Traffic Impact Study Indy Tru, LLC Truck Storage Parking Lot Shelbyville, Indiana

Prepared for:

Indy Tru, LLC 85 Kinnick Dr Greenwood, IN 46143

Contact:

Adam Stephenson 317-908-6479 adam@alliescommercialrealty.com



Prepared by First Group Engineering

September 5th, 2023

I certify that this TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS has been prepared by me or under my immediate supervision and that I have experience and training in the field of traffic and transportation engineering.

P.E.

Shawn H. Strange, P.E. Indiana Reg. #PE10100255 First Group Engineering, Inc. 5925 Lakeside Blvd. Indianapolis, Indiana 46278 317-290-9549

22-0043

Table of Content

| Executive Summary | 1 |
|---------------------|---|
| ntroduction | 3 |
| Existing Conditions | 5 |
| Trip Generation | 5 |
| Capacity Analysis | 5 |
| Warrant Analysis | 6 |
| Summary | 7 |
| Appendix | 8 |

Executive Summary

This development is a truck storage facility that is located in Shelbyville, Indiana. This facility has a truck storage area that is on a 42.92-acre lot. This truck storage area will have a storage volume of 1034 total tractor-trailer spaces as well as a trailer repair building and a single entrance road that connects to Enterprise Dr.



Figure 1. Proposed Development Location

At the time of this traffic study, there is 4 proposed phases for parking lot development. This study is based on the full build out of all 4 phases of the parking lot as well as growth of the existing traffic. Existing traffic counts have been calculated as a growth of 3% per year for 5 years. Under these conditions, this study is to determine the impacts of the storage area on 3 nearby intersections, W. Mausoleum Road and Enterprise Drive, W. Mausoleum Road and N. Michigan Road, and W Rampart Rd and N Michigan Rd.

Traffic counts and generated trips were analyzed using McTrans Highway Capacity Software 2023, and a Level of Service (LOS) was determined for post-development conditions using the existing population of the surrounding area. Future trips were generated using the Trip Generation Manual (11th edition).



| Level of Service | Unsignalized Control Delay (Seconds/ Vehicle) | Signalized Control Delay (Seconds / Vehicle) |
|------------------|--|---|
| A | < 10 | < 10 |
| В | 10 - 15 | 10 - 20 |
| С | 16 - 25 | 21 - 35 |
| D | 26 - 35 | 35 - 55 |
| E | 36 - 50 | 55 - 80 |
| F | >50 | >80 |

The intersection level of service (LOS) is used to grade the level of delay at an intersection with the following conditions:

A LOS lower than a D is undesirable while a LOS of F is considered a failure and warrants improvements to the capacity of the intersection. INDOT also looks at any level intersection with a level of service of E or lower in need of geometric or traffic control improvements.

The signalized intersection at Michigan Rd currently operates at a LOS of "A" in the AM peak hour and "B" in the PM Peak Hour. While the stop-controlled intersection at Enterprise drive operates at a LOS of "A" in both the AM and PM peak hours. The stop-controlled intersection at Rampart and Michigan will have a LOS of "A" in both the AM and PM peak hours. With no improvements made, under post development conditions the LOS will not change at these intersections.

After the Level of Service analysis, considerations for a geometric change to the studied intersections were made for safety reasons but were found not to be necessary for the projected traffic with the added development. The Indiana Design Manual was referenced for geometric change to the intersections at Enterprise and Mausoleum Dr. as well as Rampart and Michigan Rd and neither an added left turn nor a right turn was warranted for either of the studied intersections/drives.



Indy Tru Truck Parking Traffic Impact Study

Shelbyville, Indiana

Introduction



Figure 2. Proposed Development

This traffic impact study will document the changes in the traffic generated by the development of the Indy Tru Parking lot located in Shelbyville, Indiana. The proposed site has allotted 42.92 acres for a 1034 tractor-trailer parking spots. This development is on the north side of Shelbyville and is surrounded by mostly industrial businesses.

There are 3 studied intersections on Mausoleum Rd, at Enterprise Dr and N Michigan Rd. At Michigan Rd, and Rampart Rd at Michigan Rd. At Mausoleum Rd and Michigan Rd there is an existing traffic signal, while Enterprise Dr and Rampart Dr are unsignalized. There is only one outlet point from the proposed development through Enterprise Dr and it is currently being used by other industrial developments.



Traffic counts and generated trips were analyzed using McTrans Highway Capacity Software 2023, and a Level of Service (LOS) was determined for post-development conditions.

Future trips were generated using the Trip Generation Manual (11th edition), as well as using truck turnover rates provided by the owner. The generated traffic was applied to the intersections at the same distribution as the existing intersections, since the area mainly comprises of industrial buildings. Since truck traffic is not allowed on Mausoleum Rd to the west of Enterprise, all of the trucks will be taking right turns at this location, then the existing distribution was used at Michigan Rd.

This traffic study includes:

- Field Data Collection
- Trip Generation Analysis
- Highway Capacity Analysis and Signal Warrant Analysis
- Intersection Evaluation and Recommendations
- Calculations and detailed results are available in the appendix.

The traffic counts for the intersections of Enterprise and Mausoleum, and Mausoleum and Michigan were counted by detection on June 15th, 2023 for the peak hours in the morning and at night. The traffic counts for Rampart and Michigan were counted later on August 29th, 2023 for the morning and evening peak hours as well. These intersections are the closest intersection to the development and will be the only intersections greatly affected by the development. These intersections are important intersections to the traffic flow of the adjacent area and feed major businesses in the area.

Highway capacity and level of service calculations were made based on Highway Capacity Software 2023 (HCS2023) and signal warrant analysis was made utilizing criteria in the Indiana Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

Intersection evaluation and recommendations were evaluated utilizing output from HCS2023, the Indiana Department of Transportation Design Manual, and the AASHTO Policy on Geometric Design.



Existing Conditions

Michigan Road is classified as a major collector and has 2 lanes, making it 24' wide. Both Mausoleum Rd and Enterprise Rd are classified as local roads and are 24' Wide as well. The intersection at Enterprise Dr a single shared lane on each leg for all movements at the intersection. The intersection at Michigan Rd has 2 lanes going eastbound, a left and a right turn lane. In the northbound direction the intersection has a dedicated left turn lane as well as a through lane, and in the southbound direction it has a single shared lane for all movements. The northbound left turn lane is 225' long. Rampart Rd is classified as a major collector and is 3 lines wide, with a shared turn lane in the middle. The total width of the road is 38' and the westbound left turn lane is 250' long. The northbound right turn lane is 250' long.

The posted speed limit on Michigan Rd, Mausoleum Rd, and Rampart Rd is 30 mph. There is no posted speed limit on Enterprise Rd, but for this study it was assumed to be 30 mph as well.

The traffic counts that were taken show the AM Peak hour was from 7:00 AM - 8:00 AM and the PM peak hour, as well as the overall peak hour, was from 4:00 PM - 5:00 PM. The full traffic count is contained in Appendix pages A1-A6.

Trip Generation

The trip generation for the model was based on a 48 – hour turnover rate for the truck 1034 spot storage area, meaning there will be 517 trucks leaving and entering daily. The FHWA hour truck traffic distribution was used as well to find which hours of the day these trucks are most likely to be coming and going. Using this modeling method, the truck trips were calculated:

| | Parki | ng Lot (Tr | ucks) |
|------------|----------|------------|-------|
| | Entering | Exiting | Total |
| AM Peak | 63 | 11 | 74 |
| PM Peak | 32 | 49 | 81 |

Table 1. Trip Generation

The traffic model used can be found in Appendix A19-A21.

Capacity Analysis – Final Build Out (No Roadway Improvements)



Highway Capacity Analysis

For the capacity analysis, an HCS2023 analysis was run for the intersection of both existing conditions and post-development conditions as well as for each of the proposed intersections. The results can be seen in Table 2. The Level of Service (LOS) of an intersection or an approach is the way the operational condition of the intersection or approach is described. Levels of Service are ranked from A to F, with an A being very good and an F representing failure. Generally, LOS D is the minimum acceptable Level of Service before roadway improvements are warranted.

| | Existin | g LOS | Propos | ed LOS |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| Mausoleum Rd & Enterprise Dr | А | А | A | A |
| Mausoleum Rd & Michigan Rd | A | В | A | В |
| Rampart Rd & Michigan Rd | А | A | А | А |

 Table 2. Future Level of Service.

All of the proposed intersection have an LOS of B or higher for the post-development conditions which is desirable and will not cause extended delays. No improvements such as turn lanes are necessary to the existing signalized intersection of Mausoleum Rd and Michigan Rd. No improvements are needed for the unsignalized intersections of Mausoleum Rd and Michigan Rd or Rampart Rd and Michigan Rd as all levels of service outputs indicate desirable operations.

All HCS output can be found in Appendix A7 – A18.

Warrant Analysis

Turn Lane Warrants

Given the projected traffic volumes, right and left turn lanes are checked against turn lane warrants given INDOT figures 46-4a, 46-4b, & 46-4c for intersection safety. There will be no turn lanes warranted on any of the intersections.

All turn lane warrant charts can be found in the Appendix A26 – A27.



