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## I ntroduction and Summary

## Introduction

This study has been prepared to analyze the access potential of the proposed Regional Gateway Commerce Center, located at the northwest quadrant of the I-8/I-10 interchange in Casa Grande, Arizona. The purpose of this study is to prepare a Master Circulation Plan that guides the subject site through its development process, helping to determine on-site and off-site roadway improvements needed to accommodate full build-out traffic demand. This circulation plan will be a changing, evolving document dependent upon tenant demand characteristics, future roadway improvements, refinements of future traffic volumes, and other site and non-site conditions. This study is being provided for the City of Casa Grande to better understand the development potential of the site and it's impacts to the adjacent roadway system prior to the time when a more formal traffic impact study is required. This master circulation plan has been prepared as a guideline for the first phase of site development, which currently has an unknown timeline associated with it. This study has made some assumptions to identify potential site needs at full build-out and identify near-term site development "triggers" to accommodate the first phase of construction that has unknown traffic demands at this time. It is assumed more detailed traffic impact studies will be required as a greater level of detail pertaining the development characteristics of the site is known.

## Major Assumptions

Based on comments received from the City of Casa Grande and ADOT pertaining to a traffic impact study that was previously provided for this site, but not approved, the following major assumptions pertaining to this project are as follows:

- No City, County, or ADOT roadway improvements are planned for the foreseeable future. Any roadway improvement projects needed to provide necessary roadway capacity and to serve interim develop projects will be developer driven and developer paid.
- The only ADOT study-area project anticipated before the assumed 2030 build-out year for this site is an I-10 widening project that will add a general purpose lane to the inside of the existing mainline such that three through lanes are to be provided from the I-8 system interchange west.
- Although other site adjacent developments are anticipated within the study area, their volume impacts have not been included as part of the background traffic volume expansion. Any site contributing to the deterioration of operational performance measures within the study are expected to mitigate or at a minimum contribute to the cost associated with any roadway improvement, similar to this project.
- Analysis has been conducted for an assumed 2018 opening year of the site, a time frame used solely for the basis of expanding existing traffic volumes to a horizon year and allowing for a conservative analysis of baseline roadway conditions.
- For the site's anticipated opening year, a single access point, located at the Cornman/Henness Road alignment is planned. As part of the opening year condition, the developer plans to construct a 2-lane access road along a westerly
alignment to intersect Peart Road south of Jimmie Kerr to accommodate site traffic.
- Although additional site access points are planned, the ability to accelerate these access points to an opening year condition is constrained. Therefore, focus on the opening year aspects of this site is provided along with an evaluation of future site conditions assumed at full build-out of the site under its current plan.


## Executive Summary

This report documents the assumptions and procedures used to determine roadway improvement requirements for the opening year of the site based on certain trigger values. These values were developed from the site's land use plan, it's general layout, and its trip generation characteristics at full build-out. The following summary is a result of the analysis conducted.

## Site Development Description

The subject site is to develop approximately 423 acres located at the northwest corner of the I-8 / I-10 interchange in addition to dedicating about 127 acres to ADOT for the improvement of the I-8/I-10 system interchange, frontage roads, and future I-8/Henness Road Traffic Interchange. Overall, the site is planned to construct over 9.37 million square-feet of corporate headquarter office, business office, general office, general light industrial and commercial space. At full build-out, the site is anticipated to generate 71,300 daily trip ends with 10,740 trips occurring in the AM peak hour and 9,980 trips occurring in the PM peak hour.

## Principal Findings

- Intersection analysis of background traffic conditions at the intersection of Jimmie Kerr Boulevard and the I-10 eastbound on-off ramps indicate the stop-controlled southbound approach (I-10 off-ramp) is expected to operate at level of service (LOS) F in both the AM and PM peak hours. Improvements to this intersection will be required at the time of site opening or prior to, if other site adjacent development is constructed within this time frame.
- Assuming only the west site access is to be constructed and improvements to the Jimmie Kerr/I-10 EB On-Off Ramp intersection are in-place, the following trigger points are identified and the level of improvement needed, based on a percentage of total site occupancy. The results indicate about $27 \%$ of site occupancy can be accommodated with a single Henness/Cornman site access (with or without the I8/Henness TI), above this value requires additional site access.


## Summary of Improvement Requirements at Opening Year, Based on Total Site Occupancy

| Percent of Total Site Occupancy | Roadway Improvements Required |
| :---: | :--- |
| West Access Roadway \& Single Cornman/Henness Site Access |  |
| $0.0 \%$ | Improvement to the Jimmie Kerr / I-10 EB On-Off Ramp |$|$| up to 2.7\% |
| :--- |
| Kone, some minor signal timing adjustments at Jimmie |
| Kerr/Peart Road only |

- At full build-out, a total of 5 access points are being considered. The access points are anticipated to accommodate 11 inbound lanes and 8 outbound lanes at this time. All access points have an unknown time horizon and are dependent upon market forces and other considerations as to if and when they are to be pursued.
- It is anticipated that both the I-8/Henness TI and the Cox Road access will be required to accommodate site demand at build-out and provide efficient access to and from the adjacent freeway network. Potential direct access connections from the I-8 westbound Frontage Road and possibly the Henness Road TI westbound off-ramp may also be required.
- Internal to the site, the loop roadway should be considered as a six-lane facility to accommodate potential build-out year volumes estimated to exceed 3,000 vehicles during peak hour conditions. Initial loop road construction may be appropriate as a 4-lane facility, however, underground facilities and future intersection requirements should consider the wider ROW need at this time.
- The ability to channelize inbound and outbound turn movements at site access points will promote vehicle flow and reduce delays and queues. Use of roundabouts at internal intersections with the loop roadway could eliminate potential vehicle back-ups at high volume locations within the site and promote continuous flow. Traffic signals could be considered at the more minor loop road intersections that are not major ingress/egress intersections to help promote truck movements, left turn movements and help create gaps in the traffic stream.
- The ability to manage the trips generated from the corporate headquarter land use will have a significant impact to the operation of the site's internal roadway operation. Estimates show over half of all site trips are to be generated from these three lots ( 5.5 million SF of office space). Options to minimize the traffic generated from these lots on the site's internal loop road are needed in the ultimate condition. Off-site and/or on-site parking areas adjacent to direct access ramps with bus shuttle service, providing direct access to/from the corporate headquarters land uses that do not utilize the internal loop road, or other means to minimize all internal site traffic is needed in the ultimate condition to operate in an efficient manner.


## Study Area Conditions

## Study Area

The proposed development is located a few miles southeast of the downtown Casa Grande, located at the northwest corner of the I-8/I-10 interchange area. The influence area for the approximate 423 acre Regional Gateway Commerce Center site is along the Jimmie Kerr Boulevard between Trekell Road and Sunland Gin Road and the access points/routes onto I-8 and I-10 accommodating both local and regional traffic demand. Figure 1 is provided showing a vicinity map of the general study area, the existing roadway network, and the future I-8/Henness Road Traffic Interchange (TI), I-10/Selma Highway TI, and I-8/I-10 System Interchange area that currently do not have a timeframe associated with their construction. The study area is for this project is identified to be bounded by:

- West: Trekell Road
- North: Selma Highway/Jimmie Kerr Boulevard
- East: Sunland Gin Road
- South: I-8


## Existing and Proposed Development in the Study Area

Existing land uses in the study area are generally rural in nature consisting mostly of agriculture areas, areas of undeveloped land, low density residential dwellings, and some small commercial developments that can be considered low volume trip generators. The subject site was partially utilized as a campground with its remaining area undeveloped. The existing land uses adjacent to the site are highlighted below.

- North - Vacant commercial building (furniture outlet store) south of Jimmie Kerr Boulevard off of Cox Road and a mostly vacant Outlets at Casa Grande shopping center on the north side of Jimmie Kerr just west of I-10 at the intersection at Tanger Drive.
- East - The I-10 corridor. East of the I-10 corridor vacant/agricultural areas with a partially occupied distribution center and an apparent vehicle impound lot, both having access only onto Sunland Gin Road south of Jimmie Kerr.
- South - The I-8 corridor. South of the I-8 corridor low density residential and mostly undeveloped land.
- West - Agricultural/undeveloped areas.


General Study Area

The City of Casa Grande (City) has identified the following projects near the subject site that have the potential of developing in the near future. Although no specific traffic impact studies have been provided for the first three projects listed, the following information for the developments is noted:

1. An auction house, SEC of Jimmie Kerr Boulevard and I-10. This site is to auction large machinery, farm-related equipment, and other associated items. This site is only projected to be open during weekend periods and not projected to have a significant impact to study area traffic volumes.
2. The Station, NWC of Jimmie Kerr Boulevard and I-10. This project is to redevelop the existing 187,000 SF outlet mall area as a destination for home improvement type offerings. For the purposes of trip generation, this site will be considered a Factory Outlet Center.
3. The Station II, west of the Station off of Jimmie Kerr Boulevard. A 34-acre retail area with a hotel and multi-family residential on-site.
4. Casa Grande Mountain Ranch South, the sister property to the current subject property to be located on the south side of I-8 and west of I-10. A traffic report has been previously provided for this site (by Lee Engineering, 2006) and is identified to be a viable project noting over 2,300 residential housing units along with commercial, a resort hotel, and specialty retails areas are projected that would supplement the growth of the subject site. In total, this site is estimated to generate 38,000 daily trips.

Proposed development locations for sites 2, 3, and 4 are highlighted graphically in Figure 2.

## Existing Roadways and Traffic Control

The physical transportation characteristics of the site adjacent roadways consist of the following:

- I-8 and I-10 - The two site adjacent freeways are divided two-lane directional facilities providing access to the Phoenix, Tucson, and Western Arizona/Southern California areas. A full access I-10 interchange at Jimmie Kerr Boulevard is anticipated to accommodate the majority of regional trips. The interchange is located about 1-mile north of I-8 and has both of its eastbound and westbound on and off ramps located on the north side of Jimmie Kerr, operating as separate minor-street stop controlled intersections. At this time, regional I-8 traffic to/from the west can use the closest site interchange at Trekell Road, 3 miles west of I-10. The single lane off-ramp approaches to Trekell Road are minor-street stop controlled locations. Depending upon site accessibility via Cox Road at the Jimmie Kerr/I-10 EB intersection and destination within the subject site, a portion of I-8 motorists may choose to by-pass the Trekell interchange in favor of the I-10/Jimmie Kerr interchange as it would provide for a faster and more convenient route. Eventually, the future I-8/Henness Road TI will provide for a more convenient access for regional traffic to/from the east and west.

