | 0.42 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Land Use: 930 Fast Casual Restaurant

## Description

A fast casual restaurant is a sit down restaurant with no wait staff or table service. Customers typically order off a menu board, pay for food before the food is prepared and seat themselves. The menu generally contains higher quality made to order food items with fewer frozen or processed ingredients than fast food restaurants. Quality restaurant (Land Use 931), high-turnover (sit-down) restaurant (Land Use 932), fast-food restaurant without drive-through window (Land Use 933), fast-food restaurant with drive-through window (Land Use 934), and fast-food restaurant with drivethrough window and no indoor seating (Land Use 935) are related uses.

## Additional Data

Time-of-day distribution data for this land use for a weekday and Saturday are presented in Appendix A. For the one general urban/suburban site with data, the overall highest vehicle volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 11:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. and 12:00 and 1:00 p.m., respectively.

The sites were surveyed in the 2010s in Minnesota, South Carolina, Washington, and Wisconsin.

## Source Numbers

861, 869, 939, 959, 962

## Fast Casual Restaurant (930)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 1
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 3
Directional Distribution: 67\% entering, 33\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.07 | $2.07-2.07$ | $*$ |

Data Plot and Equation


## Fast Casual Restaurant (930)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 15
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 3
Directional Distribution: 55\% entering, $45 \%$ exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14.13 | $5.94-34.83$ | 7.72 |

Data Plot and Equation


# Land Use: 932 <br> High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant 

## Description

This land use consists of sit-down, full-service eating establishments with typical duration of stay of approximately one hour. This type of restaurant is usually moderately priced and frequently belongs to a restaurant chain. Generally, these restaurants serve lunch and dinner; they may also be open for breakfast and are sometimes open 24 hours a day. These restaurants typically do not take reservations. Patrons commonly wait to be seated, are served by a waiter/waitress, order from menus and pay for their meal after they eat. Some facilities contained within this land use may also contain a bar area for serving food and alcoholic drinks. Fast casual restaurant (Land Use 930), quality restaurant (Land Use 931), fast-food restaurant without drive-through window (Land Use 933), fast-food restaurant with drive-through window (Land Use 934), and fast-food restaurant with drive-through window and no indoor seating (Land Use 935) are related uses.

## Additional Data

Users should exercise caution when applying statistics during the AM peak periods, as the sites contained in the database for this land use may or may not be open for breakfast. In cases where it was confirmed that the sites were not open for breakfast, data for the AM peak hour of the adjacent street traffic were removed from the database.

The outdoor seating area is not included in the overall gross floor area. Therefore, the number of seats may be a more reliable independent variable on which to establish trip generation rates for facilities having significant outdoor seating.

Time-of-day distribution data for this land use for a weekday, Saturday, and Sunday are presented in Appendix A. For the 38 general urban/suburban sites with data, the overall highest vehicle volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 11:45 a.m. and 12:45 p.m. and 12:00 and 1:00 p.m., respectively.

The sites were surveyed in the 1980s, the 1990s, the 2000s, and the 2010s in Alberta (CAN), California, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, and Wisconsin.

## Source Numbers

$126,269,275,280,300,301,305,338,340,341,358,384,424,432,437,438,444,507,555,577$, $589,617,618,728,868,884,885,903,927,944,961,962,977$

## High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant <br> (932)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.

## Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban

Number of Studies: 39
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 5
Directional Distribution: 55\% entering, 45\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.94 | $0.76-102.39$ | 11.33 |

Data Plot and Equation


# High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant 

(932)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA<br>On a: Weekday,<br>Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.<br>Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban<br>Number of Studies: 107<br>Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 6<br>Directional Distribution: 62\% entering, 38\% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.77 | $0.92-62.00$ | 7.37 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Daily Trip Generation

| ITE |  | Trip Gen. <br> Size <br> Avg. Rate/Eq. |  |  | Daily <br> Trips | Trip Distribution |  | Daily Trips |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code/Page | Land Use |  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Enter | Exit |
| Approved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 220 | Apartment | 168 | DU | Equation |  | 1230 | 50\% | 50\% | 615 | 615 |
| 820 | Shopping Center | 54,594 | SF | Equation | 3984 | 50\% | 50\% | 1,992 | 1,992 |
| Full Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 930 | Fast Casual Resturant | 24,221 | SF | Average | 7634 | 50\% | 50\% | 3,817 | 3,817 |
| 932 | High-Turnover Sit Down | 6,348 | SF | Average | 713 | 50\% | 50\% | 357 | 356 |
| 820 | Shopping Center | 984 | SF | Equation | 260 | 50\% | 50\% | 130 | 130 |
| 431 | Miniature Golf Course | 18 | Holes | * | 60 | 50\% | 50\% | 30 | 30 |
| 432 | Golf Driving Range | 18 | Bays | Average | 983 | 50\% | 50\% | 492 | 491 |
| 435 | Multipurpose Recreational Facility | 40000 | SF | * | 1440 | 50\% | 50\% | 720 | 720 |
| 437 | Bowling Alley | 18 | Lanes | * | 234 | 50\% | 50\% | 117 | 117 |
| 445 | Multiplex Movie Theater* | 10 | Screens | * | 1380 | 50\% | 50\% | 690 | 690 |
| 310 | Hotel | 202 | Rooms | Equation | 1854 | 50\% | 50\% | 927 | 927 |
| 710 | General Office Building | 105,000 | SF | Equation | 1113 | 50\% | 50\% | 557 | 556 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 20,885 |  |  | 10,444 | 10,441 |

AM Peak Hour Trip Generation (Adjacent Street)

| ITE Code/Page | Land Use | Size |  | Trip Gen. Avg. Rate/Eq. | AM Peak Hour Trips | Trip Distribution |  | AM Peak Hour Trips |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Enter | Exit |
| Approved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 220 | Apartment | 168 | DU | Equation | 79 | 23\% | 77\% | 19 | 60 |
| 820 | Shopping Center | 54594 | SF | Equation | 180 | 62\% | 38\% | 112 | 68 |
| Full Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 930 | Fast Casual Resturant | 24221 | SF | Average | 51 | 67\% | 33\% | 35 | 16 |
| 932 | High-Turnover Sit Down | 6,348 | SF | Average | 64 | 55\% | 45\% | 36 | 28 |
| 820 | Shopping Center | 984 | SF | Equation | 153 | 62\% | 38\% | 95 | 58 |
| 431 | Miniature Golf Course* | 18 | Holes | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 432 | Golf Driving Range | 18 | Bays | Average | 29 | 61\% | 39\% | 18 | 11 |
| 435 | Multipurpose Recreational Facility | 40000 | SF | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 437 | Bowling Alley | 18 | Lanes | Average | 27 | 95\% | 5\% | 26 | 1 |
| 445 | Multiplex Movie Theater* | 10 | Screens | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 310 | Hotel | 202 | Rooms | Equation | 96 | 59\% | 41\% | 57 | 39 |
| 710 | General Office Building | 105000 | SF | Equation | 126 | 86\% | 14\% | 109 | 17 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 805 |  |  | 507 | 298 |
| (Total w/ Internal Capture) |  |  |  |  | 637 |  |  | 423 | 214 |
| Pass-by Reduction |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - | - |

*No ITE AM Trip Estimation Available
PM Peak Hour Trip Generation (Adjacent Street)

|  |  |  |  | Trip Gen. Avg. Rate/Eq. | PM Peak Hour Trips | Trip Distribution |  | PM Peak Hour Trips |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code/Page | Land Use | Size |  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Enter | Exit |
| Approved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 220 | Apartment | 168 | DU | Equation | 94 | 63\% | 37\% | 60 | 34 |
| 820 | Shopping Center | 54594 | SF | Equation | 348 | 48\% | 52\% | 168 | 180 |
| Full Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 930 | Fast Casual Resturant | 24221 | SF | Average | 343 | 55\% | 45\% | 189 | 154 |
| 932 | High-Turnover Sit Down | 6,348 | SF | Average | 63 | 62\% | 38\% | 40 | 23 |
| 820 | Shopping Center | 984 | SF | Equation | 18 | 48\% | 52\% | 9 | 9 |
| 431 | Miniature Golf Course | 18 | Holes | Average | 6 | 33\% | 67\% | 2 | 4 |
| 432 | Golf Driving Range | 18 | Bays | Average | 90 | 45\% | 55\% | 41 | 49 |
| 435 | Multipurpose Recreational Facility | 40000 | SF | Average | 144 | 55\% | 45\% | 80 | 64 |
| 437 | Bowling Alley | 18 | Lanes | Average | 23 | 65\% | 35\% | 16 | 7 |
| 445 | Multiplex Movie Theater* | 10 | Screens | Average | 138 | 51\% | 49\% | 71 | 67 |
| 310 | Hotel | 202 | Rooms | Equation | 126 | 51\% | 49\% | 65 | 61 |
| 710 | General Office Building | 105000 | SF | Equation | 120 | 16\% | 84\% | 20 | 100 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 1513 |  |  | 761 | 752 |
| (Total w/ Internal Capture) |  |  |  |  | 925 |  |  | 467 | 458 |
| Pass-by Reduction |  |  |  |  | 103 |  |  | 50 | 53 |
| (Total w/ Internal Capture and Pass-by Reduction) |  |  |  |  | 822 |  |  | 417 | 405 |


| NCHRP 8-51 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Project Name: | Mission Gateway | Organization: |  |
| Project Location: | Mission, KS | Performed By: | OIsson |
| Scenario Description: | Existing + Approved | DCM | $2 / 3 / 2020$ |
| Analysis Year: | 2019 | Checked By: |  |
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour | Date: |  |


| Table 1-A: Base Vehicle-Trip Generation Estimates (Single-Use Site Estimate) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Development Data (For Information Only) |  |  | Estimated Vehicle-Trips |  |  |
|  | ITE LUCs ${ }^{1}$ | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office | 710 | 105,000 | SQF | 126 | 109 | 17 |
| Retail | 820 | 55,578 | SQF | 333 | 207 | 126 |
| Restaurant | 932 | 30,569 | SQF | 115 | 71 | 44 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | /432/435/437/ | 8/18/40000/18/1 | Lanes/SF/Screens | 56 | 44 | 12 |
| Residential | 220 | 168 | DU | 79 | 19 | 60 |
| Hotel | 310 | 202 |  | 96 | 57 | 39 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 805 | 507 | 298 |


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


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


| Table 4-A: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |  |  |
| Office |  | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Retail | 4 |  | 16 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Restaurant | 14 | 6 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Residential | 1 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Hotel | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |


| Table 5-A: Computations Summary |  |  |  | Table 6-A: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| All Person-Trips | 805 | 507 | 298 | Office | 20\% | 94\% |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 21\% | 17\% | 28\% | Retail | 8\% | 16\% |
|  |  |  |  | Restaurant | 61\% | 50\% |
| External Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{3}$ | 637 | 423 | 214 | Cinema/Entertainment | 0\% | 0\% |
| External Transit-Trips ${ }^{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Residential | 5\% | 23\% |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ${ }^{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | 2\% | 31\% |