Passing Blister Warrant

A passing blister warrant analysis was done at Enterprise Dr and it was found to be warranted. Since Mausoleum Rd has a daily traffic volume of less than 5000 vehicles, INDOT calls for a passing blister to be warranted if there are more than 20 left turning vehicles in the design hour, which at this location there will be 75 during the AM peak hour.

However, during the AM peak hour, the 95% queue length at this location is .3 veh with a delay of just .3 seconds for the westbound through vehicles. Since this scenario has such a low through movement volume, just 4 veh in the AM peak hour, it has been determined that the addition of a passing blister wouldn't be necessary at this location. Although INDOT says it would typically be warranted, in this unique case it isn't necessary at this location, therefore this study does not recommend the passing blister at Enterprise Dr.

Traffic Signal Warrant

A traffic signal warrant analysis was done at the Enterprise Rd and Rampart Rd intersections using HCS2023 to check if the intersections warrant a traffic signal under the MUTCD standards. It was found that a traffic signal is unwarranted at these locations.

The traffic signal warrant analysis can be found in the appendix A22-A25.

Proposed Traffic Design (Geometric) Changes

There are no proposed changes to the traffic design layout of the either of the intersections studied.

Summary

The Indy Tru Truck Parking lot development will consist of a truck staging area with 1034 total tractor trailer parking spots. This staging area will take up a total of 42.92 acres.

The LOS for the 3 intersections shows there will be minimal traffic flow congestion from this new development during both the AM peak hour as well as the PM Peak hour. Under future conditions, the LOS of the intersections will drop to just a LOS of "B" which is considered a well-functioning intersection.



For traffic signal warrants, The MUTCD was referenced and showed that the addition of a traffic signal was not warranted at any of the studied intersection where there is currently no signal. For a geometric change in the intersections, the Indiana Design Manual was referenced and it was found that a passing blister may be warranted at Enterprise Rd. After considering the warrant we find that due to the low volume of through traffic at this location as well as the low queuing done at the location, it is not necessary.

Consideration for a geometric change of the 3 intersections studied to improve the LOS showed it was not necessary to make changes to the current traffic design.

No other improvements are necessary with the addition of this development as described in this report.



APPENDIX

| Traffic Counts | A1 – A6 |
|--|-----------|
| Highway Cap. Analysis: EXISTING CONDITIONS | A7 – A12 |
| Highway Cap. Analysis: FUTURE CONDITIONS | A13 – A18 |
| Trip Generation Model | A19- A21 |
| Signal Warrant Analysis | A22 – A25 |
| Turn Lane Warrant Charts | A26 – A27 |



| Michigan Road AM | | PHF | 0.674 | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--------|-----------|---------|-------|--------|-----------|---------|-------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| Leg | Michiga | n | | | Michiga | า | | | Mausolu | em | | | |
| Direction | Southbo | und | | | Northbo | und | | | Eastbou | nd | | | |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App Total | Right | Left | U-Turn | App Total | Int Total |
| 2023-06-15 07:00:00 | 41 | 67 | 0 | 108 | 25 | 23 | 0 | 48 | 16 | 12 | 0 | 28 | 184 |
| 2023-06-15 07:15:00 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 42 | 30 | 19 | 0 | 49 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 99 |
| 2023-06-15 07:30:00 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 39 | 19 | 23 | 0 | 42 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 93 |
| 2023-06-15 07:45:00 | 24 | 25 | 0 | 49 | 28 | 23 | 0 | 51 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 20 | 120 |
| Grand Total | 106 | 132 | 0 | 238 | 102 | 88 | 0 | 190 | 40 | 28 | 0 | 68 | 496 |
| % Approach | 44.5% | 55.5% | 0.0% | | 53.7% | 46.3% | 0.0% | | 58.8% | 41.2% | 0.0% | | |
| % Total | 21.4% | 26.6% | 0.0% | 48.0% | 20.6% | 17.7% | 0.0% | 38.3% | 8.1% | 5.6% | 0.0% | 13.7% | |
| PHF (7 AM - 8 AM) | 0.646 | 0.493 | 0 | 0.551 | 0.85 | 0.957 | 0 | 0.931 | 0.625 | 0.583 | 0 | 0.607 | 0.674 |
| Lights | 100 | 129 | 0 | 229 | 98 | 84 | 0 | 182 | 39 | 26 | 0 | 65 | 476 |
| % Lights | 94.3% | 97.7% | 0.0% | 96.2% | 96.1% | 95.5% | 0.0% | 95.8% | 97.5% | 92.9% | 0.0% | 95.6% | 96.0% |
| Articulated Trucks | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 15 |
| % Articulated Trucks | 4.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.1% | 3.9% | 3.4% | 0.0% | 3.7% | 2.5% | 7.1% | 0.0% | 4.4% | 3.0% |
| Buses and Single-Unit Trucks | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| % Buses and Single-Unit Trucks | 0.9% | 2.3% | 0.0% | 1.7% | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.0% |

| Michigan Road PM | | PHF | 0.689 | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--------|-----------|---------|-------|--------|-----------|---------|-------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| Leg | Michiga | n | | | Michiga | n | | | Mausolu | iem | | | |
| Direction | Southbo | und | | | Northbo | und | | | Eastbou | nd | | | |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App Total | Right | Left | U-Turn | App Total | Int Total |
| 2023-06-15 16:00:00 | 5 | 72 | 0 | 77 | 30 | 4 | 0 | 34 | 47 | 30 | 0 | 77 | 188 |
| 2023-06-15 16:15:00 | 3 | 49 | 0 | 52 | 23 | 4 | 0 | 27 | 18 | 21 | 0 | 39 | 118 |
| 2023-06-15 16:30:00 | 8 | 37 | 0 | 45 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 23 | 20 | 0 | 43 | 118 |
| 2023-06-15 16:45:00 | 1 | 40 | 0 | 41 | 27 | 3 | 0 | 30 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 23 | 94 |
| Grand Total | 17 | 198 | 0 | 215 | 106 | 15 | 0 | 121 | 97 | 85 | 0 | 182 | 518 |
| % Approach | 7.9% | 92.1% | 0.0% | | 87.6% | 12.4% | 0.0% | | 53.3% | 46.7% | 0.0% | | |
| % Total | 3.3% | 38.2% | 0.0% | 41.5% | 20.5% | 2.9% | 0.0% | 23.4% | 18.7% | 16.4% | 0.0% | 35.1% | |
| PHF (4 PM - 5 PM) | 0.531 | 0.688 | 0 | 0.698 | 0.883 | 0.938 | 0 | 0.89 | 0.516 | 0.708 | 0 | 0.591 | 0.689 |
| Lights | 15 | 194 | 0 | 209 | 103 | 13 | 0 | 116 | 93 | 80 | 0 | 173 | 498 |
| % Lights | 88.2% | 98.0% | 0.0% | 97.2% | 97.2% | 86.7% | 0.0% | 95.9% | 95.9% | 94.1% | 0.0% | 95.1% | 96.1% |
| Articulated Trucks | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 12 |
| % Articulated Trucks | 11.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.9% | 1.9% | 13.3% | 0.0% | 3.3% | 3.1% | 3.5% | 0.0% | 3.3% | 2.3% |
| Buses and Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| % Buses and Single-Unit Trucks | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 1.9% | 0.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.8% | 1.0% | 2.4% | 0.0% | 1.6% | 1.5% |

| Enterprise Dr AM | | PHF | 0.6 | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--------|-----------|-----------|------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| Leg | Mausole | um | | | Enterpris | e | | | Mausole | um | | | |
| Direction | Westbou | und | | | Northbo | und | | | Eastbour | nd | | | |
| Start Time | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App Total | Right | Left | U-Turn | App Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App Total | Int Total |
| 2023-06-15 07:00:00 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 2023-06-15 07:15:00 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 2023-06-15 07:30:00 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| 2023-06-15 07:45:00 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 20 |
| Grand Total | 4 | 29 | 0 | 33 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 48 |
| % Approach | 12.1% | 87.9% | 0.0% | | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | | 36.4% | 63.6% | 0.0% | | |
| % Total | 8.3% | 60.4% | 0.0% | 68.8% | 8.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.3% | 8.3% | 14.6% | 0.0% | 22.9% | |
| PHF (7 AM - 8 AM) | 0.5 | 0.518 | 0 | 0.589 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.875 | 0 | 0.688 | 0.6 |
| Lights | 4 | 23 | 0 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 39 |
| % Lights | 100.0% | 79.3% | 0.0% | 81.8% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 81.3% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| % Articulated Trucks | 0.0% | 13.8% | 0.0% | 12.1% | 75.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 75.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 14.6% |
| Buses and Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| % Buses and Single-Unit Trucks | 0.0% | 6.9% | 0.0% | 6.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.2% |