- Jimmie Kerr Boulevard (SR 84) - A two-lane facility on a northwest/southeast alignment parallel to the Union Pacific Railroad providing access between downtown Casa Grande and the City of Eloy to its east. This roadway is identified as a City Principal Arterial having a continuous center two-way left turn lane west of its intersection with Selma Highway and east of Tanger Drive. The roadway has a speed limit of 45 mph near its I-10 interchange and 50/55 mph west of this location prior to its approach into Casa Grande. Ultimately, this roadway is proposed as a 6-lane facility.
- Trekell Road - A two-lane roadway south of Jimmie Kerr Boulevard and identified as a City Principal and a regionally significant roadway providing access between the downtown area of Casa Grande and I-8. The roadway currently has a posted speed limit of 50 mph . This roadway is anticipated to capture a portion of I-8 site traffic to/from the west until the I-8/Henness Road TI opens (or site accessibility via Cox Road) where it will no longer be an attractive option to site-related motorists.
- Peart Road - Identified as a City Principal Arterial, although south of Jimmie Kerr Boulevard it provides access to only a few single family homes, a park, agricultural areas, and some low trip generating agricultural businesses. The posted speed limit currently is 45 mph on this two-lane facility. North of Jimmie Kerr, the roadway continues as a two-lane facility until reaching Early Road, about 0.6 miles north of Jimmie Kerr, where it widens to a four-lane facility heading toward Florence Boulevard.
- Henness Road, Selma Highway Extension, and Cornman Road south of Jimmie Kerr Boulevard currently do not exist or exist only as unpaved, low-volume agricultural roads. None of the roadways extend across Jimmie Kerr at this time.
- Cox Road - This two-lane roadway is the south leg of the I-10 eastbound on/off ramp at the Jimmie Kerr Boulevard intersection providing access to a currently vacant furniture outlet building, the previous Buena Tierra Campgrounds, and the location of the subject site. This roadway is paved with flashing light signals and automatic gates at its highway-rail grade crossing of the Union Pacific rail line, located about 150 feet south of Jimmie Kerr Boulevard. Upgrades to this rail crossing/roadway will be needed if Cox Road is to be used for site access.

Lane configurations, traffic control, AM and PM peak hour intersection turning movement volumes at the existing major roadway intersections within the study area and daily traffic volumes of study area roadway segments are shown in Figure 3.
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## Proposed Site Access Locations and Routes

A copy of the site's color-coded land use layout plan is provided in Figure 4. This figure also indicates site access locations and the opening year travel patterns anticipated. The figure shows the progression of potential site access need, an orange box being the initial opening year access (Access 1), yellow boxes (Access 1A and 2) indicating near-term access potential, and the light purple boxes (Access 3, 4, and 5) being a more long-term access options. For the opening year, only the west access (Access 1 ) is certain as the site developer will construct the west access road from its site entrance at Cornman Road along the Henness Road and future Selma Highway alignments to Peart Road (highlighted in thick orange line work, left side of figure).

## Proposed Access Points

1. Opening Year, Henness Road /Cornman Road

1A. Future Year, I-8 / Henness Road Traffic Interchange (site access via Henness / Cornman)
2. Future Year, Jimmie Kerr Boulevard / I-10 EB On-Off Ramps / Cox Road
3. Future Year, Direct Access to/from the I-8 and/or I-10 WB Frontage Road
4. Future Year, I-8 Underpass to development south of I-8
5. Future Year, Direct Access I-8/ I-10 WB Ramp

## Proposed Routing

Opening Year - Assuming site access is only available via the Henness/Cornman route, the opening year travel routes are described below:

- To/From I-8 west (regional traffic) - Use of I-8/Trekell interchange, north to the Trekell/Jimmie Kerr intersection, east to the Jimmie Kerr/Peart intersection, then south to access the site.
- To/From I-10 east (regional traffic) - Use of the I-10/Jimmie Kerr interchange, west to the Jimmie Kerr/Peart intersection, then south to access the site.
- To/From I-10 north/west (regional traffic) - Use of the I-10/Jimmie Kerr interchange, west to the Jimmie Kerr/Peart intersection, then south to access the site. Some I-10 users may travel an I-10/Florence/Peart Road route to access the site.
- To/From Casa Grande Area north and west (local traffic) - Use of Jimmie Kerr or Peart Road to the Jimmie Kerr/Peart intersection, then south to access the site.
- To/From Eloy area or points east (local traffic) - Use of Jimmie Kerr to Peart Road to the site.
- To/From Arizona City or points south (local traffic) - Use of Sunland Gin Road to Jimmie Kerr, then west to Peart Road to access the site.


Opening Year Travel Routes

## Legend
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Future Year - The Cox Road access is being considered to provide more efficient ingress/egress to the interstate system and motorists using Jimmie Kerr Boulevard. Dependent upon access need of potential site businesses, the amount of on-site development and timing of the I-8/Henness Road interchange, the Cox Road access offers the potential of accommodating a significant amount of site traffic demand, independent of any network modifications associated with a new Selma Highway TI. Improvements to the UPRR crossing and Jimmie Kerr/I-10 intersections can be anticipated if this access is utilized.

Future Year - As the site continues to grow, additional access points are anticipated to help accommodate increased site-related demand by providing alternative access points to/from the south and the interstate system helping to alleviate traffic demand at the other access points. No additional access points outside of the five identified are being considered at this time.

## Near-Term and Long-Term Transportation Improvements

At this time, no near-term transportation system improvements are being considered by the City, County, or State prior to the opening year of the site. City and ADOT representatives have identified that any near term roadway improvements within the study area will likely be developer driven and developer paid.

Previously, the City of Casa Grande in their 2006 Small Area Transportation Study (CGSATS) identified a number of study area improvements targeted for year 2020, such as the widening of Jimmie Kerr Boulevard from Sunland Gin Road to Peart Road to a six-lane facility, are not being considered at this time due to reduced income from the economic/development downturn in recent years. Similarly, County and State TIP study area projects identified for future years have also been extended, modified or eliminated.

The following improvements were previously identified with a future horizon year beyond 2020 and are still assumed to be viable projects, however, the estimated build dates are now unknown. No major study area projects were identified within the latest County CIP or State STIP literature for the study area. Only the first project below is identified to have a known timeline.

1. ADOT (from previous CIP publication) - I-10 widening project (I-10 Widening, Early Road to I-8). Previous CIP documentation had targeted this project for a mid2020's construction time frame but has since been removed and changed. Recent ADOT comments identify this project will only add one directional lane to the inside of the I-10 corridor in this area. Previously, this project was to also include an I10/Selma Highway TI, elimination of the I-10/Jimmie Kerr interchange, and construction of frontage roads between Selma Highway and Jimmie Kerr Boulevard for continued access. The time frame for construction of this project is unknown, but ADOT has identified that a 2030 completion data can be assumed for the widening.
2. ADOT (from the I-10 Corridor Study, I-8 to Tangerine Road) - As part of the I-10 corridor improvements associated with this project, work elements of this project are planned to include the construction of a new I-8/I-10 System Interchange to improve access between the two interstates, inclusion of an eastbound and westbound frontage road network between Sunland Gin Road and Henness Road, and a new traffic interchange at Henness Road. This project has an unknown construction time frame, recently estimated by ADOT to be beyond year 2030. It is understood that the I8/Henness Road TI portion of this project could be fast-tracked by the developer, depending upon their participation in the cost of construction.
3. ADOT (from the I-8/Henness Road TI Change of Access Report) - Construction of an I-8/Henness Road interchange. The time frame for construction of this project is unknown and currently going through an evaluation/approval process. Construction of this TI was to be part of a planned I-8/I-10 system interchange improvement project. Currently, the system interchange improvements have an unknown construction year time horizon, but the site developer may wish to accelerate the construction of the I-8/Henness Road interchange portion. The need for its acceleration is dependent upon securing tenant support, need to facilitate site access, and need to provide efficient access between Jimmie Kerr Boulevard and areas south of I-8 including the Casa Grande Mountain Ranch development.
4. Pinal County ( 2006 CGSATS, Streets CIP for New Developments and Development Fees) - Fee development based on the improvement of 34 lane-miles of Selma Highway in IFA 2, which includes the roadway section west of I-10. It is assumed that Selma Road would be constructed to a 4-lane facility and would be a grade separated over the Union Pacific Railroad. The time frame for construction of this project is currently unknown and would likely be delayed until the future ADOT construction of the I-10/Selma Highway TI, the I-8/I-10 system interchange project, and/or traffic demand with the I-8/Henness Road TI require such action.

For the purposes of this study, only the I-10 widening project is anticipated for the buildout year of this site.

## Analysis of Existing Conditions

## Traffic Volumes

## Historical

Historical traffic volumes, in the form of daily (24-hour) and peak hour counts, were obtained for the adjacent roadway segments as reported by the City of Casa Grande, ADOT, or as identified in the Henness Road/I-8 Traffic Interchange report (April 2013) submitted to ADOT by Kimley-Horn. The location of applicable traffic count data for the most recent count year has been summarized in Figure 3. No new 24-hour volumes have been collected as part of this project.

AM and PM Peak Hour Intersection Count Data
To confirm traffic volume levels and compare turn movement percentages to historically collected data, a 30 -minute turning movement check count was conducted at the Jimmie Kerr Boulevard intersections with the I-10 EB and WB on/off ramps and at the intersection of Jimmie Kerr and Peart Road. From the comparison of count data obtained at these intersections in 2006, the recent 2013 hourly volume entering the intersection was lower by approximately $50 \%$ from 2006 peak hour values and 2011 City volume data. This high volume reduction could partially be attributed to the closing of the nearby outlet mall facility (driveway located 450 feet west of this intersection at the signalized intersection of Tanger Drive) in addition to a seasonal variation component. Along the freeway segments, it is assumed that the latest traffic volumes identified in the I-8/Henness Road TI Change of Access Report are current.