[^9]${ }^{4}$ Person-Trips
*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.
Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas Transportation Institute

| NCHRP 8-51 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Project Name: | Mission Gateway | Organization: |  |
| Project Location: | Mission, KS | Performed By: | Olsson |
| Scenario Description: | Approved + Development | DCM |  |
| Analysis Year: | 2018 | $2 / 3 / 2020$ |  |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour | Checked By: |  |
|  | Date: |  |  |


| Table 1-P: Base Vehicle-Trip Generation Estimates (Single-Use Site Estimate) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Development Data (For Information Only) |  |  | Estimated Vehicle-Trips |  |  |
|  | ITE LUCs ${ }^{1}$ | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office | 710 | 105,000 | SQF | 120 | 20 | 100 |
| Retail | 820 | 55,578 | SQF | 366 | 177 | 189 |
| Restaurant | 932 | 30,569 | SQF | 406 | 229 | 177 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | /432/435/437/ | 8/18/40000/18/1 | Lanes/SF/Screens | 401 | 210 | 191 |
| Residential | 220 | 168 | DU | 94 | 60 | 34 |
| Hotel | 310 | 202 |  | 126 | 65 | 61 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 1513 | 761 | 752 |


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


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


| Table 4-P: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |  |  |
| Office |  | 14 | 4 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Retail | 4 |  | 55 | 8 | 28 |  |  |  |
| Restaurant | 5 | 73 |  | 14 | 10 |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1 | 7 | 7 |  | 12 |  |  |  |
| Residential | 1 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Hotel | 0 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |


| Table 5-P: Computations Summary |  |  |  | Table 6-P: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| All Person-Trips | 1,513 | 761 | 752 | Office | 55\% | 20\% |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 39\% | 39\% | 39\% | Retail | 63\% | 55\% |
|  |  |  |  | Restaurant | 37\% | 64\% |
| External Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{3}$ | 925 | 467 | 458 | Cinema/Entertainment | 10\% | 9\% |
| External Transit-Trips ${ }^{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Residential | 70\% | 68\% |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ${ }^{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | 35\% | 25\% |

[^10]${ }^{4}$ Person-Trips
*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.
Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas Transportation Institute






## Capacity Analysis

|  | 4 |  |  | 7 | 4 | $\dagger$ | * | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 152 | 1174 | 28 | 37 | 2114 | 120 | 102 | 102 | 88 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.80 | 0.54 | 0.02 | 0.21 | 0.81 | 0.68 | 0.62 | 0.61 | 0.30 |
| Control Delay | 59.7 | 34.6 | 0.0 | 51.3 | 24.2 | 47.7 | 68.6 | 67.4 | 2.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 59.7 | 34.6 | 0.0 | 51.3 | 24.2 | 47.7 | 68.6 | 67.4 | 2.6 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 121 | 473 | 0 | 26 | 505 | 44 | 81 | 81 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | m142 | 488 | m0 | 41 | 604 | \#128 | 136 | 96 | 0 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 682 |  |  | 2401 | 499 |  | 330 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) | 345 |  | 310 | 170 |  |  | 100 |  | 125 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 213 | 2178 | 1583 | 213 | 2614 | 176 | 189 | 193 | 315 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.71 | 0.54 | 0.02 | 0.17 | 0.81 | 0.68 | 0.54 | 0.53 | 0.28 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.$m$ Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream sign |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
1470：Roeland Drive \＆Shawnee Mission Parkway
01／26／2020

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个4 | 「 | \％ | 中性 |  |  | $\dagger$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 132 | 986 | 21 | 23 | 1722 | 256 | 18 | 11 | 67 | 143 | 25 | 73 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 132 | 986 | 21 | 23 | 1722 | 256 | 18 | 11 | 67 | 143 | 25 | 73 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） | 4.5 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 5.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | ＊0．84 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |  | 0.91 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  | 0.95 | 0.97 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 4594 |  |  | 1677 |  | 1681 | 1717 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  | 0.95 | 0.97 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 4594 |  |  | 1677 |  | 1681 | 1717 | 1583 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.75 | 0.63 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.63 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.63 | 0.83 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 152 | 1174 | 28 | 37 | 1813 | 301 | 29 | 12 | 79 | 164 | 40 | 88 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | ， | ， | 16 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 152 | 1174 | 28 | 37 | 2098 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 102 | 102 | 9 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Free | Prot | NA |  | Split | NA |  | Split | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 1 |  |  | 5 | 2 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 12.9 | 72.1 | 120.0 | 8.7 | 67.9 |  |  | 8.5 |  | 11.7 | 11.7 | 11.7 |
| Effective Green，g（s） | 12.9 | 72.1 | 120.0 | 8.7 | 67.9 |  |  | 8.5 |  | 11.7 | 11.7 | 11.7 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.11 | 0.60 | 1.00 | 0.07 | 0.57 |  |  | 0.07 |  | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Clearance Time（s） | 4.5 | 5.5 |  | 4.5 | 5.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 1.5 | 2.0 |  | 1.5 | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 190 | 2126 | 1583 | 128 | 2599 |  |  | 118 |  | 163 | 167 | 154 |
| v／s Ratio Prot | c0．09 | 0.33 |  | 0.02 | c0．46 |  |  | c0．04 |  | c0．06 | 0.06 |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.01 |
| v／c Ratio | 0.80 | 0.55 | 0.02 | 0.29 | 0.81 |  |  | 0.53 |  | 0.63 | 0.61 | 0.06 |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 52.3 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 52.7 | 20.8 |  |  | 53.8 |  | 52.0 | 52.0 | 49.1 |
| Progression Factor | 0.73 | 2.22 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 14.4 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 2.8 |  |  | 2.0 |  | 5.3 | 4.6 | 0.1 |
| Delay（s） | 52.5 | 32.5 | 0.0 | 53.2 | 23.6 |  |  | 55.8 |  | 57.3 | 56.5 | 49.2 |
| Level of Service | D | C | A | D | C |  |  | E |  | E | E | D |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 34.1 |  |  | 24.1 |  |  | 55.8 |  |  | 54.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 30.8 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | C |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.76 |  | 19.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） | 120.0 | Sum of lost time（s） | C |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $70.7 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period（min） | 15 |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

Queues
3: Roe Avenue \& Johnson Drive/Johnson Drive WB

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | P | * | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 211 | 269 | 52 | 264 | 158 | 765 | 72 | 97 | 405 | 205 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.54 | 0.42 | 0.37 | 0.61 | 0.29 | 0.46 | 0.08 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.25 |
| Control Delay | 46.7 | 36.4 | 50.8 | 46.4 | 12.6 | 20.7 | 0.2 | 11.8 | 19.0 | 3.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 46.7 | 36.4 | 50.8 | 46.4 | 12.6 | 20.7 | 0.2 | 11.8 | 19.0 | 3.6 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 66 | 76 | 32 | 81 | 43 | 175 | 0 | 25 | 86 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 96 | 108 | 66 | 118 | 56 | 244 | 0 | 51 | 122 | 37 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 556 |  | 629 |  | 199 |  |  | 492 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 245 |  | 130 |  | 150 |  | 25 | 150 |  | 250 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 457 | 701 | 145 | 473 | 551 | 1675 | 866 | 485 | 1630 | 840 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.46 | 0.38 | 0.36 | 0.56 | 0.29 | 0.46 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 0.25 | 0.24 |

[^11]| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％${ }^{1 / 1}$ | 中t |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 个t |  | \％ | 个4 | 「 | ${ }_{7}$ | ¢4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 184 | 196 | 28 | 45 | 208 | 9 | 101 | 658 | 53 | 83 | 381 | 178 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 184 | 196 | 28 | 45 | 208 | 9 | 101 | 658 | 53 | 83 | 381 | 178 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 211 | 225 | 44 | 52 | 236 | 28 | 158 | 765 | 0 | 97 | 405 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.64 | 0.86 | 0.88 | 0.32 | 0.64 | 0.86 | 0.74 | 0.86 | 0.94 | 0.87 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 285 | 421 | 81 | 68 | 312 | 37 | 628 | 1884 |  | 454 | 1849 |  |
| Arrive On Green | 0.08 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.52 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3456 | 2973 | 571 | 1781 | 3203 | 376 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 211 | 133 | 136 | 52 | 130 | 134 | 158 | 765 | 0 | 97 | 405 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1728 | 1777 | 1768 | 1781 | 1777 | 1803 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 6.0 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 2.9 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 4.1 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 6.2 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 6.0 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 2.9 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 4.1 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 6.2 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.32 | 1.00 |  | 0.21 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 285 | 252 | 250 | 68 | 173 | 176 | 628 | 1884 |  | 454 | 1849 |  |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.74 | 0.53 | 0.54 | 0.76 | 0.75 | 0.76 | 0.25 | 0.41 |  | 0.21 | 0.22 |  |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 449 | 338 | 336 | 125 | 231 | 234 | 628 | 1884 |  | 596 | 1849 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 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 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 44.8 | 39.8 | 39.9 | 47.6 | 43.9 | 44.0 | 9.9 | 14.1 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 13.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 3.8 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 16.1 | 9.0 | 10.0 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（ $50 \%$ ），veh／ln | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 1.6 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 1.5 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 0.0 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 48.6 | 41.5 | 41.8 | 63.7 | 53.0 | 54.0 | 10.1 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 13.3 | 0.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | D | D | D | E | D | D | B | B |  | B | B |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 480 |  |  | 316 |  |  | 923 | A |  | 502 | A |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 44.7 |  |  | 55.2 |  |  | 13.9 |  |  | 12.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | $B$ |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 14.2 | 15.7 | 11.0 | 59.0 | 9.8 | 20.2 | 12.0 | 58.0 |
| Change Period $(\mathbf{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$ ，s | 6.0 | 6.0 | $* 5.4$ | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 13.0 | 13.0 | $* 14$ | 37.0 | 7.0 | 19.0 | 6.0 | 44.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 8.0 | 9.3 | 4.4 | 14.9 | 4.9 | 9.2 | 6.1 | 8.2 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 26.2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