| Enterprise Dr PM | | PHF | 0.667 | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--------|-----------|----------|--------|--------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| Leg | Mausole | um | | | Enterpri | se | | | Mausole | eum | | | |
| Direction | Westbou | und | | | Northbo | und | | | Eastbou | nd | | | |
| Start Time | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App Total | Right | Left | U-Turn | App Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App Total | Int Total |
| 2023-06-15 16:15:00 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 13 |
| 2023-06-15 16:30:00 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 18 |
| 2023-06-15 16:45:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 2023-06-15 17:00:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| Grand Total | 17 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 20 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 48 |
| % Approach | 89.5% | 10.5% | 0.0% | | 87.0% | 13.0% | 0.0% | | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | | |
| % Total | 35.4% | 4.2% | 0.0% | 39.6% | 41.7% | 6.3% | 0.0% | 47.9% | 0.0% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 12.5% | |
| PHF (4:15 PM - 5:15 PM) | 0.607 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.679 | 0.556 | 0.375 | 0 | 0.639 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.667 |
| Lights | 17 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 43 |
| % Lights | 100.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 94.7% | 85.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 87.0% | 0.0% | 83.3% | 0.0% | 83.3% | 89.6% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| % Articulated Trucks | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 5.3% | 15.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 13.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.3% |
| Buses and Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| % Buses and Single-Unit Trucks | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 16.7% | 0.0% | 16.7% | 2.1% |

| Rampart Road AM | | PHF | 0.877 | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------|--------|-----------|---------|-------|--------|-----------|----------|-------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| Leg | Michigar | ۱ | | | Rampart | | | | Michigar | ı | | | |
| Direction | Southbo | und | | | Westbou | ind | | | Northbo | und | | | |
| Start Time | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App Total | Right | Left | U-Turn | App Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App Total | Int Total |
| 2023-08-29 07:00:00 | 32 | 3 | 0 | 35 | 19 | 29 | 0 | 48 | 41 | 30 | 0 | 71 | 154 |
| 2023-08-29 07:15:00 | 30 | 4 | 0 | 34 | 20 | 28 | 0 | 48 | 12 | 29 | 0 | 41 | 123 |
| 2023-08-29 07:30:00 | 38 | 11 | 0 | 49 | 19 | 30 | 0 | 49 | 8 | 29 | 0 | 37 | 135 |
| 2023-08-29 07:45:00 | 29 | 13 | 0 | 42 | 8 | 46 | 0 | 54 | 8 | 24 | 0 | 32 | 128 |
| Grand Total | 129 | 31 | 0 | 160 | 66 | 133 | 0 | 199 | 69 | 112 | 0 | 181 | 540 |
| % Approach | 80.6% | 19.4% | 0.0% | | 33.2% | 66.8% | 0.0% | | 38.1% | 61.9% | 0.0% | | |
| % Total | 23.9% | 5.7% | 0.0% | 29.6% | 12.2% | 24.6% | 0.0% | 36.9% | 12.8% | 20.7% | 0.0% | 33.5% | |
| PHF (7 AM - 8 AM) | 0.849 | 0.596 | 0 | 0.816 | 0.825 | 0.723 | 0 | 0.921 | 0.421 | 0.933 | 0 | 0.637 | 0.877 |
| Lights | 122 | 30 | 0 | 152 | 63 | 121 | 0 | 184 | 61 | 104 | 0 | 165 | 501 |
| % Lights | 94.6% | 96.8% | 0.0% | 95.0% | 95.5% | 91.0% | 0.0% | 92.5% | 88.4% | 92.9% | 0.0% | 91.2% | 92.8% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 20 |
| % Articulated Trucks | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.5% | 0.0% | 5.0% | 7.2% | 4.5% | 0.0% | 5.5% | 3.7% |
| Buses and Single-Unit Trucks | 7 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 19 |
| % Buses and Single-Unit Trucks | 5.4% | 3.2% | 0.0% | 5.0% | 4.5% | 1.5% | 0.0% | 2.5% | 4.3% | 2.7% | 0.0% | 3.3% | 3.5% |

Rampart Road PM

PHF 0.791

| Leg | Michigar | า | | | Rampart | | | | Michigar | า | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------|--------|-----------|---------|-------|--------|-----------|----------|-------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| Direction | Southbo | und | | | Westbou | ind | | | Northbo | und | | | |
| Start Time | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App Total | Right | Left | U-Turn | App Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App Total | Int Total |
| 2023-08-29 16:00:00 | 59 | 17 | 0 | 76 | 16 | 5 | 1 | 22 | 35 | 52 | 0 | 87 | 185 |
| 2023-08-29 16:15:00 | 37 | 10 | 0 | 47 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 20 | 35 | 48 | 0 | 83 | 150 |
| 2023-08-29 16:30:00 | 38 | 9 | 0 | 47 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 20 | 30 | 46 | 0 | 76 | 143 |
| 2023-08-29 16:45:00 | 26 | 7 | 0 | 33 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 24 | 16 | 34 | 0 | 50 | 107 |
| Grand Total | 160 | 43 | 0 | 203 | 53 | 32 | 1 | 86 | 116 | 180 | 0 | 296 | 585 |
| % Approach | 78.8% | 21.2% | 0.0% | | 61.6% | 37.2% | 1.2% | | 39.2% | 60.8% | 0.0% | | |
| % Total | 27.4% | 7.4% | 0.0% | 34.7% | 9.1% | 5.5% | 0.2% | 14.7% | 19.8% | 30.8% | 0.0% | 50.6% | |
| PHF (4 PM - 5 PM) | 0.678 | 0.632 | 0 | 0.668 | 0.828 | 0.8 | 0.25 | 0.896 | 0.829 | 0.865 | 0 | 0.851 | 0.791 |
| Lights | 159 | 41 | 0 | 200 | 50 | 25 | 1 | 76 | 109 | 176 | 0 | 285 | 561 |
| % Lights | 99.4% | 95.3% | 0.0% | 98.5% | 94.3% | 78.1% | 100.0% | 88.4% | 94.0% | 97.8% | 0.0% | 96.3% | 95.9% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 16 |
| % Articulated Trucks | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5.7% | 21.9% | 0.0% | 11.6% | 3.4% | 1.1% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 2.7% |
| Buses and Single-Unit Trucks | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 8 |
| % Buses and Single-Unit Trucks | 0.6% | 4.7% | 0.0% | 1.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.6% | 1.1% | 0.0% | 1.7% | 1.4% |

W Mausoleum Rd & N Michigan Rd - TMC Thu Jun 15, 2023 Full Length (7 AM-9 AM, 4 PM-6 PM) All Classes (Lights, Articulated Trucks, Buses and Single-Unit Trucks) All Movements ID: 1079197, Location: 39.540278, -85.783689 [N] Michigan Total: 1329 In: 726 Out: 603 548 178

HAN ASSOCIATES, INC. Provided by: Gewalt Hamilton Associates Inc. 625 Forest Edge Drive, Vernon Hills, IL, 60061, US



W Rampart Rd & N Michigan Rd - TMC

Tue Aug 29, 2023 Full Length (7 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM)

All Classes (Lights, Articulated Trucks, Buses and Single-Unit Trucks) All Movements

ID: 1099590, Location: 39.547419, -85.787582





West Mausoleum Road & Enterprise Drive - TMC

Thu Jun 15, 2023 Full Length (7 AM-9 AM, 4 PM-6 PM) All Classes (Lights, Articulated Trucks, Buses and Single-Unit Trucks) All Movements ID: 1079198, Location: 39.539995, -85.794062





HCS Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| Λ | 7 |
|---|---|
| А | 1 |

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | Grant Barker | Intersection | Enterprise Dr and Maursoleum Rd | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | First Group Engineering | Jurisdiction | Greenfield | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 6/21/2023 | East/West Street | Mausoleum Rd | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Enterprise Dr | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | 7:00 - 8:00 AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.60 | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 | | | | | |
| Project Description | 23-0030 TIS - Truck Parking | | | | | | | |
| Lanes | | | | | | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | Westbound | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | | |
|---|------|---------|--------|------|-----------|------|-----|------------|---|------|------|------------|---|----|----|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | TR | | LT | | | | | LR | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 7 | 4 | | 29 | 4 | | | 0 | | 4 | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | 3 | | | | 0 | | 75 | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | 7.1 | | 6.2 | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.13 | | | | 6.40 | | 6.95 | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.23 | | | | 3.50 | | 3.98 | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 48 | | | | | 7 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 1592 | | | | | 887 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.03 | | | | | 0.01 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.1 | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 7.3 | 0.2 | | | | 9.1 | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | А | А | | | | А | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 6.5 | | | | | | 9.1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | A | | | | A | | | | | | | |

Copyright © 2023 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

HCS Two-Way Stop-Control Report

A8

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | Grant Barker | Intersection | Enterprise Dr and Maursoleum Rd | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | First Group Engineering | Jurisdiction | Greenfield | | | | |
| Date Performed | 6/21/2023 | East/West Street | Mausoleum Rd | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Enterprise Dr | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | 4:15 - 5:15 PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.67 | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 | | | | |
| Project Description | 23-0030 TIS - Truck Parking | | | | | | |
| Lanes | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|---|------|---------|--------|------|-----------|------|-----|---|------------|------|------|------|------------|----|----|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | TR | | LT | | | | | LR | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 6 | 0 | | 2 | 17 | | | 3 | | 20 | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | 50 | | | | 0 | | 15 | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | 7.1 | | 6.2 | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.60 | | | | 6.40 | | 6.35 | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.65 | | | | 3.50 | | 3.44 | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 3 | | | | | 34 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 1347 | | | | | 1177 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | 0.03 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | 0.1 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 7.7 | 0.0 | | | | 8.2 | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | А | А | | | | А | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 0.8 | | | | | | 8.2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | А | | | | A | | | | | | | | | |