Noting data can be skewed when very low volumes are adjusted through an overall growth factor, existing AM and PM peak hour intersection turning movement volumes at Jimmie Kerr with the I-10 ramps and at Peart Road were calculated by taking the 2011 daily traffic volumes as collected by the City and applying a turn movement percent based on collected volume data from 2006 or from the 2011 volume data. The results of these calculations are also shown in Figure 3 along with the identified lane configurations and traffic control. Other intersections in the area along Jimmie Kerr Boulevard are not identified to be major intersections, highlighted as being low volume locations at "t-type" minor-street stop controlled intersections (a result of access to I-10 and I-8 available via other routes to and from the residential and commercial areas of Casa Grande). The only other signalized intersection in the study area is the intersection of Jimmie Kerr with Tanger Drive, virtually having negligible turn volume demand with the closing of the outlet mall now with only one or two small business operations remaining. Volume distribution at this intersection of Jimmie Kerr Boulevard and Sunland Gin Road has been estimated due to a lack of intersection turn movement volume data found for these locations.

## Capacity Analysis of Existing Conditions

For the existing AM and PM peak hour conditions, study area intersections were analyzed based on the methodologies presented in the Highway Capacity Manual 2010 and evaluated using the Synchro software package (version 8). To provide an indication
of intersection performance, signalized and unsignalized intersections are typically reported in terms of levels of service (LOS). The analysis of signalized intersections is based on the approach control delay, which includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay for all movements. Unsignalized stop-controlled intersection analysis is based on the minor street approach or critical movement, whichever is applicable. The capacity criteria for signalized and unsignalized intersection analysis are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Level of Service Criteria for Signalized/Unsignalized Intersections

| Level of Service | Average Control Delay (seconds/vehicle) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | Signalized | Unsignalized |
| A | $\leq 10.0$ | $\leq 10.0$ |
| B | $>10.0$ and $\leq 20.0$ | $>10.0$ and $\leq 15.0$ |
| C | $>20.0$ and $\leq 35.0$ | $>15.0$ and $\leq 25.0$ |
| D | $>35.0$ and $\leq 55.0$ | $>25.0$ and $\leq 35.0$ |
| E | $>55.0$ and $\leq 80.0$ | $>35.0$ and $\leq 50.0$ |
| F | $>80.0$ | $>50.0$ |

Source: Highway Capacity Manual, HCM 2010, Transportation Research Board, 2000.
Additional performance measures such as volume to capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) ratios and queue lengths also provide an indication of operations. For example, at two-way stop controlled intersections, main street traffic volumes may impose longer average delays for a small number of side-street vehicles, thus creating vehicle delays which correspond to a poor level of service. Motorists and agencies will typically accept longer delays (LOS E or F) if gaps in the traffic stream are anticipated within a reasonable timeframe and the side street traffic volumes do not warrant a traffic signal. As a general guide, gap acceptance thresholds for the longer delay values can be defined when the v/c ratios are under 0.80 , which corresponds to 80 percent capacity usage for that movement. Therefore, a traffic movement with a poor level of service but with a v/c value under 0.80 will be considered as operating acceptably. This is a typical condition of many low volume driveway and roadway intersection locations along busier major streets that would not warrant a change in traffic control or is associated with a low volume signalized turn movement at a signal that has a long cycle length.

As part of the City's Small Area Transportation Study, daily roadway capacities were based on roadway functional class and level of service based on maximum volumecapacity ratios. The following capacities and LOS used in that report are indicated below:

| Functional Classification | Daily Per Lane Capacity | LOS | Maximum V/C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arterial | 8,700 | A | 0.30 |
| Collector | 7,500 | B | 0.54 |
| Freeway Ramps | 8,000 | C | 0.75 |
|  |  | D | 0.90 |
|  |  | E | 1.00 |
|  |  | F | >1 |

In review of City and ADOT guidelines, the City of Casa Grande requires intersections and roadways that operate at LOS D or better without the development to be mitigated back to LOS D with site traffic. Where the highway/intersection will operate below LOS D in the horizon year(s) without the development traffic, the traffic impact of the development is to be mitigated to provide the same LOS at the horizon year(s). ADOT has similar mitigation requirements, but requires mitigation to LOS C instead of LOS D.

Using the AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes, the intersection controls and lane configurations shown in Figure 3 along with estimated signal timing inputs from field observation at the Jimmie Kerr/Peart intersection, and use of peak hour factors as outlined by ADOT, the information from both intersections were input into the Synchro software program to determine operational conditions of the study intersections. The results of the 2013 existing conditions are shown in Table 2. All capacity output sheets are contained in the appendix.

From the results shown in Table 2, the following can be identified:

- The signalized intersection of Jimmie Kerr and Peart is expected to operate in an overall acceptable service level (LOS D or better) in both the AM and PM peak hours with all individual movements operating at LOS B or better.
- At the I-10 stop controlled ramps with Jimmie Kerr, the only movement operating at an elevated delay level is the eastbound (southbound) I-10 Off-ramp left turn movement to eastbound Jimmie Kerr. Both AM and PM peak hours are identified to operate at a LOS F with v/c ratios just under 0.80 . Although based on operational criteria stated earlier, this movement would be considered to operate barely within the acceptable range. ADOT considers this movement as operating in an unacceptable manner. An obvious mitigation measure for this existing condition would be to signalize the intersection.
- All movements at the Jimmie Kerr and Sunland Gin intersection are estimated to operate in an acceptable manner in both the AM and PM peak hours
- All roadway segments within the study area operate at LOS C or better under current traffic volume conditions.

Table 2. Capacity Analysis Summary, 2013 Existing Conditions Intersections

| Intersection / Movement | EXISTING CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak |  |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |  |
|  | LOS | Delay | V/C | Queue | LOS | Delay | V/C | Queue |
| Int 1. Jimmie Kerr / Peart (S) | B | 13.9 |  |  | B | 18.3 |  |  |
| EB Left | B | 17.7 |  | <50 | B | 15.7 |  | <50 |
| EB Thru/Right | B | 10.6 |  | 150 | B | 19.1 |  | 261 |
| WB Left | B | 18.0 |  | <50 | B | 15.7 |  | <50 |
| WB Thru/Right | B | 16.1 |  | 254 | B | 19.7 |  | 249 |
| NB Leff/Thru/Right | B | 12.4 |  | <50 | B | 11.1 |  | <50 |
| SB Left | B | 14.7 |  | 62 | B | 19.4 |  | 134 |
| SB Thru/Right | B | 12.0 |  | <50 | A | 7.2 |  | <50 |
| Int 2. Jimmie Kerr / Cox / I-10 EB On/Off Ramps (MSS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EB Left | A | 9.1 |  | <50 | A | 8.6 |  | <50 |
| EB Thru/Right | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| WB Left | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| WB Thru/Right | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| NB Leff/Thru/Right | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| SB Left/Thru | F | 63.3 | 0.77 | 130 | F | 59.3 | 0.79 | 148 |
| SB Right | B | 12.3 |  | <50 | B | 11.8 |  | <50 |
| Int 3. Jimmie Kerr / I-10 WB On/Off Ramps (MSS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EB Left | A | 8.8 |  | <50 | A | 8.5 |  | <50 |
| EB Thru | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| WB Thru/Right | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| SB Left | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| SB Right | B | 13.5 |  | <50 | B | 11.7 |  | <50 |
| Int 4. Jimmie Kerr / Sunland Gin (MSS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EB Left | A | 8.5 |  | <50 | A | 8.1 |  | <50 |
| WB Left | A | 8.1 |  | <50 | A | 8.2 |  | <50 |
| NB Left/Thru | C | 22.3 |  | <50 | C | 22.0 |  | <50 |
| NB Right | B | 10.8 |  | <50 | B | 11.0 |  | <50 |
| SB Leff/Thru/Right | C | 19.9 |  | <50 | C | 19.3 |  | <50 |

Notes: $(S)=$ Signal, $(M S S)=$ Minor Street Strop
V/C shown if LOS E or F
Queue is the reported 95th percentile lenght in feet

## Roadway Segments

| Roadway Segment | Facility Type | Daily <br> Volume | Facility <br> Capacity | VIC | LOS |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jimmie Kerr East of Peart | 2 Lane Arterial | 10,030 | 17,400 | 0.58 | C |
| Jimmie Kerr East of Tanger | 2 Lane Arterial | 10,030 | 17,400 | 0.58 | C |
| Jimmie Kerr East of I-10 | 2 Lane Arterial | 10,062 | 17,400 | 0.58 | C |
| Selma W of I-10 | 2 Lane Arterial | 1,675 | 17,400 | 0.10 | A |
| Peart N of Jimmie Kerr | 2 Lane Arterial | 4,667 | 17,400 | 0.27 | A |
| Peart S of Jimmie Kerr | 2 Lane Arterial | 1,222 | 17,400 | 0.07 | A |
| Trekell S of Jimmie Kerr | 2 Lane Arterial | 2,701 | 17,400 | 0.16 | A |
| I-10 WB On-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 908 | 8,000 | 0.11 | A |
| I-10 WB Off-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 956 | 8,000 | 0.12 | A |
| I-10 EB On-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 1,486 | 8,000 | 0.19 | A |
| I-10 EB Off-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 2,085 | 8,000 | 0.26 | A |

## Non-Site Traffic Forecasting

Background traffic growth is typically estimated by using the existing traffic volumes as a base and elevating them to analysis year levels by applying an estimated average annual growth rate typically defined through historical traffic volume trends or as projected through a transportation plan. From the 2006 CGSATS, daily volume graphics for the study area arterial roadways were identified for projected 2010, 2020, and 2030 network conditions. Volumes were compared for the projected 2010 and 2020 model years with the results indicating significant traffic volume increases throughout the entire City, including a calculated yearly growth projection along Jimmie Kerr Boulevard just west of I-10 at 6.7 percent per year ( 25,000 to 48,000 vpd). The current traffic volume level on this section of Jimmie Kerr Boulevard is identified to be 10,000 daily vehicles, 15,000 vehicles below 2010 estimated daily volumes.