## Notes

＊HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，SBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | * | 7 | $\checkmark$ | 4 | , | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 8 | 347 | 55 | 60 | 387 | 4 | 46 | 52 | 72 |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.01 | 0.31 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.24 |
| Control Delay | 7.0 | 13.9 | 0.1 | 6.7 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 16.2 | 7.0 | 18.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 7.0 | 13.9 | 0.1 | 6.7 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 16.2 | 7.0 | 18.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 1 | 68 | 0 | 5 | 37 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 10 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 2 | 183 | 0 | 25 | 201 | 0 | 18 | 16 | 37 |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  | 180 |  |  | 464 |  |  | 267 | 783 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 100 |  | 100 | 130 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 739 | 1665 | 1431 | 721 | 1665 | 1431 | 405 | 884 | 398 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.01 | 0.21 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.23 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.06 | 0.18 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | , | 333 | 37 | 52 | 356 | 1 | 23 | 3 | 46 | 6 | 23 | 21 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 2 | 333 | 37 | 52 | 356 | 1 | 23 | 3 | 46 | 6 | 23 | 21 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 8 | 347 | 55 | 60 | 387 | 4 | 46 | 4 | 48 | 12 | 32 | 28 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.25 | 0.96 | 0.67 | 0.86 | 0.92 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.75 | 0.95 | 0.50 | 0.72 | 0.75 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 355 | 512 | 434 | 410 | 624 | 528 | 531 | 36 | 431 | 122 | 93 | 72 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.07 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.06 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 123 | 1480 | 181 | 848 | 655 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 8 | 347 | 55 | 60 | 387 | 4 | 46 | 0 | 52 | 72 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1604 | 1683 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.1 | 6.8 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 7.2 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.1 | 6.8 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 7.2 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.92 | 0.17 |  | 0.39 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 355 | 512 | 434 | 410 | 624 | 528 | 531 | 0 | 466 | 287 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.02 | 0.68 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.62 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 634 | 2128 | 1803 | 583 | 2128 | 1803 | 727 | 0 | 815 | 465 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 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 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 10.8 | 13.4 | 11.3 | 9.7 | 11.6 | 9.2 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh

| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 10.9 | 15.0 | 11.4 | 9.9 | 12.6 | 9.2 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 17.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | B | B | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 410 |  |  | 451 |  |  | 98 |  |  | 72 |  |
| Approach Delay, slveh |  | 14.4 |  |  | 12.2 |  |  | 11.9 |  |  | 17.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$, s | 5.5 | 18.8 | 17.0 | 8.0 | 16.3 | 7.5 | 9.6 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$, s | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 7.0 | 47.0 | 21.0 | 7.0 | 47.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 2.1 | 9.2 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 8.8 | 2.9 | 3.6 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 13.4

HCM 6th LOS B

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 152 | 1174 | 28 | 37 | 2114 | 120 | 164 | 40 | 88 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 1.02 | 0.56 | 0.02 | 0.28 | 0.85 | 0.56 | 0.72 | 0.17 | 0.26 |
| Control Delay | 107.8 | 38.0 | 0.0 | 58.0 | 27.5 | 35.6 | 69.2 | 49.0 | 1.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 107.8 | 38.0 | 0.0 | 58.0 | 27.5 | 35.6 | 69.2 | 49.0 | 1.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | $\sim 128$ | 475 | 0 | 27 | 524 | 40 | 122 | 28 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | m\#170 | 488 | m0 | 44 | 604 | 100 | \#238 | 44 | 0 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 682 |  |  | 2401 | 499 |  | 330 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) | 345 |  | 310 | 170 |  |  | 100 |  | 125 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 149 | 2086 | 1583 | 140 | 2487 | 274 | 227 | 239 | 338 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 1.02 | 0.56 | 0.02 | 0.26 | 0.85 | 0.44 | 0.72 | 0.17 | 0.26 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| m Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个个 | F | ${ }^{7}$ | 惺官 |  |  | \＄ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 132 | 986 | 21 | 23 | 1722 | 256 | 18 | 11 | 67 | 143 | 25 | 73 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 132 | 986 | 21 | 23 | 1722 | 256 | 18 | 11 | 67 | 143 | 25 | 73 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 152 | 1174 | 0 | 37 | 1813 | 301 | 29 | 12 | 79 | 164 | 40 | 88 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.75 | 0.63 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.63 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.63 | 0.83 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | ， | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | ， | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 141 | 1910 |  | 200 | 2431 | 400 | 35 | 15 | 95 | 171 | 179 | 152 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.08 | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 | 1781 | 4198 | 690 | 400 | 165 | 1089 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 152 | 1174 | 0 | 37 | 1352 | 762 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 40 | 88 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 | 1781 | 1571 | 1746 | 1654 | 0 | 0 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 9.5 | 27.4 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 38.2 | 39.1 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 2.4 | 6.4 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 9.5 | 27.4 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 38.2 | 39.1 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 2.4 | 6.4 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.40 | 0.24 |  | 0.66 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 141 | 1910 |  | 200 | 1819 | 1011 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 179 | 152 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 1.08 | 0.61 |  | 0.18 | 0.74 | 0.75 | 0.83 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.96 | 0.22 | 0.58 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 141 | 1910 |  | 200 | 1819 | 1011 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 179 | 152 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 55.3 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 48.3 | 18.7 | 18.9 | 53.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 54.0 | 50.1 | 51.9 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 98.1 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.8 | 5.2 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 56.8 | 0.2 | 3.6 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 8.0 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 13.1 | 15.6 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 1.1 | 2.7 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 153.4 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 48.4 | 21.5 | 24.1 | 64.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 110.8 | 50.4 | 55.6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | F | C |  | D | C | C | E | A | A | F | D | E |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1326 | A |  | 2151 |  |  | 120 |  | 292 |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 35.9 |  |  | 22.8 |  |  | 64.0 |  | 85.9 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | E |  | F |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 14.0 | 75.0 | 15.0 | 19.0 | 70.0 | 16.0 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 5.5 | ${ }^{*} 5.5$ | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 9.5 | 64.5 | 15.5 | 9.5 | ${ }^{*} 65$ | 11.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 11.5 | 41.1 | 10.6 | 4.3 | 29.4 | 13.0 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 11.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 5.8 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 33.3
HCM 6th LOS
C

## Notes

＊HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier．
Unsignalized Delay for［EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 |  | 0 | 24 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 323 | 76 | 5 | 217 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 323 | 76 | 5 | 217 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control Stor | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized |  | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 115 | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 78 | 92 | 92 | 87 | 87 | 78 | 87 | 87 | 87 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 371 | 97 | 6 | 249 | 0 |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 「 | 4 | F | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 60 | 8 | 175 | 152 | 18 | 162 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 60 | 8 | 175 | 152 | 18 | 162 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control S | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 75 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 85 | 78 | 85 | 85 | 78 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 71 | 10 | 206 | 179 | 23 | 186 |



Queues
6: Roeland Drive \& Martway Street/Drive 3

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 20 | 20 | 51 | 9 | 44 | 108 | 8 | 136 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.11 |
| Control Delay | 17.4 | 0.1 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 5.4 | 15.2 | 12.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 17.4 | 0.1 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 5.4 | 15.2 | 12.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 20 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 15 | 22 | 9 | 61 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 773 |  | 54 |  | 238 |  | 267 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 105 |  |  |  | 115 |  | 100 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 686 | 1033 | 396 | 1046 | 817 | 1350 | 860 | 1239 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.11 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\square}$ |  | 7 | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 18 | 0 | 12 | 40 | 0 | 7 | 29 | 48 | 26 | 6 | 94 | 11 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 18 | 0 | 12 | 40 | 0 | 7 | 29 | 48 | 26 | 6 | 94 | 11 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 20 | 0 | 20 | 51 | 0 | 9 | 44 | 75 | 33 | 8 | 124 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.60 | 0.78 | 0.92 | 0.78 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.76 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 100 | 0 | 89 | 137 | 0 | 122 | 476 | 488 | 215 | 456 | 308 | 30 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 1231 | 542 | 1286 | 1679 | 162 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 20 | 0 | 20 | 51 | 0 | 9 | 44 | 0 | 108 | 8 | 0 | 136 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1773 | 1286 | 0 | 1841 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 0.09 |
| Lane Grp Cap (c), veh/h | 100 | 0 | 89 | 137 | 0 | 122 | 476 | 0 | 703 | 456 | 0 | 338 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.37 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.40 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 653 | 0 | 581 | 359 | 0 | 320 | 749 | 0 | 1137 | 573 | 0 | 506 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 14.8 | 0.0 | 14.8 | 14.4 | 0.0 | 14.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 11.8 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 15.7 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 12.6 |


| LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh | 15.7 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 12.6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | B | A | B | B | A | B | A | A | A | B | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 40 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 152 |  | 144 |  |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 15.9 |  |  | 15.8 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  | 12.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$, s | 7.9 | 18.0 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 11.0 |
| Change Period $(\mathbf{Y}+R \mathrm{Rc}), \mathrm{s}$ | ${ }^{*} 5.4$ | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | $* 6.6$ | 21.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s | 2.9 | 3.3 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 4.1 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 11.2

```
HCM 6th LOS
    B
```

Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



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



[^12]Synchro 10 Report

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | 7 | $\stackrel{-}{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 217 | 1222 | 136 | 32 | 1852 | 152 | 142 | 145 | 209 |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.88 | 0.61 | 0.09 | 0.17 | 0.82 | 0.83 | 0.73 | 0.72 | 0.57 |
| Control Delay | 57.6 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 49.6 | 31.1 | 85.8 | 72.4 | 71.3 | 12.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 57.6 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 49.6 | 31.1 | 85.8 | 72.4 | 71.3 | 12.8 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 179 | 214 | 0 | 22 | 490 | 115 | 112 | 115 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | m169 | m229 | m0 | 44 | 589 | 145 | 177 | 161 | 64 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 682 |  |  | 2401 | 499 |  | 332 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) | 345 |  | 310 | 170 |  |  | 100 |  | 125 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 272 | 1990 | 1583 | 228 | 2245 | 190 | 231 | 238 | 397 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.80 | 0.61 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.82 | 0.80 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.53 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
1470: Roeland Drive \& Shawnee Mission Parkway
01/26/2020

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个4 | 「 | \% |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 189 | 1149 | 103 | 24 | 1546 | 178 | 68 | 37 | 7 | 177 | 66 | 184 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 189 | 1149 | 103 | 24 | 1546 | 178 | 68 | 37 | 7 | 177 | 66 | 184 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.5 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 5.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | *0.84 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |  | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.97 |  | 0.95 | 0.98 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 4609 |  |  | 1791 |  | 1681 | 1733 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.97 |  | 0.95 | 0.98 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 4609 |  |  | 1791 |  | 1681 | 1733 | 1583 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.87 | 0.94 | 0.76 | 0.75 | 0.95 | 0.79 | 0.77 | 0.71 | 0.58 | 0.87 | 0.79 | 0.88 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 217 | 1222 | 136 | 32 | 1627 | 225 | 88 | 52 | 12 | 203 | 84 | 209 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 13 | , | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 217 | 1222 | 136 | 32 | 1839 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 142 | 145 | 24 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Free | Prot | NA |  | Split | NA |  | Split | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 1 |  |  | 5 | 2 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 18.7 | 65.7 | 120.0 | 9.3 | 56.3 |  |  | 12.1 |  | 13.9 | 13.9 | 13.9 |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 18.7 | 65.7 | 120.0 | 9.3 | 56.3 |  |  | 12.1 |  | 13.9 | 13.9 | 13.9 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.16 | 0.55 | 1.00 | 0.08 | 0.47 |  |  | 0.10 |  | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.5 | 5.5 |  | 4.5 | 5.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 1.5 | 2.0 |  | 1.5 | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 275 | 1937 | 1583 | 137 | 2162 |  |  | 180 |  | 194 | 200 | 183 |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.12 | 0.35 |  | 0.02 | c0.40 |  |  | c0.08 |  | c0.08 | 0.08 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.79 | 0.63 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0.85 |  |  | 0.83 |  | 0.73 | 0.72 | 0.13 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 48.8 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 52.0 | 28.1 |  |  | 52.9 |  | 51.3 | 51.2 | 47.6 |
| Progression Factor | 1.06 | 0.36 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 1.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 4.4 |  |  | 24.8 |  | 11.6 | 10.5 | 0.1 |
| Delay (s) | 52.9 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 52.3 | 32.6 |  |  | 77.8 |  | 62.8 | 61.7 | 47.8 |
| Level of Service | D | A | A | D | C |  |  | E |  | E | E | D |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 12.6 |  |  | 32.9 |  |  | 77.8 |  |  | 56.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 29.6 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | C |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.82 |  | 19.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 120.0 | Sum of lost time (s) | C |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $69.2 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |

C Critical Lane Group

Queues
3: Roe Avenue \& Johnson Drive/Johnson Drive WB

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | - | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 380 | 442 | 99 | 374 | 164 | 586 | 72 | 79 | 649 | 349 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.75 | 0.60 | 0.59 | 0.69 | 0.43 | 0.41 | 0.10 | 0.20 | 0.51 | 0.44 |
| Control Delay | 51.0 | 35.9 | 58.5 | 45.8 | 17.3 | 23.9 | 0.3 | 14.7 | 28.1 | 4.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 51.0 | 35.9 | 58.5 | 45.8 | 17.3 | 23.9 | 0.3 | 14.7 | 28.1 | 4.8 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 118 | 121 | 60 | 116 | 56 | 149 | 0 | 26 | 177 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) | 144 | 168 | \#106 | 153 | 74 | 185 | 0 | 39 | 214 | 55 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 556 |  | 629 |  | 141 |  |  | 492 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) | 245 |  | 130 |  | 150 |  | 25 | 150 |  | 250 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 512 | 816 | 172 | 635 | 407 | 1457 | 748 | 422 | 1285 | 797 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.74 | 0.54 | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.10 | 0.19 | 0.51 | 0.44 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％${ }^{\text {\％}}$ | 中t |  | \％ | 中t |  | \％ | ¢ $\uparrow$ | F | ${ }^{7}$ | 个 $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 289 | 305 | 88 | 75 | 287 | 25 | 123 | 498 | 52 | 58 | 545 | 307 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 289 | 305 | 88 | 75 | 287 | 25 | 123 | 498 | 52 | 58 | 545 | 307 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 380 | 332 | 110 | 99 | 334 | 40 | 164 | 586 | 0 | 79 | 649 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.76 | 0.92 | 0.80 | 0.76 | 0.86 | 0.63 | 0.75 | 0.85 | 0.72 | 0.73 | 0.84 | 0.88 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | ， | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 443 | 502 | 164 | 125 | 424 | 50 | 434 | 1597 |  | 444 | 1520 |  |
| Arrive On Green | 0.13 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.07 | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.43 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3456 | 2634 | 858 | 1781 | 3199 | 380 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 380 | 222 | 220 | 99 | 184 | 190 | 164 | 586 | 0 | 79 | 649 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1728 | 1777 | 1716 | 1781 | 1777 | 1802 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 10.8 | 11.6 | 11.9 | 5.5 | 10.0 | 10.2 | 5.1 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 12.8 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 10.8 | 11.6 | 11.9 | 5.5 | 10.0 | 10.2 | 5.1 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 12.8 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.50 | 1.00 |  | 0.21 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 443 | 339 | 327 | 125 | 236 | 239 | 434 | 1597 |  | 444 | 1520 |  |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.86 | 0.66 | 0.67 | 0.79 | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.38 | 0.37 |  | 0.18 | 0.43 |  |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 449 | 409 | 395 | 143 | 320 | 324 | 520 | 1597 |  | 515 | 1520 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 42.7 | 37.4 | 37.6 | 45.8 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 14.8 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 14.7 | 20.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 15.1 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 23.1 | 8.5 | 9.2 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 5.5 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 3.2 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 2.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 5.3 | 0.0 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 57.8 | 40.3 | 40.9 | 68.9 | 50.5 | 51.2 | 15.4 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 20.9 | 0.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | E | D | D | E | D | D | B | B |  | B | C |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 822 |  |  | 473 |  |  | 750 | A |  | 728 | A |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 48.6 |  |  | 54.7 |  |  | 18.1 |  |  | 20.3 |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 18.8 | 19.3 | 11.0 | 50.9 | 13.0 | 25.1 | 13.2 | 48.8 |
| Change Period $(Y+R c), s$ | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 13.0 | 18.0 | 9.0 | 36.0 | 8.0 | 23.0 | 12.0 | 33.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋1）），s | 12.8 | 12.2 | 4.4 | 12.9 | 7.5 | 13.9 | 7.1 | 14.8 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 4.1 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 33.9 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，SBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | 7 | 4 | 4 | , | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 48 | 593 | 64 | 82 | 664 | 24 | 60 | 153 | 52 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.12 | 0.62 | 0.07 | 0.18 | 0.69 | 0.03 | 0.19 | 0.35 | 0.23 |
| Control Delay | 6.4 | 16.7 | 0.2 | 6.7 | 18.4 | 0.1 | 25.4 | 10.6 | 20.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 6.4 | 16.7 | 0.2 | 6.7 | 18.4 | 0.1 | 25.4 | 10.6 | 20.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 8 | 205 | 0 | 13 | 239 | 0 | 20 | 9 | 7 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 16 | 307 | 0 | 26 | 369 | 0 | 55 | 61 | 15 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 180 |  |  | 464 |  |  | 267 | 783 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 100 |  | 100 | 130 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 409 | 1411 | 1234 | 457 | 1411 | 1234 | 331 | 702 | 297 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.12 | 0.42 | 0.05 | 0.18 | 0.47 | 0.02 | 0.18 | 0.22 | 0.18 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{F}$ |  | \$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 36 | 510 | 58 | 64 | 578 | 9 | 50 | 26 | 100 | 2 | 6 | 23 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 36 | 510 | 58 | 64 | 578 | 9 | 50 | 26 | 100 | 2 | 6 | 23 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 48 | 593 | 64 | 82 | 664 | 24 | 60 | 28 | 125 | 4 | 12 | 36 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.91 | 0.78 | 0.87 | 0.38 | 0.83 | 0.93 | 0.80 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.64 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 317 | 775 | 657 | 370 | 813 | 689 | 448 | 75 | 334 | 73 | 44 | 113 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.06 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.08 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.06 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 298 | 1332 | 60 | 443 | 1132 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 48 | 593 | 64 | 82 | 664 | 24 | 60 | 0 | 153 | 52 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1631 | 1635 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.8 | 15.7 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 18.0 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.8 | 15.7 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 18.0 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.82 | 0.08 |  | 0.69 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 317 | 775 | 657 | 370 | 813 | 689 | 448 | 0 | 408 | 230 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.15 | 0.77 | 0.10 | 0.22 | 0.82 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.37 | 0.23 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 433 | 1520 | 1288 | 451 | 1520 | 1288 | 550 | 0 | 592 | 320 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 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 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 11.0 | 14.5 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 14.3 | 9.4 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 17.9 | 24.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.2 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.3 | 6.0 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 6.9 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh

| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 11.2 | 16.1 | 10.4 | 10.6 | 16.4 | 9.4 | 19.4 | 0.0 | 18.5 | 24.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | B | B | B | B | B | A | B | A | B | C | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 705 |  |  | 770 |  |  | 213 |  |  | 52 |  |
| Approach Delay, slveh |  | 15.3 |  |  | 15.6 |  |  | 18.7 |  |  | 24.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$, s | 8.2 | 30.1 | 19.5 | 9.4 | 29.0 | 8.7 | 10.8 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$, s | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 7.0 | 47.0 | 21.0 | 7.0 | 47.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 2.8 | 20.0 | 6.5 | 3.4 | 17.7 | 3.6 | 3.7 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 5.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 16.1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | $B$ |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  |  | ＊ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 189 | 1149 | 103 | 24 | 1546 | 178 | 68 | 37 | 7 | 177 | 66 | 184 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 189 | 1149 | 103 | 24 | 1546 | 178 | 68 | 37 | 7 | 177 | 66 | 184 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 217 | 1222 | 0 | 32 | 1627 | 225 | 88 | 52 | 12 | 203 | 84 | 209 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.94 | 0.76 | 0.75 | 0.95 | 0.79 | 0.77 | 0.71 | 0.58 | 0.87 | 0.79 | 0.88 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 294 | 1673 |  | 250 | 1922 | 265 | 105 | 62 | 14 | 230 | 242 | 205 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.17 | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 | 1781 | 4311 | 594 | 1038 | 613 | 142 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 217 | 1222 | 0 | 32 | 1185 | 667 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 203 | 84 | 209 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 | 1781 | 1571 | 1763 | 1793 | 0 | 0 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 13.9 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 40.2 | 40.5 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.4 | 4.9 | 15.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 13.9 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 40.2 | 40.5 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.4 | 4.9 | 15.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.34 | 0.58 |  | 0.08 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 294 | 1673 |  | 250 | 1401 | 786 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 242 | 205 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.74 | 0.73 |  | 0.13 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.83 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.88 | 0.35 | 1.02 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 294 | 1673 |  | 250 | 1401 | 786 | 291 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 242 | 205 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 47.6 | 25.6 | 0.0 | 45.2 | 29.6 | 29.6 | 52.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 51.4 | 47.6 | 52.3 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 8.3 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 6.4 | 11.1 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 29.5 | 0.3 | 68.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 6.7 | 13.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 15.4 | 18.4 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 2.3 | 10.0 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 56.0 | 28.5 | 0.0 | 45.3 | 36.0 | 40.7 | 58.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 80.9 | 48.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | E | C |  | D | D | D | E | A | A | F | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1439 | A |  | 1884 |  | 152 |  | F |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 32.6 |  |  | 37.8 |  | 58.5 |  | 92.1 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | D |  |  | E |  | F |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 24.3 | 59.0 | 16.7 | 21.3 | 62.0 | 20.0 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 5.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 12.5 | 53.5 | 19.5 | 9.5 | 56.5 | 15.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 15.9 | 42.5 | 12.0 | 3.9 | 35.3 | 17.5 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 6.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 43.5
HCM 6th LOS
D

## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for［EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 「 | 4 | F | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 177 | 11 | 151 | 170 | 18 | 189 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 177 | 11 | 151 | 170 | 18 | 189 |
| 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 | 0 | - | 0 | 75 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 85 | 78 | 85 | 85 | 78 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 208 | 14 | 178 | 200 | 23 | 217 |



Queues
6: Roeland Drive \& Martway Street/Drive 3

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 81 | 105 | 72 | 14 | 56 | 185 | 8 | 162 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.21 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.17 | 0.01 | 0.17 |
| Control Delay | 18.0 | 0.3 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 8.6 | 17.8 | 14.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 18.0 | 0.3 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 8.6 | 17.8 | 14.5 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 15 | , | 14 | 0 | 9 | 27 | 1 | 23 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 52 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 20 | 41 | 10 | 68 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 773 |  | 54 |  | 238 |  | 267 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 105 |  |  |  | 115 |  | 100 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 649 | 998 | 376 | 865 | 661 | 1210 | 615 | 933 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.01 | 0.17 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{F}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 73 | O | 63 | 56 | 0 | 11 | 37 | 88 | 37 | 6 | 88 | 42 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 73 | 0 | 63 | 56 | 0 | 11 | 37 | 88 | 37 | 6 | 88 | 42 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 81 | 0 | 105 | 72 | 0 | 14 | 56 | 138 | 47 | 8 | 116 | 46 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.60 | 0.78 | 0.92 | 0.78 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.76 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 243 | 0 | 216 | 168 | 0 | 150 | 408 | 483 | 164 | 381 | 202 | 80 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 1334 | 454 | 1199 | 1274 | 505 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 81 | 0 | 105 | 72 | 0 | 14 | 56 | 0 | 185 | 8 | 0 | 162 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1789 | 1199 | 0 | 1779 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 1.6 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 1.6 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.25 | 1.00 |  | 0.28 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 243 | 0 | 216 | 168 | 0 | 150 | 408 | 0 | 647 | 381 | 0 | 283 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.57 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 566 | 0 | 503 | 311 | 0 | 277 | 612 | 0 | 994 | 476 | 0 | 424 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 14.8 | 0.0 | 15.1 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 15.6 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 14.7 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.2 |

Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh

| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 15.6 | 0.0 | 16.8 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 16.5 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | B | A | B | B | A | B | B | A | A | B | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 186 |  |  | 86 |  |  | 241 |  |  | 170 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 16.3 |  |  | 17.5 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  | 16.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{C})$, $s$ | 9.0 | 18.7 | 10.1 | 7.7 | 11.0 |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | *5.4 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | *6.6 | 21.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 3.4 | 4.8 | 4.3 | 2.9 | 5.2 |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 |  |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 14.0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | $B$ |

## Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.
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| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 414 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | 6.94 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | 3.32 | - | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | 587 | 0 | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | 587 | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.2 | 0 | 0 |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | -5887 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | -0.009 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | -11.2 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | B | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | 0 | - |
| H | - |  |  |



| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 394 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | 6.94 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | 3.32 | - | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | 605 | 0 | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | 605 | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.3 | 0 | 0 |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | -605 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | -0.059 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | -11.3 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | $B$ | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - |  |
| (v.2 | - | - |  |
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## Merge Analysis

## Project Information

| Analyst | TCM | Date | $5 / 20 / 2019$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | Olsson | Analysis Year | 2019 |
| Jurisdiction | Mission, KS | Time Period Analyzed | AM |
| Project Description | 巴 Johnson Drive On-Ramp to NB Shawnee Mission Parkway |  |  |
| Geometric Data | Freeway | Ramp |  |
|  | 2 | 1 |  |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 45.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Free-Aow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 1500 | 150 |  |
| Segment Length (L) / Acceleration Length (LA),ft | Rolling | Rolling |  |
| Terrain Type | - | - |  |
| Percent Grade, \% | Freeway | Right |  |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side |  |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population |  | All Familiar | All Familiar |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weather Type |  | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |  |
| Incident Type |  | No Incident | - |  |
| Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Demand and Capacity |  |  |  |  |
| Demand Volume (Vi) |  | 1252 | 339 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) |  | 0.85 | 0.85 |  |
| Total Trucks, \% |  | 0.02 | 0.02 |  |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% |  | - | - |  |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% |  | - | - |  |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| How Rate (vi),pc/h |  | 1473 | 399 |  |
| Capacity (c), pc/h |  | 4500 | 1900 |  |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) |  | 0.42 | 0.21 |  |
| Speed and Density |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LFQ), ft | - | Number of Outer Lanes on Freeway (No) |  | 0 |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (Ms) |  | 0.339 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | How Outer Lanes (voA), pc/mi/ln |  | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | On-Ramp Influenece Area Speed (SR), mi/h |  | 44.0 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PfM) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (So), mi/h |  | - |
| How in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 1473 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h |  | 44.0 |
| How Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | 1872 | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln |  | 21.3 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | Density in Ramp Influence Area (DR), pc/mi/In |  | 19.0 |

## Project Information

| Analyst | TCM | Date | $5 / 20 / 2019$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | Olsson | Analysis Year | 2019 |
| Jurisdiction | Mission, KS | Time Period Analyzed | PM |
| Project Description | 巴 Johnson Drive On-Ramp to NB Shawnee Mission Parkway |  |  |
| Geometric Data | Freeway | Ramp |  |
|  | 2 | 1 |  |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 45.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Free-Aow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 1500 | 150 |  |
| Segment Length (L) / Acceleration Length (La),ft | Rolling | Rolling |  |
| Terrain Type | - | - |  |
| Percent Grade, \% | Freeway | Right |  |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side |  |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population |  | All Familiar | All Familiar |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weather Type |  | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |  |
| Incident Type |  | No Incident | - |  |
| Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Final Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Demand and Capacity |  |  |  |  |
| Demand Volume (Vi) |  | 1332 | 417 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) |  | 0.94 | 0.86 |  |
| Total Trucks, \% |  | 0.02 | 0.02 |  |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% |  | - | - |  |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% |  | - | - |  |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| How Rate (vi),pc/h |  | 1417 | 485 |  |
| Capacity (c), pc/h |  | 4500 | 1900 |  |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) |  | 0.42 | 0.26 |  |
| Speed and Density |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LFQ), ft | - | Number of Outer Lanes on Freeway (No) |  | 0 |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (Ms) |  | 0.340 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | How Outer Lanes (voA), pc/mi/In |  | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | On-Ramp Influenece Area Speed (SR), mi/h |  | 44.0 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PFM) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (SO), mi/h |  | - |
| How in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 1417 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h |  | 44.0 |
| How Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | 1902 | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln |  | 21.6 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | Density in Ramp Influence Area (D) | ), $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ | 19.2 |

# APPENDIX D 

Future 2038

## Drive Spacing - Influence Area Calculations

Drive $1=360$ ) center to stop bar from SMPi Rowland Dr.

olsson
PROJECT: Fintur-2145 (m.ss.an Fakery)
project no.:
drawn by:T ( $M$
page । of
page ( of $\mid$

## Signal Warrants

## Future Peak Hour Volume Warrant Roeland Drive and Martway Street


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

Future Growth


Red numbers seem artifically low. Percentages represent growth between years. For example, between 2016 and 2015 the growth was $3.5 \%$, between 2016 and 2015 the growth rate was $14.19 \%$, ect.

## Future AM

| Year 2012 | 23,700 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Year 2016 | 26,600 |
| Growth Rate | $3 \%$ |



Future PM




Capacity Analysis

Queues
3: Roe Avenue \& Johnson Drive/Johnson Drive WB

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 211 | 430 | 52 | 435 | 158 | 1381 | 72 | 97 | 714 | 205 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.68 | 0.63 | 0.49 | 0.88 | 0.42 | 0.81 | 0.08 | 0.46 | 0.43 | 0.24 |
| Control Delay | 56.2 | 42.0 | 61.3 | 62.0 | 13.5 | 27.8 | 0.2 | 17.7 | 18.7 | 2.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 56.2 | 42.0 | 61.3 | 62.0 | 13.5 | 27.8 | 0.2 | 17.7 | 18.7 | 2.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 68 | 134 | 33 | 143 | 42 | 398 | 0 | 25 | 153 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 103 | 181 | 69 | \#221 | 49 | 468 | 0 | 50 | 201 | 33 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 556 |  | 629 |  | 125 |  |  | 492 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) | 245 |  | 130 |  | 150 |  | 25 | 150 |  | 250 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 313 | 679 | 108 | 495 | 378 | 1708 | 849 | 230 | 1663 | 852 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.67 | 0.63 | 0.48 | 0.88 | 0.42 | 0.81 | 0.08 | 0.42 | 0.43 | 0.24 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％${ }^{*}$ | 中t |  | 7 | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \％ | 个 $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | 个 $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 184 | 336 | 28 | 45 | 358 | 9 | 101 | 1188 | 53 | 83 | 671 | 178 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 184 | 336 | 28 | 45 | 358 | 9 | 101 | 1188 | 53 | 83 | 671 | 178 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 211 | 386 | 44 | 52 | 407 | 28 | 158 | 1381 | 0 | 97 | 714 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.64 | 0.86 | 0.88 | 0.32 | 0.64 | 0.86 | 0.74 | 0.86 | 0.94 | 0.87 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 277 | 583 | 66 | 68 | 469 | 32 | 437 | 1744 |  | 237 | 1708 |  |
| Arrive On Green | 0.08 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.06 | 0.49 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.48 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3456 | 3217 | 365 | 1781 | 3374 | 231 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 211 | 212 | 218 | 52 | 214 | 221 | 158 | 1381 | 0 | 97 | 714 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1728 | 1777 | 1805 | 1781 | 1777 | 1829 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 6.0 | 11.1 | 11.2 | 2.9 | 11.8 | 11.9 | 4.5 | 32.4 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 13.1 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 6.0 | 11.1 | 11.2 | 2.9 | 11.8 | 11.9 | 4.5 | 32.4 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 13.1 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.20 | 1.00 |  | 0.13 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 277 | 322 | 327 | 68 | 247 | 254 | 437 | 1744 |  | 237 | 1708 |  |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.76 | 0.66 | 0.67 | 0.76 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.36 | 0.79 |  | 0.41 | 0.42 |  |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 311 | 322 | 327 | 107 | 249 | 256 | 437 | 1744 |  | 291 | 1708 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 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 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 45.0 | 38.1 | 38.1 | 47.6 | 42.1 | 42.2 | 12.7 | 21.2 | 0.0 | 17.9 | 16.9 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 9.4 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 16.1 | 25.6 | 26.0 | 0.5 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 2.9 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 1.6 | 6.9 | 7.1 | 1.7 | 13.4 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 5.2 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 54.4 | 43.0 | 43.2 | 63.7 | 67.7 | 68.2 | 13.2 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 19.0 | 17.6 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | D | D | E | E | E | B | C |  | B | B |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 641 |  |  | 487 |  |  | 1539 | A |  | 811 | A |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 46.8 |  |  | 67.5 |  |  | 23.8 |  |  | 17.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c), ~ s$ | 14.0 | 19.9 | 11.0 | 55.1 | 9.8 | 24.1 | 12.0 | 54.1 |
| Change Period $(\mathbf{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$ ，s | 6.0 | 6.0 | ${ }^{*} 5.4$ | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 9.0 | 14.0 | $* 8.6$ | 45.0 | 6.0 | 17.0 | 6.0 | 47.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 8.0 | 13.9 | 4.7 | 34.4 | 4.9 | 13.2 | 6.5 | 15.1 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 5.3 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 32.7
HCM 6th LOS C

## Notes

＊HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，SBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \% | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 8 | 493 | 55 | 60 | 550 | 4 | 46 | 52 | 72 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.01 | 0.41 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.26 |
| Control Delay | 6.5 | 14.8 | 0.1 | 6.7 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 8.5 | 22.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 6.5 | 14.8 | 0.1 | 6.7 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 8.5 | 22.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 1 | 164 | 0 | 10 | 125 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 16 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 2 | 267 | 0 | 24 | 300 | 0 | 23 | 19 | 43 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 180 |  |  | 464 |  |  | 267 | 783 |
| Turn Bay Length (t) | 100 |  | 100 | 130 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 621 | 1495 | 1299 | 618 | 1495 | 1299 | 387 | 778 | 352 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.01 | 0.33 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.37 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.20 |