Copyright © 2023 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

HCS Signalized Intersection Results Summary

| | | | Ū | | | | | | | | , i | | | Α | .9 | |
|-------------------|------------------|------------------------------|-------------|----------|------------|----------|----------|---------------|------|----------|----------|---------|----------------------|----------|---------|--------------|
| General Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | ion Inf | ormatio | on | | 444, | × l <u>*</u> |
| Agency | | First Group Engine | ering | | | | | | Du | ration, | h | 1.000 | | | * | |
| Analyst | | Grant Barker | | Analys | is Date | e 6/21/2 | 023 | | Are | ea Type | e | Other | | | | ۲_ الج |
| Jurisdiction | | Greenfield | | Time P | eriod | AM Pe | eak | | PH | IF | | 1.00 | | | W = E | 4 |
| Urban Street | | Michigan Rd | | Analys | is Yea | r 2023 | | | Ana | alysis l | Period | 1> 7: | 00 | | | |
| Intersection | | Mausoleum Rd & M | 1ichig | File Na | me | Michig | jan Exis | t AM | .xus | | | | | | ካ ተ | × |
| Project Descrip | tion | 23-0030 TIS - Trucl | <pre></pre> | g | | | | | | | | | | | * 1 4 7 | × 1* |
| | | | | I | | | | | | | T | | | N. | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | ∕B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | <u> </u> | | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | eh/h | | | 28 | | 40 | | | | | 88 | 102 | | | 132 | 106 |
| | 4! | | | li - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | tion | | 0 | | 15t - | | | | | | | | | KŤ | | ~ |
| Cycle, s | 95.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | <u>∿</u> † | 1 51 | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | \prec_{4} |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | Green | 70.9 | 5.4 | 6.7 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | |
| | NO | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | _ | $\sum \mathcal{A} $ | | _ | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Time or Desculte | | | | EDI | _ | EDT | | _ | | | NDI | | NDT | | | ODT |
| Assigned Desc | | | | EBL | - | EBI | VVBL | -+ | VV | ВІ | NBI E | - | | 581 | - | 5B1 |
| Assigned Phase | e | | | | | 4 | | \rightarrow | | _ | 5 1.0 | | 2 | | _ | 0 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | \rightarrow | | _ | 1.0 | | 4.0 | <u> </u> | _ | 0.4 74.0 |
| Change Duration | , S | | | <u> </u> | | 10.7 | | \rightarrow | | _ | 9.4 | | 04.3 4.0 | <u> </u> | _ | 14.9 |
| Max Allow Hoor | (Y+R) | (), S | | | | 4.0 | | \rightarrow | | _ | 4.0 | _ | 4.0 | <u> </u> | | 4.0 |
| | o Timo | (a_{1}) | | | | J.4 | | + | | _ | 3.Z | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | | $(g_s), s$ | | | | 4.3 | | - | | | 2.0 | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | | 0.0 |
| Bhase Call Pro | hability | (<i>g</i> e), s | | <u> </u> | | 0.1 | <u> </u> | + | | _ | | | 0.0 | <u> </u> | | 0.0 |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | _ | | | 0.00 | | -+ | | _ | 0.90 | , , | | | | |
| | Dinty | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | 0.44 | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | Т | | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | | 14 | | | 1 | | 5 | 2 | | | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow F | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 28 | | 40 | | | Ť | | 88 | 102 | | | 238 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | w Rate (<i>s</i>), veh/h/l | n | 1711 | | 1572 | | | | | 1838 | 1788 | | | 1690 | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | y s), S | | 1.5 | | 2.3 | | | | | 0.0 | 0.9 | | | 3.9 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learance | e Time (<i>g c</i>), s | | 1.5 | | 2.3 | | | | | 0.0 | 0.9 | | | 3.9 | |
| Green Ratio (g | /C) | i | | 0.07 | | 0.07 | | | | | 0.78 | 0.85 | | | 0.75 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 120 | | 110 | | | | | 986 | 1512 | | | 1262 | |
| Volume-to-Capa | acity Ra | tio(X) | | 0.233 | | 0.362 | | | | | 0.089 | 0.067 | | | 0.189 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ft | /In (95 th percentile | e) | 29.9 | | 42 | | | | | 17.5 | 7.6 | | | 54.6 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percent | ile) | 1.1 | | 1.6 | | | | | 0.7 | 0.3 | | | 2.1 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percen | tile) | 0.18 | | 0.00 | | | | | 0.08 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay (| (d1), s/ | /veh | | 41.7 | | 42.1 | | | | | 3.5 | 1.2 | | | 3.6 | |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.4 | | 0.7 | | | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | | | 0.3 | |
| Initial Queue De | elay (d | ₃), s/veh | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (| d), s/ve | eh | | 42.1 | | 42.9 | | | | | 3.5 | 1.3 | | | 3.9 | |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | | D | | | | | А | Α | | | Α | |
| Approach Delay | y, s/veh | /LOS | | 42.6 | | D | 0.0 | | | | 2.3 | | А | 3.9 | | А |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 8 | .6 | | | | | | | A | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | /LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bicycle LOS Sc | ore / LC |)S | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Copyright © 2023 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS Signalized Intersection Results Summary

| | | пса | s Sigi | anzeu | | ersect | | esu | 115 | Sun | iniary | , | | A | 10 | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------|---------|----------|----------|---------------|------|-----------|----------|---------|-----------------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| Concerct Inform | | | | Interpotion Information | | | | | | | | | با ها با هامیان ام از | | | |
| General Inforn | nation | First Crown Francisco | | | | | | | Inte | ersect | | ormatio | on \ | - í | 4 | |
| Agency | | First Group Engine | ering | A | - D-4 | - 0/04/0 | 000 | | Dur | alion, | n | 1.000 |) | _7 | | R. |
| Analyst | | Grant Barker | | Analys | IS Date | e 6/21/2 | 023 | | Are | атур – | e | Othe | ſ | | | 14 A |
| Jurisdiction | | Greenfield | | Time P | 'eriod | PM Pe | eak | | PH | F | <u> </u> | 1.00 | | | W + E 8 | ¥ → |
| Urban Street | | Michigan Rd | | Analys | is Yea | r 2023 | | | Ana | alysis | Period | 1> 7: | 00 | | | |
| Intersection | | Mausoleum Rd & M | lichig | File Na | ame | Michig | jan Exis | t PM | .xus | | | | | - 4 | <u>1</u> | |
| Project Descrip | tion | 23-0030 TIS - Truck | k Parkin | g | | | | | | | | | | | 1 el 1 eta 1. | P. D. |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | W | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | 1. | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | /eh/h | | | 85 | | 97 | | | | | 15 | 106 | | | 198 | 17 |
| | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | _ | | |
| Signal Informa | ation | | | - | 14 | | | | | | | | | rt | | 7 |
| Cycle, s | 95.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 5 T | 17 | Es. | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | - 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | Green | 73.0 | 2.0 | 8.1 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | _ | | | |
| Uncoordinated | NO | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -11 | ך אוץ א | 1 | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Timer Deculto | | | | ГРІ | _ | ГРТ | \//DI | | 10/ | рт | NDI | | NDT | | | ODT |
| Assigned Phase | 2 | | | EDL | | | VVDI | - + | VV | ы | | | 2 | 30 | | 6 |
| Coso Number | e | | | <u> </u> | + | 4 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | | _ | 1.0 | | 2 | <u> </u> | | 0 |
| Phase Duration | | | | | + | 9.0 | | + | | _ | 6.0 | - | 4.0 82.0 | | | 0.4 77.0 |
| Change Period | (V+R) | | | <u> </u> | + | 12.1 | | + | | _ | 4.0 | | 10 | | | 10 |
| Max Allow Hear | , (<i>1</i> | MAH)s | | | - | 3.4 | | + | | _ | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ce Time | e (q s), S | | | + | 7.7 | | + | | | 2.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Green Extensio | on Time | (ge), s | | | | 0.4 | | | | | 0.1 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 0.99 | | 1 | | | 0.33 | 3 | | 1 | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | 0.37 | , | | | | |
| | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | ults | | <u> </u> | EB | | | W | B | _ | | NB | | <u> </u> | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | | 1 | R | | 1 | | R | L | | R | L. | | R |
| Assigned Move | ement | <u> </u> | | / | | 14 | | | _ | _ | 5 | 2 | | <u> </u> | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | |), ven/n | | 85 | | 97 | | | _ | _ | 15 | 106 | | | 215 | |
| Adjusted Satura | | | in | 1753 | | 1566 | | | _ | _ | 1691 | 1817 | | <u> </u> | 1873 | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | js), s Time (r.) e | | 4.4 | | 5.7 | | | _ | _ | 0.0 | 1.0 | | | 2.9 | |
| Cycle Queue C | | e filme (<i>g</i> c), s | | 4.4 | | 0.09 | | | - | _ | 0.0 | 1.0 | | <u> </u> | 2.9 | |
| Green Katio (g | ////////////////////////////////////// | | | 140 | | 122 | | | + | _ | 0.11 | 1510 | | | 1/20 | |
| | acity Ra | tio (X) | | 0.570 | | 0 729 | | | | _ | 0.017 | 0.070 | | | 0 1/0 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q) ft | Vin (195 th percentile | e) | 90.7 | | 106.1 | | | + | _ | 3.1 | 9.8 | | | 39.4 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), Ve | eh/ln (95 th percenti | ile) | 3.5 | | 4.1 | | | | | 0.1 | 0.4 | | | 1.6 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | 0.55 | | 0.00 | | | + | | 0.01 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay | (d1), s | /veh | | 41.8 | | 42.4 | | | | _ | 3.3 | 1.4 | | | 2.9 | |
| Incremental De | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | | 1.3 | | 2.9 | | | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | | | 0.2 | |
| Initial Queue D | elay (d | 3), s/veh | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (| d), s/ve | eh | | 43.1 | | 45.3 | | | | | 3.3 | 1.5 | | | 3.1 | |
| Level of Service | e (LOS) | | | D | | D | | | | | Α | Α | | | Α | |
| Approach Dela | y, s/veh | /LOS | | 44.3 | | D | 0.0 | | | | 1.8 | | А | 3.1 | | А |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 17 | .2 | | | | | | | В | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | sults | // 00 | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | Score | / LUS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BICYCIE LOS SC | core / LC | 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Copyright © 2023 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS Two-Way Stop-Control Report