From previous discussions with the City Traffic Engineer, the growth projections within the CGSATS report were developed near the peak of the economic growth cycle during the mid-2000's and over represent volume assumptions for the identified year. The $I$ 8/Henness Change of Access Report has also identified a similar volume anomaly with traffic growth projections during this same time, noting some 2030 volume estimates within the I-10 Corridor Study, I-8 to Tangerine Road were high and considered to be representative of 2040 conditions.

## Background Conditions, Non-Site Traffic - Opening Year

Although an actual year for initial site occupancy is unknown, a 2018 opening year has been assumed. This time period has only been utilized as a basis to grow existing traffic volume conditions to provide a conservative estimate of possible capacity constraints within the study area. For the purposes of this study, a simple $2 \%$ per year area-wide growth rate for 5 years (2013 to 2018) has been used resulting in a total growth of 10.4 percent. Figure 5 displays the daily roadway volumes and the AM and PM peak hour intersection turning movement estimates for the 2018 Background Condition. The 2\% per year growth rate is considered a reasonable estimate based on comparison of City provided volume data between 2008 and 2011 which indicated volume declines and discussions with the City that has identified limited construction which would have impacted volumes near the study area. Additional traffic volume from other potential site adjacent developments (the Station and Station II projects) have not been included as formal traffic impact studies have not been previously submitted and therefore may not be imminent. It is assumed that the City and/or ADOT will require any future development to mitigate or participate in correcting any traffic concerns prior to their opening, similar to this site.

Without near-term roadway improvements planned for the study area, the roadway network for the opening year background condition is the same as current conditions. The volume data shown in Figure 5 was substituted for the current year volumes and analyzed with intersection and roadway capacity results summarized in Table 3.


Table 3. Capacity Analysis Summary, Background Conditions (Opening Year)

Intersections

| Intersection / Movement | 2018 BACKGROUND |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak |  |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |  |
|  | LOS | Delay | V/C | Queue | LOS | Delay | V/C | Queue |
| Int 1. Jimmie Kerr / Peart (S) | B | 15.0 |  |  | C | 20.6 |  |  |
| EB Left | B | 17.6 |  | <50 | B | 15.6 |  | <50 |
| EB Thru/Right | B | 11.5 |  | 301 | C | 21.8 |  | 300 |
| WB Left | B | 17.8 |  | <50 | B | 15.8 |  | <50 |
| WB Thru/Right | C | 18.0 |  | 395 | C | 22.9 |  | 285 |
| NB Left/Thru/Right | B | 12.2 |  | <50 | B | 11.2 |  | <50 |
| SB Left | B | 14.5 |  | 95 | C | 21.2 |  | 155 |
| SB Thru/Right | B | 11.8 |  | <50 | A | 7.0 |  | <50 |
| Int 2. Jimmie Kerr / Cox / I-10 EB On/Off Ramps (MSS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EB Left | A | 9.3 |  | <50 | A | 8.8 |  | <50 |
| EB Thru/Right | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| WB Left | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| WB Thru/Right | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| NB Left/Thru/Right | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| SB Left/Thru | F | 125.7 | 1.01 | 208 | F | 116.5 | 1.02 | 231 |
| SB Right | B | 13.0 |  | <50 | B | 12.4 |  | <50 |
| Int 3. Jimmie Kerr / I-10 WB On/Off Ramps (MSS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EB Left | A | 9.0 |  | <50 | A | 8.7 |  | <50 |
| EB Thru | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| WB Thru/Right | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| SB Left | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - |
| SB Right | B | 14.7 |  | <50 | B | 12.3 |  | <50 |
| Int 4. Jimmie Kerr / Tanger Dr (S) | A | 5.4 |  |  | A | 3.5 |  |  |
| EB Left | A | 1.7 |  | <50 | A | 1.7 |  | <50 |
| EB Thru | A | 1.7 |  | 102 | A | 1.8 |  | 70 |
| WB Thru | A | 7.5 |  | 468 | A | 4.7 |  | 168 |
| WB Right | A | 3.0 |  | 58 | A | 3.0 |  | <50 |
| SB Left | B | 13.1 |  | 123 | B | 13.1 |  | <50 |
| SB Right | A | 8.4 |  | <50 | A | 8.4 |  | <50 |
| Int 5. Jimmie Kerr / Sunland Gin (MSS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EB Left | A | 8.6 |  | <50 | A | 8.2 |  | <50 |
| WB Left | A | 8.2 |  | <50 | A | 8.4 |  | <50 |
| NB Left/Thru | D | 28.4 |  | 63 | D | 28.1 |  | 62 |
| NB Right | B | 11.2 |  | <50 | B | 11.4 |  | <50 |
| SB Left/Thru/Right | C | 22.7 |  | <50 | C | 22.0 |  | <50 |

[^0]Roadway Segments

| Roadway Segment | Facility Type | Daily <br> Volume | Facility <br> Capacity | VIC | LOS |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jimmie Kerr West of Peart | 2 Lane Arterial | 10,300 | 17,400 | 0.59 | C |
| Jimmie Kerr East of Peart | 2 Lane Arterial | 11,100 | 17,400 | 0.64 | C |
| Jimmie Kerr East of I-10 | 2 Lane Arterial | 11,100 | 17,400 | 0.64 | C |
| Selma E of I-10 | 2 Lane Arterial | 1,450 | 17,400 | 0.08 | A |
| Selma W of I-10 | 2 Lane Arterial | 1,850 | 17,400 | 0.11 | A |
| Peart N of Jimmie Kerr | 2 Lane Arterial | 5,150 | 17,400 | 0.30 | B |
| Peart S of Jimmie Kerr | 2 Lane Arterial | 1,350 | 17,400 | 0.08 | A |
| Trekell S of Jimmie Kerr | 2 Lane Arterial | 3,000 | 17,400 | 0.17 | A |
| I-10 EB On-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 1,000 | 8,000 | 0.13 | A |
| I-10 EB Off-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 2,300 | 8,000 | 0.29 | A |
| I-10 WB On-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 1,650 | 8,000 | 0.21 | A |
| I-10 WB Off-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 1,050 | 8,000 | 0.13 | A |

Table 3 highlights indicate:

- Acceptable intersection operations at all Jimmie Kerr intersection locations except at the I-10 EB off-ramp. During both AM and PM peak hours, the southbound approach is estimated to operate at LOS F with a v/c ratio that exceeds 1.0, indicating the need for intersection improvements prior to 2018. Mitigation to correct the poor operation is to signalize the intersection, if meeting signal installation warrant criteria.
- All study area roadway segments are estimated to operate at LOS C or better.


## Background Conditions, Non-Site Traffic - Build-out

The time-frame for site build-out is projected around year 2040, however, for the purposes of estimating traffic volumes on an existing roadway network, a 12-year horizon after site opening (year 2030) was assumed. This time period was considered based on potential modifications to ADOT facilities beyond this time that could impact volume and development patterns in the study area. To estimate growth from opening year to build-out year, a growth rate of 5.5 percent per year for 12 years (total increase of $90.1 \%$ ) was used to project volumes. The daily volume projections on the adjacent roadway network for this time period are provided in Figure 6. The use of the 5.5 percent value is based on the reasoning below:

- Future year forecast volumes (2020 and 2030) within the 2006 CGSATA are currently projected for an extended time horizon than indicated. Horizon year assumptions also include volume projections and roadway network development that are not realistic for year 2030.
- The CGSATS identified a population growth of 4 percent and employment growth of 7 percent per year between 2020 and 2030, an average population and employment growth of 5.5 percent per year.
- The Kimley-Horn Change of Access Report noted freeway volume projections for the 2025 and 2030 no-build scenarios. The I-10 freeway segment north of Jimmie Kerr (closest to subject site) was calculated to increase by a rate of 5.6 percent per year for this time period ( $31 \%$ total growth, from 74,333 vpd to $97,440 \mathrm{vpd}$ ), a estimate of regional traffic growth.
- A 5 percent per year increase is a reasonable value to use for traffic projections in communities experiencing high growth characteristics.


Notes:
Volumes are a $90.1 \%$ increase ( $5.5 \%$ per year for 12 years) above 2018 background values shown in Figure 5.

## Trip Generation

To estimate the site's trip generation characteristics, Trip Generation, Ninth Edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) 2012, was used to calculate average weekday daily total, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour number of trips. The data in this publication is categorized by land use types. The land use categories (LUC) that would be applicable to the proposed site in each phase were based on information received from the client:

- Land Use 1: Corporate Headquarters (LUC \#714) - 5,504,809 SF
- Land Use 2: Commercial, Shopping Center (LUC \#820) - 114,998 SF
- Land Use 3: Business Park (LUC \#770) - 673,873 SF
- Land Use 4: Garden Offices (LUC \#710) - 764,478 SF
- Land Use 5: General Light Industrial (LUC \#110) - 2,312,036 SF

Table 4 identifies the total trip generation characteristics estimated for the entire site based on use of the fitted curve equations to estimate the traffic associated with each land use.

## Mode Split

Based on the location of the site, all trips are assumed to arrive via private transportation and no reduction for transit, bike, or walk modes assumed.

From the ITE description of each land use, no identification is provided as to the percentage of trips generated by truck traffic. Data contained within the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Edition, identifies an AM and PM truck generation rate (based on study in Fontana, California) for warehousing/light industrial land uses per 1,000 SF of gross floor area ranging from 0.01 to 0.05 . Since the light industrial land use generates about 1 trip per 1,000 SF, $5 \%$ of all peak hour trips from the Light Industrial land use will be assumed as trucks. This portion of site traffic is assumed to travel along the most direct route between the site and interstate freeway system and will have a different distribution pattern than non-truck vehicles.

## Intra-site Traffic

Because of the expanse size of the site, there is an assumption of some multi-point travel internal to the site (i.e., private currier services, maintenance activity, car pool, food services, trips between other land use facilities). To account for this interaction, a 5\% assumption of total trips for the office/industrial land uses was assumed while a $15 \%$ assumption for the shopping center land use assumed. These trips are to be subtracted from the trip total to and from the site identified as intra-site trips, but accounted for along the internal roadway network.

## Pass-by Traffic

Due to the nature of the subject site and low volume conditions of the area, no reduction for pass-by trips were assumed. It is assumed that all trips being generated by the subject site will be new traffic.