[^14]| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{4}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\hat{F}$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | , | 473 | 37 | 52 | 506 | 1 | 23 | 3 | 46 | 6 | 23 | 21 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 2 | 473 | 37 | 52 | 506 | 1 | 23 | 3 | 46 | 6 | 23 | 21 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 8 | 493 | 55 | 60 | 550 | 4 | 46 | 4 | 48 | 12 | 32 | 28 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.25 | 0.96 | 0.67 | 0.86 | 0.92 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.75 | 0.95 | 0.50 | 0.72 | 0.75 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 312 | 658 | 557 | 377 | 763 | 647 | 480 | 33 | 391 | 106 | 86 | 67 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.07 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.06 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 123 | 1480 | 179 | 850 | 655 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 8 | 493 | 55 | 60 | 550 | 4 | 46 | 0 | 52 | 72 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1604 | 1684 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.1 | 11.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 11.7 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.1 | 11.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 11.7 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.92 | 0.17 |  | 0.39 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 312 | 658 | 557 | 377 | 763 | 647 | 480 | 0 | 424 | 259 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.03 | 0.75 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.72 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 551 | 1847 | 1565 | 516 | 1847 | 1565 | 640 | 0 | 708 | 404 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 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 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 10.5 | 13.6 | 10.4 | 9.6 | 11.8 | 8.4 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh

| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 10.6 | 15.3 | 10.4 | 9.8 | 13.1 | 8.4 | 15.7 | 0.0 | 13.4 | 20.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | B | B | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | C | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 556 |  |  | 614 |  |  | 98 |  | 72 |  |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 14.8 |  |  | 12.8 |  |  | 14.5 |  | 20.6 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  | C |  |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$, s | 5.6 | 24.4 | 17.6 | 8.3 | 21.7 | 7.7 | 9.8 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$, s | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 7.0 | 47.0 | 21.0 | 7.0 | 47.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 2.1 | 13.7 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 13.0 | 3.0 | 3.8 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.1 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 14.1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | $B$ |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 152 | 1875 | 28 | 37 | 3575 | 120 | 102 | 102 | 88 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.80 | 0.86 | 0.02 | 0.21 | 1.36 | 0.68 | 0.62 | 0.61 | 0.30 |
| Control Delay | 39.6 | 46.9 | 0.0 | 51.3 | 190.5 | 47.7 | 68.6 | 67.4 | 2.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 39.6 | 46.9 | 0.0 | 51.3 | 190.5 | 47.7 | 68.6 | 67.4 | 2.6 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 126 | 815 | 0 | 26 | $\sim 1473$ | 44 | 81 | 81 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | m90 | m541 | m0 | 41 | \#1580 | \#128 | 136 | 96 | 0 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 682 |  |  | 2401 | 499 |  | 330 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) | 345 |  | 310 | 170 |  |  | 100 |  | 125 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 213 | 2178 | 1583 | 213 | 2627 | 176 | 189 | 193 | 315 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.71 | 0.86 | 0.02 | 0.17 | 1.36 | 0.68 | 0.54 | 0.53 | 0.28 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| m Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
1470: Roeland Drive \& Shawnee Mission Parkway
01/28/2020


C Critical Lane Group



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 「 | 4 | F | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 60 | 8 | 175 | 152 | 18 | 162 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 60 | 8 | 175 | 152 | 18 | 162 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control S | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 75 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 85 | 78 | 85 | 85 | 78 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 71 | 10 | 206 | 179 | 23 | 186 |



Queues
6: Roeland Drive \& Martway Street/Drive 3

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 20 | 20 | 51 | 9 | 44 | 108 | 8 | 136 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.11 |
| Control Delay | 17.4 | 0.1 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 5.4 | 15.2 | 12.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 17.4 | 0.1 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 5.4 | 15.2 | 12.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 2 | , | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 20 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 15 | 22 | 9 | 61 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 773 |  | 54 |  | 238 |  | 267 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 105 |  |  |  | 115 |  | 100 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 686 | 1033 | 396 | 1046 | 817 | 1350 | 860 | 1239 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.11 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 18 | 0 | 12 | 40 | 0 | 7 | 29 | 48 | 26 | 6 | 94 | 11 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 18 | 0 | 12 | 40 | 0 | 7 | 29 | 48 | 26 | 6 | 94 | 11 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 20 | 0 | 20 | 51 | 0 | 9 | 44 | 75 | 33 | 8 | 124 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.60 | 0.78 | 0.92 | 0.78 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.76 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 100 | 0 | 89 | 137 | 0 | 122 | 476 | 488 | 215 | 456 | 308 | 30 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 1231 | 542 | 1286 | 1679 | 162 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 20 | 0 | 20 | 51 | 0 | 9 | 44 | 0 | 108 | 8 | 0 | 136 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1773 | 1286 | 0 | 1841 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 0.09 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 100 | 0 | 89 | 137 | 0 | 122 | 476 | 0 | 703 | 456 | 0 | 338 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.37 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.40 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 653 | 0 | 581 | 359 | 0 | 320 | 749 | 0 | 1137 | 573 | 0 | 506 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 14.8 | 0.0 | 14.8 | 14.4 | 0.0 | 14.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 11.8 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 15.7 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 12.6 |


| LnGrp LOS | B | A | B | B | A | B | A | A | A |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 40 |  | 60 |  | 152 |  | B |  |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 15.9 |  | 15.8 |  | 7.0 | 144 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  | B | A | 12.5 |  |  |  |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 7.9 | 18.0 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 11.0 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | $* 5.4$ | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | ${ }^{2} 6.6$ | 21.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 2.9 | 3.3 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 4.1 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 11.2

```
HCM 6th LOS
    B
```

Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.
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| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{7}$ |  | 信 | 个4 | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1342 | 740 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1342 | 740 | 4 |
| 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 | - | - | - | 100 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 78 | 92 | 92 | 85 | 78 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1459 | 871 | 5 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 436 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | 6.94 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | 3.32 | - | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | 568 | 0 | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | 568 | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.4 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | $B$ |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | -568 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | -0.005 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | -11.4 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | B | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | 0 | - |
| (v) |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{7}$ |  | 个 | 个中 | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 0 | 15 | 0 | 1342 | 704 | 38 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 0 | 15 | 0 | 1342 | 704 | 38 |
| 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 | - | - | - | 100 |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade，\％ | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 78 | 78 | 92 | 85 | 78 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 19 | 0 | 1459 | 828 | 49 |


| Major／Minor | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 414 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | 6.94 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow－up Hdwy | - | 3.32 | - | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap－1 Maneuver | 0 | 587 | 0 | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked，\％ |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap－1 Maneuver | - | 587 | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap－2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay，s | 11.3 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |


| Minor Lane／Major Mvmt | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity（veh／h） | -5887 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V／C Ratio | -0.033 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay（s） | -11.3 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | $B$ | - |
| HCM 95th \％tile Q（veh） | - | 0.1 | - |
| H | - |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 152 | 1875 | 28 | 37 | 3274 | 301 | 29 | 91 | 102 | 102 | 88 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.58 | 0.81 | 0.02 | 0.30 | 1.15 | 0.29 | 0.24 | 0.50 | 0.66 | 0.65 | 0.31 |
| Control Delay | 50.5 | 24.4 | 0.0 | 59.9 | 98.0 | 5.6 | 58.3 | 24.9 | 73.0 | 71.7 | 2.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 50.5 | 24.4 | 0.0 | 59.9 | 98.0 | 5.6 | 58.3 | 24.9 | 73.0 | 71.7 | 2.8 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 48 | 811 | 0 | 28 | ~1193 | 41 | 22 | 9 | 81 | 81 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | m31 | m538 | m0 | 44 | \#1299 | 77 | 37 | 62 | \#148 | 98 | 0 |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  | 682 |  |  | 2401 |  |  | 499 |  | 330 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 350 |  | 310 | 170 |  | 230 | 100 |  | 100 |  | 125 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 300 | 2316 | 1583 | 125 | 2840 | 1025 | 125 | 188 | 163 | 166 | 293 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.51 | 0.81 | 0.02 | 0.30 | 1.15 | 0.29 | 0.23 | 0.48 | 0.63 | 0.61 | 0.30 |

## Intersection Summary

~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
$m$ Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
1470：Roeland Drive \＆Shawnee Mission Parkway
01／28／2020

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％${ }^{1 / 4}$ | 个4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 个种 | F | \％ | $\hat{F}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | ${ }^{7}$ |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 132 | 1781 | 21 | 23 | 3110 | 256 | 18 | 11 | 67 | 143 | 25 | 73 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 132 | 1781 | 21 | 23 | 3110 | 256 | 18 | 11 | 67 | 143 | 25 | 73 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） | 4.5 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | ＊0．84 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.87 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 0.97 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 3433 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 4694 | 1583 | 1770 | 1620 |  | 1681 | 1717 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 0.97 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 3433 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 4694 | 1583 | 1770 | 1620 |  | 1681 | 1717 | 1583 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.87 | 0.95 | 0.75 | 0.63 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.63 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.63 | 0.83 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 152 | 1875 | 28 | 37 | 3274 | 301 | 29 | 12 | 79 | 164 | 40 | 88 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 152 | 1875 | 28 | 37 | 3274 | 233 | 29 | 17 | 0 | 102 | 102 | 8 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Free | Prot | NA | Perm | Split | NA |  | Split | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 9.2 | 76.7 | 120.0 | 5.1 | 72.6 | 72.6 | 8.1 | 8.1 |  | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.1 |
| Effective Green， g （ s ） | 9.2 | 76.7 | 120.0 | 5.1 | 72.6 | 72.6 | 8.1 | 8.1 |  | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.1 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.08 | 0.64 | 1.00 | 0.04 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.07 | 0.07 |  | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
| Clearance Time（s） | 4.5 | 5.5 |  | 4.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 1.5 | 2.0 |  | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 263 | 2262 | 1583 | 75 | 2839 | 957 | 119 | 109 |  | 155 | 158 | 146 |
| v／s Ratio Prot | 0.04 | c0．53 |  | 0.02 | c0．70 |  | c0．02 | 0.01 |  | c0．06 | 0.06 |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.15 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.01 |
| v／c Ratio | 0.58 | 0.83 | 0.02 | 0.49 | 1.15 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.16 |  | 0.66 | 0.65 | 0.06 |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 53.5 | 16.6 | 0.0 | 56.2 | 23.7 | 11.0 | 53.0 | 52.7 |  | 52.6 | 52.6 | 49.7 |
| Progression Factor | 0.93 | 1.41 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 73.4 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 |  | 7.5 | 6.6 | 0.1 |
| Delay（s） | 49.9 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 58.0 | 97.1 | 11.6 | 53.4 | 53.0 |  | 60.1 | 59.2 | 49.7 |
| Level of Service | D | C | A | E | F | B | D | D |  | E | E | D |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 25.4 |  |  | 89.6 |  |  | 53.1 |  |  | 56.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 65.6 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | E |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 1.01 |  | 19.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） | 120.0 | Sum of lost time（s） | E |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $87.2 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period（min） | 15 |  |  |