A11

| General Information | | Site Information | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Analyst | Grant Barker | Intersection | Rampart Rd and Michigan Rd | | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | First Group Engineering | Jurisdiction | Greenfield | | | | | |
| Date Performed | 08/29/2023 | East/West Street | Rampart Rd | | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Michigan Rd | | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | 7:00 - 8:00 AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 | | | | | |
| Project Description | 23-0030 TIS - Truck Parking | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Lanes



| Vehicle Volumes and Adju | istme | nts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|---|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | ound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | L | | R | | | Т | R | | LT | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | 133 | | 66 | | | 112 | 69 | | 31 | 129 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | 8 | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | N | 0 | | | Ν | lo | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.2 | | | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 6.96 | | 6.20 | | | | | | 4.10 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 3.58 | | 3.30 | | | | | | 2.20 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | l Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 152 | | 75 | | | | | | 35 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 660 | | 928 | | | | | | 1377 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.23 | | 0.08 | | | | | | 0.03 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q_{95} (veh) | | | | | | 0.9 | | 0.3 | | | | | | 0.1 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 12.1 | | 9.2 | | | | | | 7.7 | 0.1 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | B A | | | | | А | | | | | | А | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 11.1 | | | | | | 1.6 | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | В | | | | | | A | | | | | | | | |

Copyright © 2023 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

HCS Two-Way Stop-Control Report

A12

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Analyst | Grant Barker | Intersection | Rampart Rd and Michigan Rd |
| Agency/Co. | First Group Engineering | Jurisdiction | Greenfield |
| Date Performed | 08/29/2023 | East/West Street | Rampart Rd |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Michigan Rd |
| Time Analyzed | 4:00 - 5:00 AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.79 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |
| Project Description | 23-0030 TIS - Truck Parking | | |
| - | | | |

Lanes



| Vehicle Volumes and Adju | ustments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|------|----|-------|-------|-----|----|-------|-------|---|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | L | | R | | | Т | R | | LT | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | 32 | | 53 | | | 180 | 116 | | 43 | 160 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | 22 | | 6 | | | | | | 0 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | (| C | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | N | lo | | | Ν | lo | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.2 | | | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 7.24 | | 6.32 | | | | | | 4.10 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 3.72 | | 3.36 | | | | | | 2.20 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 40 | | 67 | | | | | | 54 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 475 | | 798 | | | | | | 1195 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.09 | | 0.08 | | | | | | 0.05 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.3 | | 0.3 | | | | | | 0.1 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 13.3 | | 9.9 | | | | | | 8.2 | 0.3 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | В | | А | | | | | | А | А | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 11.2 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | .9 | | |
| Approach LOS | | В | | | | | 1 | | | | A | | | | | |

Copyright © 2023 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

| | -Control Report | A13 | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | Grant Barker | Intersection | Enterprise Dr and Maursoleum Rd |
| Agency/Co. | First Group Engineering | Jurisdiction | Greenfield |
| Date Performed | 6/21/2023 | East/West Street | Mausoleum Rd |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Enterprise Dr |
| Time Analyzed | 7:00 - 8:00 AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.60 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |

Lanes

Project Description



23-0030 TIS - Truck Parking

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments Approach Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound U U R U L т R L т U L Т R L т R Movement 1U 7 9 10 12 Priority 1 2 3 4U 4 5 6 8 11 Number of Lanes 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 Configuration TR LT LR 0 12 Volume (veh/h) 7 4 75 4 Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) 67 0 92 **Proportion Time Blocked** 0 Percent Grade (%) **Right Turn Channelized** Median Type | Storage Undivided **Critical and Follow-up Headways** Base Critical Headway (sec) 4.1 7.1 6.2 Critical Headway (sec) 4.77 6.40 7.12 2.2 3.5 3.3 Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) Follow-Up Headway (sec) 2.80 3.50 4.13 Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service Flow Rate, v (veh/h) 125 20 Capacity, c (veh/h) 1262 854 v/c Ratio 0.10 0.02 0.3 0.1 95% Queue Length, Q₉₅ (veh) 8.2 0.8 9.3 Control Delay (s/veh) Level of Service (LOS) А А А Approach Delay (s/veh) 9.3 7.8

Copyright © 2023 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

Approach LOS

А

А

| | A14 | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| General Information | | Site Information | |
| Analyst | Grant Barker | Intersection | Enterprise Dr and Maursoleum Rd |
| Agency/Co. | First Group Engineering | Jurisdiction | Greenfield |
| Date Performed | 6/21/2023 | East/West Street | Mausoleum Rd |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Enterprise Dr |
| Time Analyzed | 4:15 - 5:15 PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.67 |

Analysis Time Period (hrs)

1.00

Lanes

Intersection Orientation

Project Description

General Analyst



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

East-West

23-0030 TIS - Truck Parking

| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | bound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
|---|--------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|-------|---|---|-------|-------|------|---|-------|-------|----|
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | TR | | LT | | | | | LR | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | 7 | 0 | | 26 | 20 | | | 3 | | 59 | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | 96 | | | | 0 | | 66 | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | (|) | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | 7.1 | | 6.2 | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 5.06 | | | | 6.40 | | 6.86 | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 3.06 | | | | 3.50 | | 3.89 | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | l Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 39 | | | | | 93 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 1163 | | | | | 956 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.03 | | | | | 0.10 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.1 | | | | | 0.3 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 8.2 | 0.3 | | | | 9.2 | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | А | А | | | | А | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 4 | .8 | | | 9 | .2 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | 4 | | | | 4 | | | | | |

HCS Signalized Intersection Results Summary

| | | | Joigi | anzed | | 513601 | | -3u | 113 | Sun | iiiiai y | | | A | 15 | |
|-------------------|--|------------------------|--------|----------|---------|----------|-----------|----------------------------|-------|--------|----------|--------|------|----------|------------|-----------|
| Gonoral Inform | nation | | | | | | | | Int | oreact | ion Inf | ormati | 00 | | ╵╺╡╻┤╻┶╕╴↓ | |
| Agency | allon | First Group Engine | arina | | | | | | | ration | h | 1 000 | | | 4 | |
| Analyst | | Grant Barker | ching | Analys | is Date | a 6/21/2 | 023 | | Δre | a Typ | | Othe | r | | | ۲. الم |
| Jurisdiction | | Greenfield | | Time F | | | ozo ak | | PH | Г | <u> </u> | 1 00 | | → + | N w‡e | }- ¢ |
| Urban Street | | Michigan Rd | | Analys | is Yea | r 2023 | Jan | | Δn | alvsis | Period | 1> 7 | 00 | | | → * |
| Intersection | | Mausoleum Rd & M | lichia | File Na | ame | Michie | an Pror | ΔM | YUS | aryoio | renou | 1, 1, | 00 | | K 4 | <u> </u> |
| Project Descrip | tion | 23-0030 TIS - Truck | Parkin | a | | whom | Juillio | <i>, , , , , , , , , ,</i> | | | | | | - | 1 ላ ጎ ቀ ነ | ት ሰ |
| T TOJOOL DOCOMP | | 20 0000 110 1100 | | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | ∕B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | · | T | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | /eh/h | | | 36 | | 51 | | | | | 136 | 118 | | | 153 | 134 |
| | | | | li. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Signal Informa | ation | li and | r | 4 | 4 | | 2 | | | | | | | -+ | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 51 | 51 | E. | | | | | | 1 | | 3 | - 4 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | Green | 65.1 | 5.8 | 7.1 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | - | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 K | 1 | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | _ | 1 | _ | | | _ | | | | _ | | 11 | _ | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | - | EBT | WBI | | W | 'BT | NBL | - | NBT | SB | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | е | | | | | 4 | | \rightarrow | | | 5 | | 2 | | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | \rightarrow | | | 1.0 | | 4.0 | | | 8.4 |
| Phase Duration | 1, S | | | | - | 11.1 | | \rightarrow | | | 9.8 | | 78.9 | | | 69.1 |
| Change Period | Period, (Y+ <i>R c</i>), s ow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s | | | | | 4.0 | | \rightarrow | | | 4.0 | | 4.0 | | | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Head | (Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s eue Clearance Time (g s), s | | | | | 3.4 | | \rightarrow | | | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | ueue Clearance Time ($g s$), s | | | | | 5.0 | | \rightarrow | | | 2.0 | | | <u> </u> | | |
| Green Extensio | | (ge), s | | <u> </u> | | 0.2 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | | | 0.2 | _ | 0.0 | <u> </u> | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | <u> </u> | | 0.89 | <u> </u> | \rightarrow | | | 0.97 | | | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | 0.49 | | | | | |
| Movement Gro | oup Res | sults | | | EB | | | W | B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | _ | L | Т | R | L | Т | - | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Move | ment | | | 7 | | 14 | | | + | | 5 | 2 | | | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Rate (v |), veh/h | | 36 | | 51 | | | | | 136 | 118 | | | 287 | |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo | ow Rate (s), veh/h/l | n | 1584 | | 1459 | | | + | | 1471 | 1788 | 1 | | 1753 | |
| Queue Service | Time (g | g s), s | | 1.9 | | 3.0 | | | | | 0.0 | 1.1 | 1 | | 4.9 | |
| Cycle Queue C | learanc | e Time (g c), s | | 1.9 | | 3.0 | | | + | | 0.0 | 1.1 | | | 4.9 | |
| Green Ratio (g | ı/C) | | | 0.08 | | 0.08 | | | | | 0.77 | 0.83 | i — | | 0.72 | |
| Capacity (c), v | /eh/h | | | 125 | | 115 | | | | | 758 | 1488 | | | 1268 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acity Ra | itio(X) | | 0.288 | | 0.443 | | | | | 0.179 | 0.079 | 1 | | 0.226 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), f | /In (95 th percentile |) | 38.5 | | 54 | | | | | 38.8 | 9.6 | | | 68.6 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q), ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | ile) | 1.4 | | 2.0 | | | | | 1.3 | 0.4 | | | 2.7 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | tile) | 0.23 | | 0.00 | | | | | 0.17 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay | (d 1), s | /veh | | 39.1 | | 39.6 | | | | | 4.4 | 1.4 | | | 4.1 | |
| Incremental De | lay (<i>d</i> 2 |), s/veh | | 0.5 | | 1.0 | | | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | | | 0.4 | |
| Initial Queue D | elay (<i>d</i> | з), s/veh | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (| Control Delay (<i>d</i>), s/veh | | | 39.5 | | 40.6 | | | | | 4.5 | 1.5 | | | 4.5 | |
| Level of Service | Level of Service (LOS) | | | D | | D | | | | | А | А | | | Α | |
| Approach Dela | Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | 40.1 | | D | 0.0 | | | | 3.1 | | Α | 4.5 | | А |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | eh / LOS | | | | 8 | .9 | | | | | | | A | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Aultimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | S Score | /LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bicycle LOS So | core / LC | DS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Copyright © 2023 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS Signalized Intersection Results Summary