Table 4. Trip Generation Estimate

| 을릉00 | Land Use | Office | Commercial | Bus. Park | Garden Office | Gen Lt. Indues |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ITE Land Use Code | 714 | 820 | 770 | 710 | 110 |  |
|  | ITE Land Use Title | Corporate Headquarters | Shopping Center | Business Park | Gen Office Bldg | Gen Lt. Indust |  |
|  | Land Use Variable | 1000 GFA | 1000 GLA | 1000 GFA | 1000 GFA | 1000 GFA |  |
|  | Variable Amount | 5504.895 | 114.998 | 673.873 | 764.478 | 2313.036 |  |
|  | Weekday | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.97 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+2.23$ | 42.7 | $\mathrm{T}=10.62(\mathrm{X})+715.61$ | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.76 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+3.68$ | $\mathrm{T}=7.47$ (X)-101.92 |  |
|  | AM Peak Hour | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.96 \mathrm{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+0.60$ | 0.96 | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.97 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+0.49$ | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.80 \mathrm{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+1.57$ | $\mathrm{T}=1.18(\mathrm{X})-89.28$ |  |
|  | PM Peak Hour | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.88 \mathrm{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+0.98$ | 3.71 | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.90 \mathrm{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+0.85$ | $\mathrm{T}=1.12(\mathrm{X})+78.45$ | $\mathrm{T}=1.43$ ( X$)-157.36$ |  |
| ஃ๐ | Weekday | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% |  |
|  | AM Peak Hour | 93\% | 62\% | 85\% | 88\% | 88\% |  |
|  | PM Peak Hour | 10\% | 48\% | 26\% | 17\% | 12\% |  |
|  | Percentage of Intra-Site Trips ${ }^{(1)}$ | 5\% | 15\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Grand Total |
|  | Weekday | 1,977 | 737 | 394 | 308 | 859 | 4,275 |
|  | AM Peak Hour Inbound | 331 | 11 | 39 | 43 | 98 | 522 |
|  | AM Peak Hour Outbound | 25 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 58 |
|  | PM Peak Hour Inbound | 27 | 31 | 11 | 8 | 19 | 96 |
|  | PM Peak Hour Outbound | 234 | 33 | 31 | 39 | 139 | 476 |
|  | Weekday | 37,560 | 4,174 | 7,479 | 5,852 | 16,318 | 71,383 |
|  | AM Peak Hour Inbound | 6,280 | 58 | 731 | 815 | 1,859 | 9,743 |
|  | AM Peak Hour Outbound | 472 | 36 | 128 | 110 | 252 | 998 |
|  | PM Peak Hour Inbound | 495 | 174 | 203 | 151 | 360 | 1,383 |
|  | PM Peak Hour Outbound | 4,462 | 189 | 577 | 737 | 2,633 | 8,598 |
| 告 | Weekday | 39,537 | 4,911 | 7,873 | 6,160 | 17,177 | 75,658 |
|  | AM Peak Hour Inbound | 6,611 | 69 | 770 | 858 | 1,957 | 10,265 |
|  | AM Peak Hour Outbound | 497 | 42 | 135 | 116 | 266 | 1,056 |
|  | PM Peak Hour Inbound | 522 | 205 | 214 | 159 | 379 | 1,479 |
|  | PM Peak Hour Outbound | 4,696 | 222 | 608 | 776 | 2,772 | 9,074 |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 To account for portion of trip generation made between individual lots within the site as a whole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Identified by the external trip values, build-out of site is projected to generate a grand total of approximately 71,400 daily, 10,750 AM peak hour, and 9,980 PM peak hour trips onto the adjacent street roadway network at full occupancy.

When the site generated trips (inbound plus outbound trips) are divided by the entire site development area, the average daily, AM and PM peak hour rates can be calculated, as shown below:

- Average Daily Trip Rate = 71,383 trips / 9.371 MSF = 7.62 trips / 1,000 KSF
- Average AM Pk Hr Rate $=10,741$ trips $/ 9.371 \mathrm{MSF}=1.15$ trips $/ 1,000 \mathrm{KSF}$ (15\% of daily trips)
- Average PM Pk Hr Rate $=9,981$ trips $/ 9.371 \mathrm{MSF}=1.07$ trips $/ 1,000 \mathrm{KSF}$ (14\% of daily trips)


## Trip Distribution

## Site Traffic Distribution

Distribution patterns for site traffic have been based loosely on a gravity model method, considering adjacent population centers divided by the square of the distance between the site and population center as identified from data generated from the US Census 2010 dataset (data contained in the Appendix). Percentages were then adjusted slightly to reduce the draw from the Casa Grande and Phoenix areas to increase demand to areas east, west and south as new local housing potential is realized with increased site employment opportunities. Figure 7 shows the estimated distribution percentage for traffic approaching and departing the site for build-out year, along with the total daily trip estimates for the subject site. These distribution percentages are similar to values used in the Henness Road / I-8 Traffic Interchange report conducted by Kimley-Horn.

## Proposed Site Access and I nternal Site Circulation at Full Build Out

At some point in the future, freeway improvement projects are anticipated to occur in the study area that will impact travel patterns to and from the site. None of these projects are currently programmed, allowing the site to adjust land uses, intensities, and parcel sizes to best accommodate evolving tenant need and facilitate access to the surrounding roadway network.

## Site Assignment

Figure 8 is provided to show the internal traffic assignment within the subject site. This has been calculated by identifying the daily site generated traffic volumes for selected parcel groupings, estimating the percentage of traffic to use each site access point based on Figure 7 distribution percentages, then estimating likely routes between the parcel grouping and access. Peak hour volumes on the roadways were estimated based on the trip generation data in Table 4 and calculated percentage of peak hour trips to daily trips then rounded. It can be assumed that a peak hour directional factor on these roadways can approach $70 \%$ due to access and land use locations.

Figure 9 schematically shows estimated access designs for the subject site at the major access points, internal roadway cross-section designs, and potential intersection control for internal site locations based on the information shown in Figure 8. It should be noted that a significant amount of unknown factors could modify conditions. With a total of 5 access points identified to accommodate 10,000 peak hour trips, traffic volumes will require channelized turn movements to help accommodate the desired demand and to minimize delays and queues. Additional access points may be considered and the potential for off-site parking/shuttle service could help reduce the overall number of onsite vehicles, if needed. Use of roundabouts (with by-pass channelization lanes) at the high volume access roadway/internal loop road intersections where turn movements are project to be high, may help reduce potential vehicle queue. The following items are noted regarding internal site access and circulation:


Note:
At full build-out the site it estimated to generate a total of 71,838 daily trips.
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- High demand is identified for all site access points with a destination to/from the site's internal ring road. Because of these volumes, roundabouts are preferred to signalized intersections to help vehicle flow at these locations. It would be beneficial to permit right turn movements from channelized lanes. Adequate ROW should be reserved for internal main intersections to allow flexibility in future design.
- The ring road should be considered as a 6-lane facility in the future as inbound and outbound volumes dictate the need for a wide cross-section design to accommodate peak hour traffic demands in excess of 3,000 directional peak hour vehicles. The current site plan indicates a 110 -foot ROW for the ring road matching the City of Casa Grande minor-arterial cross-section design (4-lane roadway). This is an appropriate design for near-term conditions, but underground and above ground utilities and intersection designs should consider a potential 6-lane cross-section, if and when on-site volumes dictate widening need. Other future options, such as a converting the loop road to a one-way facility, could be an alternative to a six-lane future design.
- Estimated daily volumes along the internal roadways off of the loop road that exceed 3,000 daily vehicles (segments 8,9 , and 13) should be considered as eventual 4-lane facilities, depending upon driveway access locations. All other roadway segments are appropriate as 2-lane roads.
- Secondary internal intersections could be considered for eventual signal control to help left turn movements from the internal areas, provide the necessary gaps needed for trucks and allow for possible gaps in the traffic stream for more minor side street and driveway locations.
- Other minor/minor intersections can likely be accommodated via minor street or all-way stop control.
- Because drivers will mostly be repeat motorists, they will be able to adjust their ingress and egress route, if delays become persistent.
- The internal roadways appear to be properly located, however, the first roadway off of Cornman Road east of Henness Road (segment 12, at the approximate 660foot location) may have a very difficult time accommodating outbound left turn movements due to the high vehicle demand projected along Cornman Road in this area.
- Individual site access points should promote right-in/right-out movements as much as possible and parcels/lots provide joint access with access to the side street locations where practical.
- Left turn movements to/from the ring road should be limited to the major streets, if possible. Similarly, current access management concept should be continued, allowing only right-in/right-out movements near intersections, aligning driveways on opposite side of streets, and controlling the location of left turn movements. Right turn deceleration lanes to individual lots, especially at the corporate office locations should be provided considering the identified demand along the loop road.
- Sidewalks, bike lanes, roadway lighting, should be considered to help promote safety and alternate travel options.
- No parking/stopping along the loop road or entrance roadways to the site should be allowed.
- Additional traffic control considerations may be needed based on design characteristics of specific lots.
- Over one-half of all site generated traffic is to be generated from the 5.5 million square feet of corporate headquarter office land use. The three lots proposed for this land use are located at the southeast corner of the site. The ability to provide easy access to these lots, eliminating their vehicles from using the interior loop road will improve the overall operation of the site. Options to consider may be a new right-in/right-out Jimmie Kerr access point east of Cox Road serving only the parking areas of these three lots, moving/separating the land uses to other parts of the site, utilizing one of the site lots or non-site parcel adjacent to a direct access ramp for a dedicated parking area with bus shuttle service to the entire site.


## Roadway Cross Sections

The following roadway cross-section have been identified from the City of Casa Grande 2006 CGSATS pertaining to 6-lane, 4-lane, and 2-lane designs. Widening at intersection approaches will be needed.