C Critical Lane Group

Queues
3: Roe Avenue \& Johnson Drive/Johnson Drive WB

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\dagger$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $p$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 380 | 673 | 99 | 613 | 164 | 1058 | 72 | 79 | 1151 | 349 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.81 | 0.77 | 0.72 | 0.92 | 0.85 | 0.78 | 0.10 | 0.39 | 0.89 | 0.46 |
| Control Delay | 56.6 | 40.8 | 73.4 | 60.1 | 57.5 | 33.1 | 0.3 | 19.4 | 39.6 | 6.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 56.6 | 40.8 | 73.4 | 60.1 | 57.5 | 33.1 | 0.3 | 19.4 | 39.6 | 6.6 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 122 | 203 | 63 | 201 | 57 | 324 | 0 | 26 | 355 | 21 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 142 | 270 | \#106 | \#281 | \#125 | 377 | 0 | 41 | 402 | 79 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 556 |  | 629 |  | 141 |  |  | 492 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 245 |  | 130 |  | 150 |  | 25 | 150 |  | 250 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 480 | 879 | 141 | 670 | 193 | 1361 | 709 | 217 | 1309 | 772 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.79 | 0.77 | 0.70 | 0.91 | 0.85 | 0.78 | 0.10 | 0.36 | 0.88 | 0.45 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume | eds cap | city, qu | may | longer |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ＊＊ | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 个 $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 个 $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 289 | 518 | 88 | 75 | 493 | 25 | 123 | 899 | 52 | 58 | 967 | 307 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 289 | 518 | 88 | 75 | 493 | 25 | 123 | 899 | 52 | 58 | 967 | 307 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 380 | 563 | 110 | 99 | 573 | 40 | 164 | 1058 | 0 | 79 | 1151 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.76 | 0.92 | 0.80 | 0.76 | 0.86 | 0.63 | 0.75 | 0.85 | 0.72 | 0.73 | 0.84 | 0.88 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 448 | 734 | 143 | 125 | 634 | 44 | 221 | 1395 |  | 233 | 1359 |  |
| Arrive On Green | 0.13 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.06 | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.38 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3456 | 2966 | 578 | 1781 | 3370 | 235 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 380 | 337 | 336 | 99 | 302 | 311 | 164 | 1058 | 0 | 79 | 1151 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1728 | 1777 | 1766 | 1781 | 1777 | 1828 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 10.8 | 17.6 | 17.7 | 5.5 | 16.6 | 16.7 | 5.7 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 29.6 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 10.8 | 17.6 | 17.7 | 5.5 | 16.6 | 16.7 | 5.7 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 29.6 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.33 | 1.00 |  | 0.13 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 448 | 440 | 437 | 125 | 334 | 344 | 221 | 1395 |  | 233 | 1359 |  |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.85 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.79 | 0.90 | 0.91 | 0.74 | 0.76 |  | 0.34 | 0.85 |  |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 484 | 444 | 442 | 143 | 338 | 347 | 221 | 1395 |  | 286 | 1359 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 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 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 42.6 | 34.9 | 35.0 | 45.8 | 39.7 | 39.7 | 23.3 | 26.3 | 0.0 | 20.5 | 28.2 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 12.6 | 7.7 | 8.0 | 23.1 | 26.1 | 26.1 | 12.5 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 6.7 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 5.3 | 8.4 | 8.5 | 3.2 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 3.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 13.2 | 0.0 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 55.2 | 42.6 | 43.0 | 68.9 | 65.8 | 65.8 | 35.9 | 30.2 | 0.0 | 21.3 | 34.9 | 0.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | E | D | D | E | E | E | D | C |  | C | C |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1053 |  |  | 712 |  |  | 1222 | A | 1230 | A |  |
| Approach Delay，slveh |  | 47.3 |  |  | 66.2 |  |  | 31.0 |  |  | 34.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 19.0 | 24.8 | 11.0 | 45.2 | 13.0 | 30.8 | 12.0 | 44.2 |
| Change Period $(\mathbf{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$ ，s | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 14.0 | 19.0 | 8.0 | 35.0 | 8.0 | 25.0 | 6.0 | 37.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 12.8 | 18.7 | 4.6 | 27.8 | 7.5 | 19.7 | 7.7 | 31.6 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 3.4 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 41.9 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | $D$ |

## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，SBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 | $\leftrightarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 48 | 841 | 64 | 82 | 901 | 24 | 60 | 153 | 52 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.17 | 0.80 | 0.07 | 0.27 | 0.80 | 0.02 | 0.23 | 0.39 | 0.28 |
| Control Delay | 6.6 | 23.3 | 0.1 | 7.5 | 22.4 | 0.0 | 29.9 | 11.8 | 22.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 6.6 | 23.3 | 0.1 | 7.5 | 22.4 | 0.0 | 29.9 | 11.8 | 22.8 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 8 | 364 | 0 | 13 | 406 | 0 | 27 | 12 | 8 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 16 | \#547 | 0 | 26 | \#680 | 0 | 55 | 61 | 15 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 180 |  |  | 464 |  |  | 267 | 783 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 100 |  | 100 | 130 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 297 | 1218 | 1085 | 309 | 1222 | 1088 | 267 | 566 | 234 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.16 | 0.69 | 0.06 | 0.27 | 0.74 | 0.02 | 0.22 | 0.27 | 0.22 |

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

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 36 | 723 | 58 | 64 | 784 | 9 | 50 | 26 | 100 | 2 | 6 | 23 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 36 | 723 | 58 | 64 | 784 | 9 | 50 | 26 | 100 | 2 | 6 | 23 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 48 | 841 | 64 | 82 | 901 | 24 | 60 | 28 | 125 | 4 | 12 | 36 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.91 | 0.78 | 0.87 | 0.38 | 0.83 | 0.93 | 0.80 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.64 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 254 | 976 | 827 | 298 | 1005 | 852 | 363 | 62 | 275 | 58 | 36 | 91 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.05 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.07 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.06 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 298 | 1332 | 62 | 441 | 1132 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 48 | 841 | 64 | 82 | 901 | 24 | 60 | 0 | 153 | 52 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1631 | 1635 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.9 | 28.6 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 31.5 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.9 | 28.6 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 31.5 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.82 | 0.08 |  | 0.69 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 254 | 976 | 827 | 298 | 1005 | 852 | 363 | 0 | 337 | 185 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.19 | 0.86 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.90 | 0.03 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.45 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 333 | 1201 | 1018 | 350 | 1201 | 1018 | 430 | 0 | 468 | 253 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 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 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 13.7 | 15.2 | 8.7 | 12.9 | 15.1 | 8.0 | 26.4 | 0.0 | 25.4 | 31.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.4 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.3 | 12.0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 13.6 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 14.1 | 20.8 | 8.8 | 13.4 | 23.2 | 8.0 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 26.4 | 32.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | B | C | A | B | C | A | C | A | C | C | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 953 |  |  | 1007 |  |  | 213 |  |  | 52 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 19.6 |  |  | 22.0 |  |  | 26.4 |  |  | 32.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 8.7 | 44.3 | 20.1 | 9.9 | 43.2 | 9.2 | 10.9 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 7.0 | 47.0 | 21.0 | 7.0 | 47.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 2.9 | 33.5 | 8.0 | 3.5 | 30.6 | 4.1 | 4.2 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 5.9 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 21.7
HCM 6th LOS

|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 217 | 2229 | 136 | 32 | 3185 | 152 | 142 | 145 | 209 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.88 | 1.12 | 0.09 | 0.17 | 1.41 | 0.83 | 0.73 | 0.72 | 0.57 |
| Control Delay | 57.4 | 74.6 | 0.0 | 49.6 | 216.2 | 85.8 | 72.4 | 71.3 | 12.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 57.4 | 74.6 | 0.0 | 49.6 | 216.2 | 85.8 | 72.4 | 71.3 | 12.8 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 180 | $\sim 1196$ | 0 | 22 | $\sim 1356$ | 115 | 112 | 115 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | m103 | m532 | m0 | 44 | \#1473 | 145 | 177 | 161 | 64 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 682 |  |  | 2401 | 499 |  | 332 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) | 345 |  | 310 | 170 |  |  | 100 |  | 125 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 272 | 1990 | 1583 | 228 | 2254 | 190 | 231 | 238 | 397 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.80 | 1.12 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 1.41 | 0.80 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.53 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| m Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
1470: Roeland Drive \& Shawnee Mission Parkway
01/28/2020


C Critical Lane Group



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 「 | 4 | F | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 177 | 11 | 151 | 170 | 18 | 189 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 177 | 11 | 151 | 170 | 18 | 189 |
| 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 | 0 | - | 0 | 75 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 85 | 78 | 85 | 85 | 78 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 208 | 14 | 178 | 200 | 23 | 217 |



Queues
6: Roeland Drive \& Martway Street/Drive 3

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\stackrel{-}{4}$ | + | $\dagger$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 81 | 105 | 72 | 14 | 56 | 185 | 8 | 162 |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.21 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.17 | 0.01 | 0.17 |
| Control Delay | 18.0 | 0.3 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 8.6 | 17.8 | 14.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 18.0 | 0.3 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 8.6 | 17.8 | 14.5 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 15 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 9 | 27 | 1 | 23 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 52 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 20 | 41 | 10 | 68 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 773 |  | 153 |  | 238 |  | 267 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 105 |  |  |  | 115 |  | 100 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 649 | 998 | 376 | 865 | 661 | 1210 | 615 | 933 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.01 | 0.17 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | $\hat{\square}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{F}$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\square}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 73 | O | 63 | 56 | 0 | 11 | 37 | 88 | 37 | 6 | 88 | 42 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 73 | 0 | 63 | 56 | 0 | 11 | 37 | 88 | 37 | 6 | 88 | 42 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 81 | 0 | 105 | 72 | 0 | 14 | 56 | 138 | 47 | 8 | 116 | 46 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.60 | 0.78 | 0.92 | 0.78 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.76 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 243 | 0 | 216 | 168 | 0 | 150 | 408 | 483 | 164 | 381 | 202 | 80 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 1334 | 454 | 1199 | 1274 | 505 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 81 | 0 | 105 | 72 | 0 | 14 | 56 | 0 | 185 | 8 | 0 | 162 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1585 | 1781 | 0 | 1789 | 1199 | 0 | 1779 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 1.6 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 1.6 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.25 | 1.00 |  | 0.28 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 243 | 0 | 216 | 168 | 0 | 150 | 408 | 0 | 647 | 381 | 0 | 283 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.57 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 566 | 0 | 503 | 311 | 0 | 277 | 612 | 0 | 994 | 476 | 0 | 424 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 14.8 | 0.0 | 15.1 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 15.6 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 14.7 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.2 |

Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh

| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 15.6 | 0.0 | 16.8 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 16.5 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | B | A | B | B | A | B | B | A | A | B | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 186 |  |  | 86 |  |  | 241 |  |  | 170 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 16.3 |  |  | 17.5 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  | 16.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 14.0

HCM 6th LOS B

## Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.




| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 663 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | 6.94 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | 3.32 | - | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | 404 | 0 | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | 404 | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | -404 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | -0.013 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | 14 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | 0 | - |