| | | | 5 Sigi | anzed | | i seci | | esu | 113 | Sun | iiiiai y | | | A | 16 | |
|----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------|---------|---------|----------|----------|-----|----------|------------|----------|----------|----------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Concerct Inform | | | | | | | | | lust | | ion Inf | | | 1 1 | | s L |
| General Inform | hation | First Croup Engine | oring | | | | | | Inte | ersect | | | on . | - | 4 | |
| Agency | | Cropt Parker | enng | Analya | ie Det | 6/21/2 | 022 | | Du | | 11 0 | Othou | | -1 | | ۲. م |
| Analyst | | | | Time | IS Date | | 023 | | | затур Г | e | 1.00 | | - <u>-</u> | N w‡e | 2 |
| Junsaiction | | Greeniieid Michigon Bd | | | ie Vee | PIVI Pt | ак | | | | Doriod | 1.00 | 00 | | | 4 4 |
| Intersection | | | lichia | File No | is real | ZUZS | on Dror | | | alysis | renou | 1-7. | 00 | | | <u> </u> |
| Breiget Deserin | tion | | | | ime | IVIICHIQ | jan Prop | | .xus | | | | | - | <u>ী</u> | × ۲ |
| Project Descrip | lion | 23-0030 113 - 1100 | K Farking | y | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand Inform | nation | | | | EB | | | V | /B | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Approach Move | ement | | | L | Т | R | L | T · | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Demand (v), v | /eh/h | | | 115 | | 131 | | | | | 35 | 123 | | | 230 | 20 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | · | |
| Signal Informa | ation | v | 2 | | 4 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | _ |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | 5.† | 51 | ĸ | | | | | | 1 | N | 3 | - |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | Green | 63.7 | 3.5 | 10.8 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | 3 | 1 * |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | く に | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Timer Results | | | | EBL | | EBT | WBI | - | W | 'BT | NBL | - | NBT | SB | | SBT |
| Assigned Phase | е | | | | | 4 | | | | | 5 | | 2 | | | 6 |
| Case Number | | | | | | 9.0 | | | | | 1.0 | | 4.0 | | | 8.4 |
| Phase Duration | n, s | | | | | 14.8 | | | | | 7.5 | | 75.2 | | | 67.7 |
| Change Period | , (Y+ R (| c), S | | | | 4.0 | | | | | 4.0 | | 4.0 | | | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Hea | Allow Headway (<i>MAH</i>), s sue Clearance Time (<i>q</i> s), s | | | | | 3.4 | | | | | 3.2 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearan | Here Clearance Time (g_s), s | | | | | 10.2 | | | | | 2.0 | | | | | |
| Green Extensio | reen Extension Time ($g \in $), s | | | | | 0.5 | | | | | 0.1 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Pro | bability | | | | | 1.00 | | | | | 0.58 | ; | | | | |
| Max Out Proba | bility | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | 0.41 | | | | | |
| Movement Cre | | | _ | | ГР | _ | | 10/ | D | | | ND | | | <u>CD</u> | _ |
| Approach Move | mont | Suits | | | | D | | T | <u>Б</u> | Ъ | | | D | | т | D |
| Approach Nove | ment | | | | | 14 | | 1 | + | | 5 | 2 | | <u> </u> | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow I | Pate (v |) veh/h | | 115 | | 14 | | | + | | 35 | 2 123 | | | 250 | 10 |
| Adjusted Satura | ation Flo |), ven/n w Rate (s) veh/h/l | In | 1570 | | 1301 | | | + | _ | 10/15 | 1817 | | | 1873 | |
| | Time ((| π_{s}) s | | 63 | | 82 | | | + | _ | 0.0 | 1 4 | | <u> </u> | 4.0 | |
| | learance | e Time (a_c) s | | 6.3 | | 8.2 | | | + | _ | 0.0 | 1.1 | | | 4.0 | |
| Green Ratio (o | V/C | 5 mile (g c), 5 | | 0.12 | | 0.12 | | | - | _ | 0.72 | 0.79 | | <u> </u> | 0.71 | |
| Capacity (c), y | /eh/h | | | 188 | | 166 | | | + | | 545 | 1438 | | | 1326 | |
| Volume-to-Cap | acitv Ra | tio (X) | | 0.613 | | 0.787 | | | | | 0.064 | 0.086 | <u> </u> | | 0.188 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q). ft | /In (95 th percentile | e) | 124.6 | | 148.8 | | | | | 12.6 | 16.2 | | | 62.4 | |
| Back of Queue | (Q). Ve | eh/In (95 th percenti | , ile) | 4.4 | | 5.2 | | | - | | 0.3 | 0.6 | | | 2.5 | |
| Queue Storage | Ratio (| RQ) (95 th percent | , tile) | 0.75 | | 0.00 | | | + | | 0.06 | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | |
| Uniform Delay | (d1), s/ | /veh | , | 37.6 | | 38.5 | | | | | 4.9 | 2.1 | | | 4.4 | |
| Incremental De | lay (d 2 |), s/veh | | 1.2 | | 3.2 | | | + | | 0.0 | 0.1 | | | 0.3 | |
| Initial Queue D | elay (d | 3), s/veh | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | | | | 38.9 | | 41.7 | | | | | 4.9 | 2.2 | | | 4.7 | |
| Level of Service | Level of Service (LOS) | | | D | | D | | | | | Α | А | | | Α | |
| Approach Dela | Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | | | 40.4 | | D | 0.0 | | _ | | 2.8 | | A | 4.7 | | А |
| Intersection De | lay, s/ve | h / LOS | | | | 17 | .7 | | | | | | | B | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Multimodal Re | Multimodal Results | | | | EB | | | W | В | | | NB | | | SB | |
| Pedestrian LOS | S Score | /LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bicycle LOS So | core / LC | DS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Copyright © 2023 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved.