## City of Casa Grande Principal Arterial - Typical Section (Internal Site Ring Road and Cornman Road Designs)



City of Casa Grande Minor Arterial - Typical Section (Potential West Access Road Design, Cox Road Access, \& I-8 WB Frontage Road Access)


## City of Casa Grande Major Collector - Typical Sections

 (Low Volume Internal Road Design, segments 8, 9 \& 13)

City of Casa Grande Minor Collector - Typical Section
(Potential Site Internal Road Design, all other roads)


## LOS Analysis at Site Build Out

Background Condition
Analysis was conducted for the build-out year along the study area roadway segments only and assuming no roadway network modifications. Intersection turn movement analyses were not conducted noting significant unknown roadway network variables that could influence its operating conditions, including the location/improvement of freeway access points, location of population growth areas and commercial developments, and ability for agencies or developer to pay for infrastructure improvements. The level of service conditions for the roadway segments are based on the City of Casa Grande roadway capacity values utilized earlier in the report and the daily traffic volumes shown
in Figure 6. The assumed number of lanes for the facility type may be different than existing conditions (all roadways are single lane directional facilities) to keep the LOS value at LOS D or better. Table 5 shows the facilities required to accommodate estimated daily volumes in an acceptable manner at build-out.

Table 5. Roadway Segment LOS, Background Conditions (Build-out)

| Roadway Segment | Facility Type <br> Assumption | Daily <br> Volume | Facility <br> Capacity | VIC | LOS |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jimmie Kerr West of Peart | 4 Lane Arterial | 19,600 | 34,800 | 0.56 | C |
| Jimmie Kerr East of Peart | 4 Lane Arterial | 21,100 | 34,800 | 0.61 | C |
| Jimmie Kerr East of I-10 | 4 Lane Arterial | 21,100 | 34,800 | 0.61 | C |
| Selma E of I-10 | 2 Lane Arterial | 2,750 | 17,400 | 0.16 | A |
| Selma W of I-10 | 2 Lane Arterial | 3,500 | 17,400 | 0.20 | A |
| Peart N of Jimmie Kerr | 2 Lane Arterial | 9,800 | 17,400 | 0.56 | C |
| Peart S of Jimmie Kerr | 2 Lane Arterial | 2,600 | 17,400 | 0.15 | A |
| Trekell S of Jimmie Kerr | 2 Lane Arterial | 5,700 | 17,400 | 0.33 | B |
| I-10 EB On-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 1,900 | 8,000 | 0.24 | B |
| I-10 EB Off-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 4,400 | 8,000 | 0.55 | C |
| I-10 WB On-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 3,100 | 8,000 | 0.39 | B |
| I-10 WB Off-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 2,000 | 8,000 | 0.25 | A |

The results of Table 5 indicate:

- Jimmie Kerr Boulevard will need widening to a minimum 4-lane arterial roadway by 2030.
- All other roadway segments can accommodate estimated 2030 background volumes at LOS C or better.


## Total Traffic Conditions

Noting the daily, AM peak hour and PM peak hour site traffic generation previously indicated in Table 4, the distribution of site related trips as indicated in Figure 7, and identification of the site access points shown in Figure 8, the following can be concluded:

- To accommodate the projected 71,400 daily trips to be generated by the site, the total number of roadway network lanes needed to accommodate site traffic is approximately equal to 8 directional lanes ( $71,400 \mathrm{vpd} / 8,700 \mathrm{vpdpl}=8.2$ directional lanes).
- When considering the directional aspects of the peak hour demand at the site access points, it is assumed one lane (turn or through) can accommodate $10 \%$ or 870 vehicles per hour per direction. Based on this assumption, the AM and PM peak hour demand would require approximately 11 approach lanes leading into the site ( $9,743 \mathrm{vph} / 870 \mathrm{vph}=11.2$ lanes) and 10 lanes exiting the site ( $8,598 \mathrm{vph}$ / $870 \mathrm{vph}=9.9$ lanes). Figure 9 identifies 12 inbound lanes and 8 outbound lanes. Channelization of turn movements may allow for a reduction in the estimated number of lanes.

Figure 10 has been developed to identify the future daily traffic volume conditions at site build-out assuming the site-related traffic volumes are placed onto the existing roadway network under two scenarios. The first scenario assumes two site access points, the west access roadway between Cornman and Peart and a Cox Road access. The second scenario also assumes two access points, the west access roadway and the I-8/Henness TI. Table 6 provides the roadway segment capacity analysis results below for each scenario under the total traffic condition (and excludes any additional or diverted background traffic as a result of the access roads and the Henness TI). It should be noted that the analysis does not consider the additional traffic potential from other site developments or diverted traffic potential.

Table 6. Roadway Segment LOS, Total Traffic Conditions (Build-out)
Scenario 1, West Access and Cox Road Access

| Roadway Segment | Facility Type <br> Assumption | Daily <br> Volume | Facility <br> Capacity | VIC | LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jimmie Kerr West of Peart | 6 Lane Arterial | 41,020 | 52,200 | 0.79 | D |
| Jimmie Kerr East of Peart | 4 Lane Arterial | 21,100 | 34,800 | 0.61 | C |
| Jimmie Kerr East of I-10 | 6 Lane Arterial | 31,990 | 52,200 | 0.61 | C |
| Peart N of Jimmie Kerr | 4 Lane Arterial | 28,080 | 34,800 | 0.81 | D |
| Peart S of Jimmie Kerr | 6 Lane Arterial | 31,160 | 52,200 | 0.60 | C |
| Trekell S of Jimmie Kerr | 2 Lane Arterial | 12,840 | 17,400 | 0.74 | C |
| I-10 EB On-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 5,470 | 8,000 | 0.68 | C |
| I-10 EB Off-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 2 Lane Ramp | 16,893 | 16,000 | 1.06 | F |
| I-10 WB On-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 15,593 | 16,000 | 0.97 | E |
| I-10 WB Off-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 5,570 | 8,000 | 0.70 | C |
| West Site Access Rd. N of Cornmanna | 4 Lane Arterial | 28,560 | 34,800 | 0.82 | D |

Scenario 2, West Access and I-8/Henness Rd TI

| Roadway Segment | Facility Type <br> Assumption | Daily <br> Volume | Facility <br> Capacity | VIC | LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jimmie Kerr West of Peart | 6 Lane Arterial | 30,310 | 52,200 | 0.58 | C |
| Jimmie Kerr East of Peart | 4 Lane Arterial | 21,100 | 34,800 | 0.61 | C |
| Jimmie Kerr East of I-10 | 4 Lane Arterial | 21,100 | 34,800 | 0.61 | C |
| Peart N of Jimmie Kerr | 4 Lane Arterial | 24,510 | 34,800 | 0.70 | C |
| Peart S of Jimmie Kerr | 4 Lane Arterial | 24,020 | 34,800 | 0.69 | C |
| Trekell S of Jimmie Kerr | 2 Lane Arterial | 2,600 | 17,400 | 0.15 | A |
| I-10 EB On-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 1,900 | 8,000 | 0.24 | B |
| I-10 EB Off-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 4,400 | 8,000 | 0.55 | C |
| I-10 WB On-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 3,100 | 8,000 | 0.39 | B |
| I-10 WB Off-Ramp at Jimmie Kerr | 1 Lane Ramp | 2,000 | 8,000 | 0.25 | A |
| West Site Access Rd. N of Cornman | 4 Lane Arterial | 21,420 | 34,800 | 0.62 | C |
| Henness Rd. S of Cornman | 6 Lane Arterial | 49,960 | 52,200 | 0.96 | E |



West Access to Peart and Cox Road Access Only


West Access to Peart and Henness TI Access Only

## Legend

3,570 - Daily Traffic Volume, Site Component
3,570 - Daily Traffic Volume, Background + Site

Comments pertaining to each scenario are listed below:

## Scenario 1

- Allows traffic to distribute between the east and west portions of the site.
- Will require the West Access Road and Peart Road south of Jimmie Kerr to be 6lane facilities.
- Will require an additional I-10 access other than at Jimmie Kerr.
- No direct access to I-8 and the site is provided.


## Scenario 2

- Permits site traffic to only enter/exit from the west side of the site.
- Will require an additional access point onto Henness Road in addition to the Henness/Cornman access.
- Will require an additional access point from I-8 westbound as over 35,000 daily trips (17,500 inbound) are anticipated to access the site from this direction. This volume can't be accommodated via typical interchange design.
- Can serve and promote development of the Casa Grande Mountain Ranch development south of I-8.

The results of the above analysis indicate two access points will not likely be able to accommodate site traffic at full build-out and will likely require both the Henness TI and the Cox Road access to accommodate traffic demand in an acceptable manner.

## I ncremental LOS Analysis to Determine Near-Term Site Development Threshold Values

To determine the amount and type of roadway network improvements are needed based on an unknown amount of site development intensity for opening year, AM and PM peak hour intersection turning movement capacity analyses were conducted. Utilizing the nobuild opening year background traffic condition as a base scenario, site traffic was added to the intersection until an individual movement operated at LOS E (signalized) or at a volume to capacity ratio exceeded 0.80 (stop controlled). The added traffic, considered site generated trips, was converted to average site development area using the AM and PM peak hour average trip rates (calculated in the Trip Generation section of this report) for the entire site. These site development "trigger" values are identified as a percentage of total site development that can be constructed before for the next major transportation improvement is required. Only near-term analysis was considered appropriate as too many variables exist for the build-out year.

As part of the opening year background capacity analysis, the I-10 EB On/Off Ramp approach to Jimmie Kerr Boulevard is identified to operate in an unacceptable manner in both AM and PM peak hours. Any site development traffic added to this intersection will require improvements to this location.

Table 7 identifies the near-term "trigger" values for major roadway improvements dependent upon the level of site occupancy and peak hour estimates. Multiple scenarios are possible.