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


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 643 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | 6.94 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | 3.32 | - | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | 416 | 0 | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | 416 | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 14.5 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | -416 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | -0.086 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | -14.5 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | $B$ | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - |  |
| H.3 | - | - |  |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  | * | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 217 | 2229 | 136 | 32 | 2960 | 225 | 88 | 64 | 142 | 145 | 209 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.82 | 0.99 | 0.09 | 0.26 | 1.08 | 0.23 | 0.71 | 0.48 | 0.77 | 0.76 | 0.72 |
| Control Delay | 72.4 | 33.4 | 0.0 | 58.6 | 68.6 | 5.5 | 84.6 | 60.4 | 78.0 | 76.7 | 35.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 72.4 | 33.4 | 0.0 | 58.6 | 68.6 | 5.5 | 84.6 | 60.4 | 78.0 | 76.7 | 35.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 92 | ~1055 | 0 | 24 | $\sim 1036$ | 30 | 68 | 43 | 112 | 114 | 57 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | m53 | m527 | m0 | 47 | \#1128 | 51 | \#113 | 69 | \#195 | 164 | 136 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 682 |  |  | 2401 |  |  | 499 |  | 332 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) | 350 |  | 310 | 170 |  | 230 |  |  | 100 |  | 125 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 271 | 2244 | 1583 | 125 | 2743 | 982 | 125 | 134 | 203 | 209 | 305 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.80 | 0.99 | 0.09 | 0.26 | 1.08 | 0.23 | 0.70 | 0.48 | 0.70 | 0.69 | 0.69 |

## Intersection Summary

~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
m Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％${ }^{1}$ | 个 $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 个种 | 「 | 7 | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 189 | 2095 | 103 | 24 | 2812 | 178 | 68 | 37 | 7 | 177 | 66 | 184 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 189 | 2095 | 103 | 24 | 2812 | 178 | 68 | 37 | 7 | 177 | 66 | 184 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） | 4.5 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | ＊0．84 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Fit | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 0.98 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 3433 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 4694 | 1583 | 1770 | 1810 |  | 1681 | 1733 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 0.98 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 3433 | 3539 | 1583 | 1770 | 4694 | 1583 | 1770 | 1810 |  | 1681 | 1733 | 1583 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.87 | 0.94 | 0.76 | 0.75 | 0.95 | 0.79 | 0.77 | 0.71 | 0.58 | 0.87 | 0.79 | 0.88 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 217 | 2229 | 136 | 32 | 2960 | 225 | 88 | 52 | 12 | 203 | 84 | 209 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 7 | ， | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 217 | 2229 | 136 | 32 | 2960 | 166 | 88 | 57 | 0 | 142 | 145 | 93 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Free | Prot | NA | Perm | Split | NA |  | Split | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | Free |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 11.1 | 74.3 | 120.0 | 5.1 | 68.3 | 68.3 | 8.4 | 8.4 |  | 13.2 | 13.2 | 13.2 |
| Effective Green， $\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{s})$ | 11.1 | 74.3 | 120.0 | 5.1 | 68.3 | 68.3 | 8.4 | 8.4 |  | 13.2 | 13.2 | 13.2 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.09 | 0.62 | 1.00 | 0.04 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.07 | 0.07 |  | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| Clearance Time（s） | 4.5 | 5.5 |  | 4.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 1.5 | 2.0 |  | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 317 | 2191 | 1583 | 75 | 2671 | 900 | 123 | 126 |  | 184 | 190 | 174 |
| v／s Ratio Prot | c0．06 | c0．63 |  | 0.02 | c0．63 |  | c0．05 | 0.03 |  | c0．08 | 0.08 |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.09 |  |  | 0.10 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.06 |
| v／c Ratio | 0.68 | 1.02 | 0.09 | 0.43 | 1.11 | 0.18 | 0.72 | 0.46 |  | 0.77 | 0.76 | 0.54 |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 52.8 | 22.9 | 0.0 | 56.0 | 25.9 | 12.4 | 54.6 | 53.6 |  | 51.9 | 51.9 | 50.5 |
| Progression Factor | 1.29 | 1.31 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 0.4 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 54.8 | 0.5 | 15.1 | 1.0 |  | 16.5 | 15.0 | 1.6 |
| Delay（s） | 68.3 | 40.9 | 0.0 | 57.4 | 80.7 | 12.9 | 69.8 | 54.6 |  | 68.5 | 66.9 | 52.1 |
| Level of Service | E | D | A | E | F | B | E | D |  | E | E | D |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 41.1 |  |  | 75.7 |  |  | 63.4 |  |  | 61.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  |  | 60.4 |  | HCM 2000 | Level of | Service |  | E |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 120.0 |  | Sum of los | time（s） |  |  | 19.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 90．0\％ |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | E |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

## Merge Analysis

## Project Information

| Analyst | TCM | Date | $5 / 20 / 2019$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | Olsson | Analysis Year | 2019 |
| Jurisdiction | Mission, KS | Time Period Analyzed | AM |
| Project Description | 巴 Johnson Drive On-Ramp to NB Shawnee Mission Parkway |  |  |
| Geometric Data | Freeway | Ramp |  |
|  | 2 | 1 |  |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 45.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Free-Aow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 1500 | 150 |  |
| Segment Length (L) / Acceleration Length (La),ft | Rolling | Rolling |  |
| Terrain Type | - | - |  |
| Percent Grade, \% | Freeway | Right |  |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side |  |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | All Familiar |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weather Type | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |
| Incident Type | No Incident | - |
| Fnal Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Fnal Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Demand and Capacity | 2047 | 479 |
| Demand Volume (Vi) | 0.95 | 0.85 |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Total Trucks, \% | - | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | - |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 2155 | 564 |
| Row Rate (vi),pc/h | 4500 | 1900 |
| Capacity (c), pc/h | 0.60 | 0.30 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) |  |  |
| Speed and Density |  |  |

## Speed and Density

| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Number of Outer Lanes on Freeway (No) | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (Ms) | 0.373 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | How Outer Lanes (voA), pc/mi/In | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | On-Ramp Influenece Area Speed (SR), mi/h | 43.9 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PFM) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (SO), mi/h | - |
| How in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 2155 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h | 43.9 |
| Row Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | 2719 | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 31.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C | Density in Ramp Influence Area (DR), pc/mi/ln | 25.6 |

You created this PDF from an application that is not licensed to print to novaPDF printer (http://www.novapdf.com)

## Project Information

| Analyst | TCM | Date | $5 / 20 / 2019$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency | Olsson | Analysis Year | 2019 |
| Jurisdiction | Mission, KS | Time Period Analyzed | PM |
| Project Description | 巴 Johnson Drive On-Ramp to NB Shawnee Mission Parkway |  |  |
| Geometric Data | Freeway | Ramp |  |
|  | 2 | 1 |  |
| Number of Lanes (N), In | 45.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Free-Aow Speed (FFS), mi/h | 1500 | 150 |  |
| Segment Length (L) / Acceleration Length (La),ft | Rolling | Rolling |  |
| Terrain Type | - | - |  |
| Percent Grade, \% | Freeway | Right |  |
| Segment Type / Ramp Side |  |  |  |

## Adjustment Factors

| Driver Population | All Familiar | All Familiar |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weather Type | Non-Severe Weather | Non-Severe Weather |
| Incident Type | No Incident | - |
| Final Speed Adjustment Factor (SAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Fnal Capacity Adjustment Factor (CAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Demand Adjustment Factor (DAF) | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Demand and Capacity | 2268 | 629 |
| Demand Volume (Vi) | 0.94 | 0.86 |
| Peak Hour Factor (PHF) | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Total Trucks, \% | - | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), \% | - | - |
| Tractor-Trailers (TT), \% | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (fHV) | 2413 | 731 |
| Row Rate (vi),pc/h | 4500 | 1900 |
| Capacity (c), pc/h | 0.70 | 0.38 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c) |  |  |
| Speed and Density |  |  |

## Speed and Density

| Upstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | Number of Outer Lanes on Freeway (No) | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distance to Upstream Ramp (LUP), ft | - | Speed Index (Ms) | 0.404 |
| Downstream Equilibrium Distance (LEQ), ft | - | How Outer Lanes (voA), pc/mi/In | - |
| Distance to Downstream Ramp (LDOWN), ft | - | On-Ramp Influenece Area Speed (SR), mi/h | 43.8 |
| Prop. Freeway Vehicles in Lane 1 and 2 (PFM) | 1.000 | Outer Lanes Freeway Speed (SO), mi/h | - |
| How in Lanes 1 and 2 (v12), pc/h | 2413 | Ramp Junction Speed (S), mi/h | 43.8 |
| Row Entering Ramp-Infl. Area (vR12), pc/h | 3144 | Average Density (D), pc/mi/ln | 35.9 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | D | Density in Ramp Influence Area (DR), pc/mi/ln | 28.8 |
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## CITY OF MISSION

KANSAS

## MEMORANDUM

Date: April 23, 2020
To: Mike Lee, Chair, and Members of the Planning Commission
From: Brian Scott, Assistant City Administrator
RE: Phase I Requirements For Projects When A Lender Is Not Involved


#### Abstract

At the November 25, 2019 meeting of the Planning Commission, Commissioner Troppito requested that we have a discussion at future commission meeting about requirements for Phase I environmental studies on development projects that may not be financed through a conventional loan from a financial institution or other similar type financing.


The following is taken from the minutes of that meeting:

Commission Troppito: "Commission for approval, in instances where a sophisticated financial institution is not involved, the reason for that being, if the developer/applicant cannot provide the Phase 1 environmental assessment that's adequate and within the timeframe to be recent enough to be considered under ANSI standards as being sufficient, then we should require one ourselves. I'd like you to look into that, get with the city attorney, and discuss it with Laura Smith, the city administrator, and come back with a recommendation on how to proceed with that. You know, at our next meeting."

Mr. Scott: "Okay. It may be a while before we meet again, but, yeah. We'll put that on the agenda for next time."

We have this discussion on the agenda for the April 27th meeting for further clarification and understanding.


[^0]:    * Based on Table 4-1 of KDOT's Access Management Policy.
    **Roadway referred to as Shawnee Mission Parkway for the purposes of this report.
    ${ }^{* * *}$ Roadway is not maintained by KDOT, thus KDOT Classification was not considered.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Land Use Codes (LUCs) from Trip Generation Informational Report, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.
    ${ }^{2}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site-not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator
    ${ }^{3}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Land Use Codes (LUCs) from Trip Generation Informational Report, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.
    ${ }^{2}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site-not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator
    ${ }^{3}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P

[^3]:    Intersection Summary

[^4]:    Intersection Summary

[^5]:    Intersection Summary

[^6]:    Intersection Summary

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Buttke, Carl H. Unpublished studies of building employment densities, Portland, Oregon.

[^8]:    2 Trip Generation Characteristics of Traditional and Multiplex Movie Theaters. Washington, DC, USA: Institute of Transportation Engineers, March 2001.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ Land Use Codes (LUCs) from Trip Generation Informational Report, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.
    ${ }^{2}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site-not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator
    ${ }^{3}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ Land Use Codes (LUCs) from Trip Generation Informational Report, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.
    ${ }^{2}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site-not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator
    ${ }^{3}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P

[^11]:    Intersection Summary

[^12]:    Mission Gateway Existing + Approved + Development AM
    Olsson

[^13]:    Mission Gateway Existing + Approved + Development PM
    Olsson

[^14]:    Intersection Summary