HCS Two-Way Stop-Control Report

A17

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Analyst | Grant Barker | Intersection | Rampart Rd and Michigan Rd |
| Agency/Co. | First Group Engineering | Jurisdiction | Greenfield |
| Date Performed | 08-29-2023 | East/West Street | Rampart Rd |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Michigan Rd |
| Time Analyzed | 7:00 - 8:00 AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |
| Project Description | 23-0030 TIS - Truck Parking | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| Vehicle Volumes and Adju | istme | nts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|-------|-------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | ound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | | | | | | | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | | | | | | |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | | | | |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | | | | | |
| Configuration | | | | | | L | | R | | | Т | R | | LT | Т | | | | | | | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | 158 | | 77 | | | 154 | 88 | | 36 | 161 | | | | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | 10 | | 0 | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | N | 0 | | | Ν | lo | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.2 | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 7.00 | | 6.20 | | | | | | 4.10 | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | | | 2.2 | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 3.60 | | 3.30 | | | | | | 2.20 | | | | | | | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | l Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 180 | | 88 | | | | | | 41 | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 581 | | 873 | | | | | | 1299 | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.31 | | 0.10 | | | | | | 0.03 | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 1.3 | | 0.3 | | | | | | 0.1 | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 14.0 | | 9.6 | | | | | | 7.9 | 0.2 | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | В | | А | | | | | | А | А | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 12 | 2.5 | | | | | | | 1 | 2.2 | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | | ļ | 4 | | | | | | | |

Copyright © 2023 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

HCS Two-Way Stop-Control Report

A18

| General Information | | Site Information | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Analyst | Grant Barker | Intersection | Rampart Rd and Michigan Rd |
| Agency/Co. | First Group Engineering | Jurisdiction | Greenfield |
| Date Performed | 08-29-2023 | East/West Street | Rampart Rd |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Michigan Rd |
| Time Analyzed | 4:00 - 5:00 AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.79 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 1.00 |
| Project Description | 23-0030 TIS - Truck Parking | | |
| | | | |

Lanes



| Vehicle Volumes and Adju | istme | nts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---------|--------|------|-------|------|------|------|----|-------|-------|-----|----|-------|-------|---|
| Approach | | Eastb | ound | | | West | ound | | | North | bound | | | South | bound | |
| Movement | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R | U | L | Т | R |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | | | | L | | R | | | Т | R | | LT | Т | |
| Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | 39 | | 61 | | | 283 | 159 | | 50 | 192 | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | 8 | | 3 | | | | | | 3 | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | (|) | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | N | 0 | | | Ν | lo | | | | | |
| Median Type Storage | | | | Undi | vided | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical and Follow-up He | adwa | ys | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 7.5 | | 6.2 | | | | | | 4.1 | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | 6.96 | | 6.26 | | | | | | 4.16 | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | | | | | | 2.2 | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | 3.58 | | 3.33 | | | | | | 2.23 | | |
| Delay, Queue Length, and | Leve | l of Se | ervice | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 49 | | 77 | | | | | | 63 | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 387 | | 682 | | | | | | 1001 | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.13 | | 0.11 | | | | | | 0.06 | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.4 | | 0.4 | | | | | | 0.2 | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 15.7 | | 11.0 | | | | | | 8.8 | 0.4 | |
| Level of Service (LOS) | | | | | | С | | В | | | | | | А | А | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 12 | 2.8 | | | | | | | 2 | .1 | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | E | 3 | | | | | | | / | 4 | |

Copyright © 2023 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

| | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| AM Enterprise Ex + Growth | 0 | 8 | 5 | 34 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AM Michigan Ex + Growth | 32 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 123 |
| AM Rampart Ex + Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 130 | 80 | 36 | 150 | 0 |

AM Peak Hour







| | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| PM Enterprise Ex + Growth | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PM Michigan Ex + Growth | 99 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 20 |
| PM Rampart Ex + Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 209 | 134 | 50 | 185 | 0 |

PM Peak Hour







AM Peak Hour

| PHF 0.60 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Enterprise Car | 0 | 7 | 4 | 25 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Enterprise Truck | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Added Truck | | | 0 | 63 | | | 0 | | 11 | | | |
| Total Veh | 0 | 7 | 4 | 92 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Round | 0 | 7 | 4 | 92 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Truck | | 0% | 0% | 73% | 0% | | | | 93% | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PHF 0.67 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Michigan Car | 30 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 117 |
| Michigan Truck | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Added Truck | 5 | | 7 | | | | 47 | | | | | 16 |
| Total Veh | 37 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 139 |
| Round | 37 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 139 |
| % Truck | 19% | | 15% | | | | 34% | 4% | | | 0% | 16% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PHF 0.88 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Rampart Car | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 124 | 74 | 36 | 150 | 0 |
| Rampart Truck | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Added Truck | | | | 4 | | 0 | | 24 | 8 | 0 | 12 | |
| Total Veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 154 | 88 | 36 | 161 | 0 |
| Round | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 154 | 88 | 36 | 161 | 0 |
| % Truck | | | | 10% | | 0% | | 20% | 16% | 0% | 7% | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

PM Peak Hour

| PHF 0.67 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|------------------|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Enterprise Car | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Enterprise Truck | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Added Truck | | | 0 | 32 | | | 0 | | 49 | | | |
| Total Veh | 0 | 7 | 0 | 35 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Round | 0 | 7 | 0 | 35 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Truck | | 0% | | 97% | 0% | | 0% | | 73% | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PHF 0.69 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Michigan Car | 95 | 0 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 17 |
| Michigan Truck | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Added Truck | 23 | | 26 | | | | 24 | | | | | 0 |
| Total Veh | 121 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 20 |
| Round | 121 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 20 |
| % Truck | 22% | | 21% | | | | 64% | 2% | | | 0% | 12% |
| | | грт | | | | | | | | CDI | ODT | 000 |
| PHF 0.79 | EBL | EDI | EBR | VVBL | VVDI | WDR | INDL | | INDR | SBL | SBI | SBR |
| Rampart Car | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 202 | 130 | 48 | 180 | 0 |
| Rampart Truck | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| Added Truck | | | | 2 | | 0 | | 74 | 25 | 0 | 6 | |
| Total Veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 283 | 159 | 50 | 192 | 0 |
| Round | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 283 | 159 | 50 | 192 | 0 |
| % Truck | | | | 8% | | 3% | | 28% | 18% | 3% | 6% | |

| | | ŀ | HCS V | Varrar | nts Re | port | | | | | A22 | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------|----------|----|
| Project Information | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | Grant B | arker | | 1 | Date | | | | 6/23/ | 2023 | | |
| Agency | First Gro | oup Engin | eering | | Analysis Ye | ear | | | 2023 | | | |
| Jurisdiction | Greenfie | eld | | • | Time Perio | d Analyze | d | | PM Pe | eak Hour | | |
| Project Description | 23-0030 |) Trinity Al | loy Truck | Parking | | | | | _ | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Major Street Direction | East-We | est | | | Populatior | ı < 10,000 | | | No | | | |
| Starting Time Interval | 7 | | | (| Coordinate | ed Signal : | System | | No | | | |
| Median Type | Undivid | ed | | (| Crashes (c | rashes/yea | ar) | | 0 | | | |
| Major Street Speed (mi/h) | 30 | | | | Adequate | Trials of C | rash Exp. | Alt. | No | | | |
| Nearest Signal (ft) | 2900 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Geometry and Traffic | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | لح ح | ר הי | ገ ተ ቀ ዮ | , (↑ ↑ ↑ | | | | | | | |
| Approach | | Eastbound | d | | Westboun | d | Ν | Iorthboun | d | S | outhbour | nd |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R |
| Number of Lanes, N | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Usage | | TR | | | LT | | | LR | | | | |
| Vehicle Volumes Averages (veh/h) | 0 | 5 | 8 | 36 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Averages (peds/h) | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| Gap Averages (gaps/h) | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| Delay (s/veh) | | 0.7 | | | 0.4 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | |
| Delay (veh-hrs) | | 0.1 | | | 0.2 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | |
| School Crossing and Roadway | / Netwo | rk | | - | | | | | | - | | |
| Number of Students in Highest Hour | 0 | | | • | Two or Mo | ore Major | Routes | | No | | | |
| Number of Adequate Gaps in Period | 0 | | | Ņ | Weekend | Counts | | | No | | | |

Railroad Crossing

Number of Minutes in Period

0

| Grade Crossing Approach | None | Rail Traffic (trains/day) | 4 | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Highest Volume Hour with Trains | Unknown | High Occupancy Buses (%) | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Distance to Stop Line (ft) | - | Tractor-Trailer Trucks (%) | 10 | | | | | | | |

5-year Growth Factor (%)