Table 7. Near-Term Development Trigger Points

| Jimmie Kerr / Peart Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario | Control Period | Site Occupancy Trigger | Needed Improvement |
| No-Build | PM Peak | up to $2.7 \%$ or 250,000 SF | None. Increase cycle length and modify green splits. |
| Alt 1 | AM Peak | up to 4.5\% or 475,000 SF | Improve NB Peart S of Jimmie Kerr, single NBL, T, R lanes. P/P NBL \& SBL. Requires widening of UPRR crossing. |
| Alt 2 | AM Peak | up to $11.0 \%$ or 1,032,000 SF | Spot widen E/W approaches, 2 EBT and 2 WBT lanes, dual WBL, 2 SB lanes S of Jimmie Kerr. |
| Alt 3 | AM \& PM Peak | up to $14.5 \%$ or 1,360,000 SF | Three thru, 2 left, 1 right where needed - Over 14.5\% requires another Jimmie Kerr intersection. Improvements to the l-10 WB ramp / Jimmie Kerr intersection. 4-lane Jimmie Kerr cross-section. |
| Site Access Points |  |  |  |
| West Site Access Roadway |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Control | Site Occupancy Trigger | Needed Improvement |
| Opening Year |  | 0\% or 0 SF | Jimmie Kerr / l-10 EB intersection |
| Alt A1 | 2-lane access roadway peak hour directional capacity, ~ 1050/ln | up to $11.0 \%$ or 1,032,000 SF | Assumes acceptable operation at Jimmie Kerr / I-10 EB intersection |
| Alt A2 | 4-lane access roadway peak hour directional capacity, ~ 1200/ln | up to $24.9 \%$ or 2,330,000 SF | Requires Alt 2 improvements to Jimmie Kerr/Peart intersection, l-10 WB ramp/Jimmie Kerr intersection and a second Jimmie Kerr intersection (Selma Highway) for site traffic. Maximum capacity of single site access point for traffic to/from north. |
| Alt A3 | 4-lane access roadway peak hour directional capacity, ~ 1200/ln | up to $26.8 \%$ or 2,516,000 SF | Maximum capacity of single site access point for a combination of traffic to/from North and I-8/Henness TI. |
| Alt A4 | 6-lane access roadway peak hour directional capacity, - 1600/ln | up to 49.6\% or 4,650,000 SF | Assumes acceptable operation at Jimmie Kerr and I10 ramps, requires second Henness site access. |
| Cox Road Site Access |  |  |  |
| Alt B | 4-lane access roadway peak hour capacity, ~ 1000/In | Can accommodate up to $20.7 \%$ or 1,940,000 SF | Assumes acceptable signalized intersection of Jimmie Kerr with the I-10 ramps and improved UPRR crossing |
| 1-8 / Henness Road TI |  |  |  |
| Alt C | Single Lane On-Off Ramps | Can accommodate up to 27.4\% of $2,570,000 \mathrm{SF}$ | Construct TI, requires additional Henness Road access to site other than at Cornman |

The above table indicates the following major trigger points:

1. Improvements to the Jimmie Kerr/I-10 EB intersection are require as 2018 background conditions identify LOS F conditions for the eastbound off-ramp left turn movement in both the AM and PM peak hours.
2. Site occupancy can reach $11.0 \%$ of total site build-out with spot improvements to the Jimmie Kerr / Peart Road intersection and improvement to the Peart Road UPRR crossing assuming only the 2-lane west access roadway.
3. Site occupancy can reach $14.5 \%$ of total with the above improvements, widening of Jimmie Kerr to a 4-lane facility, improvements to the Jimmie Kerr/I-10 WB On-Off intersection, and widening of the west access roadway to a 4-lane cross section.
4. Site occupancy can reach $24.9 \%$ of total with the above improvements and another Jimmie Kerr intersection from the west access road for site traffic to access. This assumes the Jimmie Kerr/I-10 intersections can accommodate traffic demand and no I-8/Henness interchange.
5. Site occupancy can reach $26.8 \%$ of total for a single site access point at Cornman/Henness Road with the I-8/Henness TI. Depending upon when this TI is operational, this may or may not require the list of improvements along Jimmie Kerr that were previously identified.
6. Site occupancy could potentially reach $49.6 \%$ based on a 6-lane Henness Road/west access road design. To accommodate this traffic demand, a second Hessness Road access will be required.
7. A Cox Road access could accommodate up to $20.7 \%$ of site occupancy.
8. The I-8/Henness TI could accommodate up to $27.4 \%$ of site occupancy.

Overall, it is estimated that the single west access point could accommodate a maximum of about $50 \%$ of site occupancy prior to another major site access being required.

Use of peak hour traffic conditions as opposed to daily capacity values are considered to be a more conservative approach to the trigger values that have been developed. Conditions could be re-evaluated upon more detailed information involving the site opening year, adjacent developments, on-site tenant characteristics, and changes to roadway volumes and conditions.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

The following bullet items highlight the conclusions of this study based on the information presented and interpretation of the analyses performed:

- Previous City and ADOT recommends have identified no improvements are planned for any study area facilities that are not developer driven or developer paid.
- Assuming a $2 \%$ per year background growth rate for 5 years, all study area roadway segments are anticipated to operate at LOS C or better for the opening year non-site background conditions. Only the stop controlled I-10 eastbound offramp left turn movement at Jimmie Kerr is expected to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hour conditions for this time period.
- Adjacent development projects within the study area (the Station and the Station II developments) have not been considered as part of the background traffic volumes. New developments are assumed to mitigate any poor operational roadways conditions, or at a minimum, contribute to roadway improvement costs within the study area.
- At build-out, the $9,371,000 \mathrm{SF}$ of site development is estimated to generate a total of 71,383 daily trips, 10,741 AM peak hour trips and 9,981 PM peak hour trips onto the adjacent roadway network based on the site's land use assumptions. Over half of all trips generated are projected from the office headquarter land use located in the southeast corner of the site. The ability to manage the vehicles from these parcels will have a significant impact on the operation of the internal loop roadway.
- To accommodate site traffic at build-out, a total of 5 access points are being considered. At site opening, only the west access roadway is planned. The introduction of the other four access points is dependent upon development intensity, timing, and other considerations that are not known at this time. In all, the five access points are anticipated to include a total of 11 inbound lanes and 8 outbound lanes.
- To accommodate traffic projections at build-out, the site's internal loop roadway should be considered as an eventual six-lane facility as peak hour traffic volumes could exceed 3,000 directional vehicles. The central north/south connector roadway and potential future direct access ramp into the site from the I-8/Henness westbound off-ramp may require construction with a 4-lane cross-section. All other site roadways can be constructed as two-lane facilities.
- Site access to and from the adjacent roadway network should consider use of channelized movements to minimize delays and queues associated with signalized operations. It may be beneficial to provide sufficient right-of-way along the loop road to accommodate roundabouts with by-pass lanes to facilitate movements, specifically at the intersections with the site access roadways.
- The developer is to construct a west 2-lane access roadway between the site's Cornman/Henness access point and Peart Road for opening year. This two-lane roadway can accommodate up to $11 \%$ of site occupancy based on anticipated peak hour demand (and could potentially accommodate up to $22 \%$ based on daily capacity values). To accommodate the $11 \%$, improvements will be required at the Jimmie Kerr/Peart and Jimmie Kerr/I-10 intersections along with UPRR highway grade crossing improvements on Peart Road. Site occupancy above this value will require a 4-lane access roadway and additional roadway network improvements. The single west site access point could accommodate up to $26.8 \%$ of total site occupancy before another site access is required.
- A 4-lane site access at Cox Road, intersecting at the Jimmie Kerr/I-10 eastbound On-Off Ramp intersection, could accommodate up to $20.7 \%$ of total site development. To advance this access point, widening/improvement of the UPRR highway-grade rail crossing and significant improvements to the Jimmie Kerr intersections with the I-10 ramps will be needed.
- The I-8/Henness traffic interchange is identified to accommodate up to $27.4 \%$ of total site development under typical single lane ramp considerations. The construction of the Henness TI will also help promote development of the Casa Grande Mountain Ranch development south of I-8.

The following recommendations are presented.

- Improvements to the Jimmie Kerr / I-10 Eastbound On-Off Ramp intersection is required to accommodate site traffic and existing non-site traffic movements at site opening. The extent of improvements should consider the potential of a site access at Cox Road, timing of the I-8/Henness traffic interchange, and site development intensity.
- Trigger thresholds have been identified at opening year for the following levels of total site occupancy (excludes I-10/Jimmie Kerr intersection considerations):
o Up to $2.7 \%$ - Requires no roadway improvements.
o Up to $4.5 \%$ - Requires improvement to the northbound Peart Road approach to Jimmie Kerr, signal phasing changes, and improvement / widening of the UPRR rail crossing at Peart Road.
o Up to $11.0 \%$ - Requires spot widening of the Jimmie Kerr Boulevard approaches at Peart Road to two lanes, dual westbound left turn lanes, and southbound Peart Road widening to accommodate two lanes.
o Up to $14.5 \%$ - Requires further/ultimate widening/improvement to the Jimmie Kerr / Peart Road intersection, requires Jimmie Kerr to be widened to a 4-lane roadway between Peart and the I-10 ramps, improvement of the I-10 Westbound On-Off ramp intersection with Jimmie Kerr, and widening of the west access road to a 4-lane design.
o Up to $24.9 \%$ - Requires a second west access road intersection to Jimmie Kerr and acceptable access to/from I-10.
o Up to $26.8 \%$ - Requires the I-8/Henness interchange and is the maximum site occupancy that can be accommodated by the single site access point planned for opening year.
o The west access roadway could potentially accommodate up to $49.6 \%$ of total site occupancy, but requires a second site access. The I-8/Henness TI is estimated to accommodate up to $27.4 \%$ of site development and a Cox Road access is estimated to accommodate up to $20.7 \%$ of site traffic.
- As more details become evident for opening year, including specific tenants and their land uses, building layout designs, and site access needs, traffic impact studies should be prepared for each construction phase. This will provide more detail into specific improvements that are required along with the timing of such improvements.