0

| Volume Summary A23 | | | | | | | | | | A23 | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Hour | Major Volume | Minor Volume | Total Volume | Peds/h | Gaps/h | 1A (100%) | 1A (80%) | 1B (100%) | 1B (80%) | 2 (100%) | 3A (100%) | 3B (80%) | 4A (100%) | 4B (80%) |
| 07 - 08 | 101 | 12 | 113 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 08 - 09 | 87 | 11 | 98 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 09 - 10 | 60 | 28 | 88 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 10 - 11 | 54 | 25 | 79 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 11 - 12 | 54 | 25 | 79 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 12 - 13 | 53 | 25 | 78 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 13 - 14 | 56 | 27 | 83 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 14 - 15 | 67 | 30 | 97 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 15 - 16 | 53 | 60 | 113 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 16 - 17 | 57 | 63 | 120 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 17 - 18 | 50 | 57 | 107 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 18 - 19 | 42 | 47 | 89 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Total | 734 | 410 | 1144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Warrants | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Warrant 1: I | Eight-Hou | ur Vehicu | ılar Volur | ne | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Minimu | m Vehicula | ar Volumes | s (Both ma | jor approa | ichesand | d higher | minor app | oroach)c | or | | | | | |
| B. Interrup | tion of Co | ntinuous T | raffic (Botl | n major ap | proaches | and hi | gher mino | r approacl | ו)or | | | | | |
| 80% Vehic | ularand | Interrup | tion Volun | nes (Both i | major appi | roaches | and higł | ner minor a | approach) | | | | | |
| Warrant 2: Four-Hour Vehicular Volume | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Four-Hour Vehicular Volume (Both major approachesand higher minor approach) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Warrant 3: Peak Hour | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Peak-Hour Conditions (Minor delay and minor volumeand total volume)or | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. Peak-Ho | our Vehicul | lar Volume | es (Both ma | ajor appro | achesar | nd highe | r minor ap | proach) | | | | | | |
| Warrant 4: I | Pedestria | n Volum | e | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Four Ho | our Volume | esor | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. One-Ho | ur Volume | s | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Warrant 5: S | School Cr | ossing | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gaps Sam | e Period | and | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Student Vo | olumes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nearest Tr | affic Contr | ol Signal (| optional) | | | | | | | | | | \checkmark | |
| Warrant 6: | Coordina | ted Signa | ıl System | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Degree of | Platooning | g (Predom | inant direo | tion or bo | th directio | ons) | | | | | | | | |
| Warrant 7: (| Crash Exp | perience | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Adequa | te trials of | alternative | es, observa | ance and e | nforceme | nt failed | and | | | | | | | |
| B. Reported crashes susceptible to correction by signal (12-month period)and | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C. 80% Volumes for Warrants 1A, 1B,or 4 are satisfied | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Warrant 8: Roadway Network | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Weekday Volume (Peak hour totaland projected warrants 1, 2, or 3)or | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. Weekend Volume (Five hours total) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Warrant 9: | Grade Cro | ossing | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Grade C | Crossing wi | thin 140 ft | tand | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. Peak-Ho | our Vehicul | lar Volume | 2S | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Copyright © 202 | 23 Universit | y of Florida | . All Rights | Reserved. | | HCSTM V | Varrants Ve | rsion 2023 | | | G | enerated: 6 | 5/27/2023 1 | 0:58:27 AM |

| | | ŀ | HCS V | Varrai | nts Re | port | | | | | A24 | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------|------------|--------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------|------------|-----|---|--|
| Project Information | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analyst | Grant Barker Date 8/29/23 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency | First Group Engineering Analysis Year | | | | | | | 2023 | 2023 | | | | |
| Jurisdiction | Greenfie | Greenfield Time Period Analyzed | | | | | | | | ak Hour | | | |
| Project Description | 23-0030 | 23-0030 TIS - Truck Parking | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Major Street Direction | North-S | orth-South Population < 10,000 | | | | | | | | No | | | |
| Starting Time Interval | 7 | 7 Coordinated Signal System No | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median Type | Undivid | ed | | - | Crashes (ci | rashes/yea | ar) | | 0 | | | | |
| Major Street Speed (mi/h) | 30 | | | | Adequate | Trials of C | rash Exp. | Alt. | No | | | | |
| Nearest Signal (ft) | 2900 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Geometry and Traffic | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | → | ٦ , | ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ | /* ′_↑ ∳ / | T T | | | | | | | |
| Approach | | Eastboun | d | | Westboun | d | 1 | Northbour | nd | Southbound | | | |
| Movement | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | L | Т | R | |
| Number of Lanes, N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Lane Usage | | | | L | | R | | Т | R | | LT | | |
| Vehicle Volumes Averages (veh/h) | 0 | 5 | 8 | 70 | 10 | 54 | 3 | 201 | 104 | 35 | 145 | 0 | |
| Pedestrian Averages (peds/h) | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Gap Averages (gaps/h) | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| Delay (s/veh) | | 0.7 | | | 0.4 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | |
| Delay (veh-hrs) | | 0.1 | | | 0.2 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | |
| School Crossing and Roadway | y Netwo | rk | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Students in Highest Hour | 0 | 0 Two or More Major Routes No | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Adequate Gaps in Period | 0 | 0 | | | | Counts | | | No | No | | | |
| Number of Minutes in Period | 0 | 0 5-year Growth Factor (%) 0 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Railroad Crossing | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade Crossing Approach | None | | | | Rail Traffic | (trains/da | ay) | | 4 | | | | |
| Highest Volume Hour with Trains | Unknow | /n | | | High Occupancy Buses (%) | | | | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Distance to Stop Line (ft) | - | - Tractor-Trailer Trucks (%) 10 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Volume Summary A25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Hour | Major Volume | Minor Volume | Total Volume | Peds/h | Gaps/h | 1A (100%) | 1A (80%) | 1B (100%) | 1B (80%) | 2 (100%) | 3A (100%) | 3B (80%) | 4A (100%) | 4B (80%) |
| 07 - 08 | 440 | 239 | 703 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 08 - 09 | 375 | 199 | 595 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 09 - 10 | 412 | 131 | 557 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 10 - 11 | 372 | 119 | 504 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 11 - 12 | 368 | 117 | 498 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 12 - 13 | 383 | 115 | 511 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 13 - 14 | 696 | 125 | 834 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 14 - 15 | 452 | 144 | 612 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 15 - 16 | 549 | 113 | 674 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 16 - 17 | 691 | 120 | 824 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 17 - 18 | 621 | 108 | 740 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 18 - 19 | 518 | 90 | 617 | 0 | 0 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Total | 5877 | 1620 | 7669 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Warrants | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Warrant 1: I | Eight-Hou | ur Vehicu | lar Volur | ne | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Minimu | m Vehicula | ar Volumes | s (Both ma | jor approa | ichesand | d higher | minor app | oroach)c | or | | | | | |
| B. Interrup | tion of Co | ntinuous T | raffic (Botl | n major ap | proaches | and hi | gher mino | r approacl | ר)or | | | | | |
| 80% Vehic | ularand | Interrup | tion Volun | nes (Both r | major appi | roaches | and higł | ner minor a | approach) | | | | | |
| Warrant 2: Four-Hour Vehicular Volume | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Four-Hour | [.] Vehicular | Volume (B | oth major | approach | esand | higher mi | nor appro | ach) | | | | | | |
| Warrant 3: Peak Hour | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Peak-Hour Conditions (Minor delay and minor volumeand total volume)or | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. Peak-Ho | our Vehicul | lar Volume | s (Both ma | ajor appro | achesar | ıd higheı | r minor ap | proach) | | | | | | |
| Warrant 4: I | Pedestria | n Volum | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Four Ho | our Volume | esor | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. One-Ho | our Volume | s | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Warrant 5: S | School Cr | ossing | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gaps Sam | e Period | and | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Student Vo | olumes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nearest Tr | affic Contr | ol Signal (| optional) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Warrant 6: | Coordina | ted Signa | l System | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Degree of | Platooning | g (Predom | inant direc | tion or bo | th directio | ons) | | | | | | | | |
| Warrant 7: | Crash Exp | perience | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Adequa | te trials of | alternative | es, observa | ince and e | nforceme | nt failed | and | | | | | | | |
| B. Reported crashes susceptible to correction by signal (12-month period)and | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C. 80% Volumes for Warrants 1A, 1B,or 4 are satisfied | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Warrant 8: I | Roadway | Network | · | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Weekday Volume (Peak hour totaland projected warrants 1, 2, or 3)or | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. Weeken | d Volume | (Five hour | s total) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Warrant 9: | Grade Cro | ossing | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Grade C | Crossing wi | thin 140 ft | :and | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. Peak-Ho | our Vehicul | lar Volume | S | | | 11000 | | | | | | | 1.0/7.17 | 1.50.50 |
| Copyright © 202 | 23 Universit | y ot Florida | . All Rights | Keserved. | | HCS TM V | varrants Ve | rsion 2023 | | | | Generated | a: 9/5/2023 | 1:56:41 PM |



GUIDELINES FOR RIGHT-TURN LANES AT UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS ON 2-LANE HIGHWAYS

Figure 46-4A

| Operating | Opposing | Advancing Volume (veh/h) | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------------------------|------------|------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Speed | Volume | 5% | 10% | 20% | 30% | | | | | | | |
| (mph) | (veh/h) | Left Turns | Left Turns | Left Turns | Left Turns | | | | | | | |
| | 800 | 330 | 240 | 180 | 160 | | | | | | | |
| | 600 | 410 | 305 | 225 | 200 | | | | | | | |
| 40 | 400 | 510 | 380 | 275 | 245 | | | | | | | |
| | 200 | 640 | 470 | 350 | 305 | | | | | | | |
| | 100 | 720 | 515 | 390 | 340 | | | | | | | |
| | 800 | 280 | 210 | 165 | 135 | | | | | | | |
| | 600 | 350 | 260 | 195 | 170 | | | | | | | |
| 50 | 400 | 430 | 320 | 240 | 210 | | | | | | | |
| | 200 | 550 | 400 | 300 | 270 | | | | | | | |
| | 100 | 615 | 445 | 335 | 295 | | | | | | | |
| | 800 | 230 | 170 | 125 | 115 | | | | | | | |
| 60 | 600 | 290 | 210 | 160 | 140 | | | | | | | |
| | 400 | 365 | 270 | 200 | 175 | | | | | | | |
| | 200 | 450 | 330 | 250 | 215 | | | | | | | |
| | 100 | 505 | 370 | 275 | 240 | | | | | | | |

VOLUME GUIDELINES FOR LEFT-TURN LANE ON TWO-LANE HIGHWAY



Figure 46-4C

LEFT TURN LANE NOT WARRANTED