## APPENDIX

Master Circulation Study
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| File Name: <br> Start Date: <br> Sinct Time: <br> Sita Cada: <br> Locatton 1: | $\begin{aligned} & 51-1019-182 \\ & 311 / 2011 \\ & 12.00 .00 \mathrm{AM} \\ & 182 \\ & \text { Selma Hwry } \end{aligned}$ | ast dide |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tme | Esst | Hotarly Total |  | Houry Total | Total |
|  | 0.00 .00 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 2 |
|  | 0:15:00 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 9 |
|  | 0.30:00 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
|  | 0.4500 | 2 | 3. | 0 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 1000:00 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
|  | 1:175:00 | $\square$ |  | 2 |  | 3 |
|  | 1:30:00 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 |
|  | 1.45:00. | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | 2:0000 | - 1 |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | 2:15:00 | 0 |  | 1 |  | , |
|  | 23000 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
|  | $2.45: 00$ | 0 | 2. | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | 3.00:00 | - 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |
|  | 315.00 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
|  | 33.309 | $\square$ |  | 0 |  | 1 |
|  | 3:45:00 | - 1 | 4 | 1 | 4. | 2 |
|  | 4.0000 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |
|  | 4115:00 | 2. |  | 4 |  | 6 |
|  | 4:30.00. | 0 |  | 4 |  | 4 |
|  | 4:45:00 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 4 |
|  | 5:00.00 | 4 |  | 5 |  | 10 |
|  | 6.1509 | 6 |  | 4 |  | 10 |
|  | 553000 | 1 |  | 4 |  | 5 |
|  | 5:46:00 | 2. | 43 | 5 | 19 | 7 |
|  | 6.00 .00 | 5. |  | 8. |  | 13 |
|  | 6.1500 | 14. |  | 6. |  | 20 |
|  | 6.30:00 | 9 |  | 13 |  | 22 |
|  | 6.4500 | 14 | 42 | 15 | 42 | 29 |
|  | 7:00.00. | 6. |  | 31 |  | 17 |
|  | 71500 | 14 |  | 19 |  | 33 |
|  | 73000 | 11 |  | 14 |  | 25 |
|  | 7.4500 | 5 | 38 | 15 | 60 | 21 |
|  | 8:0000 | 7 |  | 15 |  | 22 |
|  | 8:15.00 | 7 |  | 12 |  | 18 |
|  | 8.30 .00 | 9 |  | 15 |  | 24 |
|  | 8.45.00 | 2 | 25 | 17 | 59 | 19 |
|  | 9.00:00 | 7 |  | 9 |  | 18 |
|  | 0:15:00 | $\square \quad 4$ |  | 12 |  | 15 |
|  | $9.30 \cdot 00$ | 8 |  | 13 |  | 21 |
|  | 0.4500 | 8. | 27 | 11 | 45 | 19 |
|  | 1000:00 | 10 |  | 5 |  | 15 |
|  | 10:1500 | 7 |  | 7. |  | 14. |
|  | 10,30.00 | 5 |  | 8 |  | 13 |
|  | 10.45 .001 | 8 | 30 | 11 | 31 | 19 |
|  | 1100:00 | 5 |  | 9. |  | 14 |
|  | 11:15:00 | 8. |  | 5. |  | 14 |
|  | 11:30.00 | 6. |  | 7 |  | 13 |
|  | 11/45:00 | 3. | 23 | 8 | 28 | 11 |
|  | 12:00:00 | 9 |  | 8 |  | 17 |
|  | 12.15.00 | 6. |  | 7 |  | 13 |
|  | 12:30.00 | 7 |  | 8 |  | 15 |
|  | 12:45:00\| | 7 | 29 | 10 | 33 | 77 |
|  | 13:00:00 | 17 |  | 10. |  | 27 |
|  | 1315500 | 12 |  | 11 |  | 23 |
|  | 13:30.00 | 6 |  | 10 |  | 16 |
|  | 13:45:00 | 8. | 43 | 13. | 44. | 21 |
|  | 14:00:00 | 11. |  | 18 |  | 29 |
|  | 14:15:00 | 9 |  | 11 |  | 20 |
|  | 14.30:00 | 14 |  | 12 |  | 25 |
|  | 14.45 .00. | 18 | 52 | 16 | 57 | 34 |
|  | 15:00:00 | 14 |  | 10 |  | 24 |
|  | 15:15:00 | 10 |  | 16. |  | 26 |
|  | 15:3000 | 11. |  | 15. |  | 26 |
|  | 15.45 .00 | 19 | 54 | 15 | 50 | 34 |
|  | 16:00:00 | 7 |  | 13. |  | 20 |
|  | 16:15:00 | 17 |  | 19 |  | 30 |
|  | 18,30:00 | 17 |  | 13 |  | 30 |
|  | 16:45:00 | 20 | 61 | 15. | 60 | 35 |
|  | 17:00:00 | 18 |  | 11. |  | 30 |
|  | 17715:00 | 16 |  | 10 |  | 26 |
|  | 1730:00 | 12 |  | 9 |  | 21 |
|  | 17:45:00 | 19. | 66 | 7 | 37 | 26 |
|  | 1800000 | 11 |  | 8 |  | 19 |
|  | $18.15 \cdot 00$ | 7 |  | 6. |  | 13 |
|  | 18,30.00 | 11. |  | 5 |  | 17 |
|  | 18:45:00] | 9 | 38 | 6 | 26 | 15 |
|  | 19,00:00 | 8 |  | 6 |  | 14 |
|  | 18.1500 | 4 |  | 4 |  | 8 |
|  | 1930000 | 5 |  | 3 |  | 8. |
|  | 19.45:00 | - 2 | 15 | 6 | 19 | 8 |
|  | 20,00:00 | 7 |  | 3 |  | 10 |
|  | 20.1500 | 5 |  | 2 |  | 7 |
|  | 20.30 .00 | 4 |  | 1 |  | 5 |
|  | 20.45:00 | 2 | 18 | 2 | 8 | 4 |
|  | 21:00:00 | 1. |  | 3 |  | 4 |
|  | 21:15:00. | 9 |  | 3 |  | 12 |
|  | 21:30:00 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 6 |
|  | 21:45:00. | 2 | 15. | 0 | 9 | 2. |
|  | 22:00:00 | 4 |  | 1 |  | 5 |
|  | 22:15:00 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 6 |
|  | 22:30:00 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
|  | 22:45:00. | 4 | 12 | 2 | 7 | 6 |
|  | 2300.00 | 1 |  | 3 |  | H |
|  | 23:15:00 | 1 |  | 4 |  | 5 |
|  | 23:3000 | - 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
|  | 23:45:00 | 1 | 4.1 | 0 | 8 | 1 |
| 24 Hr . Totais |  | 623 |  | 673 |  | 1296 |
| AMP Peak hir |  | 6:45 |  | 7:15 |  |  |
| AM Poak Hr To |  | ${ }^{45}$ |  | ${ }_{6} 6$ |  |  |


| PM Peak Hr | 16:55 | $15: 30$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| PM P*ak Hz Total | 73. | 62 |
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| PM Poak Hi | ta:00 | 13:00 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| PM PGak H: Totai | 67 | 48 |


| File Name: <br> Start Deta: <br> SLan Time: <br> Sifa Coda: <br> Location 1; | $\begin{aligned} & 11-1019-188 \\ & 3 \cdot 1 / 2019 \\ & 12: 00.00 \mathrm{AM} \\ & \text { 188 } \\ & \text { Jimmie Ker } \mathrm{a} \end{aligned}$ | and west of P | Pearl 8 d. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Time | East | Hourly Fotal |  | Houry Totai | Tolat |
|  | 0.00001 | 8 |  | 19 |  | 18 |
|  | 0.15 .00 | 9. |  | 3 |  | 12 |
|  | 0.30 .60 | 11 |  | 3 |  | 14 |
|  | 0.45:00 | 5 | 34 | 5 | 20. | 10 |
|  | 1:0000 | 7 |  | 4 |  | 11 |
|  | 1:15,00 | 7 |  | 5 |  | 12 |
|  | 1:3000 | 3. |  | 6 |  | 9 |
|  | 1:45.00 | 3 | 20 | 1 | 16 | 4 |
|  | 2:0000 | 4 |  | 2 |  | 6 |
|  | 2.15.00 | 6. |  | 2. |  | , |
|  | 2:30.00 | 2 |  | 10 |  | 12 |
|  | 2:45:00 | 2. | 14 | 7 | 21 | 9 |
|  | 3:00.00. | 5. |  | 4 |  | 8 |
|  | 3.15.00 | 3 |  | 10 |  | 13 |
|  | 3,30:00 | 3. |  | 19. |  | 22 |
|  | 3.4500 | 7 | 18 | 5 | 36 | 12 |
|  | 8:00:00 | 5 |  | 10 |  | 16 |
|  | 44500 | 11 |  | 23 |  | 34 |
|  | 430.00 | 13. |  | 24 |  | 37 |
|  | 4.4500 | 18. | 46 | 18 | 75 | 34 |
|  | 5:00:00 | 21 |  | 21. |  | 42 |
|  | 5.15:00, | 27. |  | 34 |  | 61 |
|  | 5:30:00 | 25 |  | 35. |  | 60 |
|  | 5.45:00 | 17 | 90 | 37 | 127 | 54 |
|  | 8:00:00 | 21 |  | 39 |  | 60 |
|  | 8:15:00 | 49 |  | 56 |  | 105 |
|  | 6:30:00 | 52 |  | 55 |  | 107 |
|  | 6.45:00 | 53 | 175 | 55 | 205 | 108 |
|  | 7.0000 | 53. |  | 84. |  | 137 |
|  | 2:15:001 | 63. |  | 94 |  | 157 |
|  | 7.3000 | 89. |  | 110 |  | 189 |
| $304$ | 7:95:00 | 79 : | \% 284 | 85 | 573 | 964 |
|  | 8.00 .00 | 73 |  | 58. |  | 131 |
|  | 81500 | 514 |  | 66 |  | 117 |
|  | 8:30:00 | 80 |  | 78. |  | \% |
|  | 8.45 .00 | 63 | 247 | 73 | 275 | 136 |
|  | 800.00 | 57 |  | 65 |  | 123 |
|  | 915:00 | 58 |  | 73 |  | 131 |
|  | 9:30:00 | 45 |  | 71 |  | 116 |
|  | 9.45:00 | 49 | 200 | 60 | 270 | 109 |
|  | 10:00:00 | 88 |  | 56 |  | 154 |
|  | 10:15:00 | B0 |  | 69 |  | 149 |
|  | 10:30.00 | 67 |  | 75 |  | 182 |
|  | 104500 | 48 | 303. | 62 | 272 | 110 |
|  | 1:0000 | 77 |  | 95. |  | 172 |
|  | 11115.00 | 70 |  | 99 |  | 169 |
|  | 1130.00 | 79 |  | 78 |  | 157 |
|  | $11: 4500 \mathrm{y}$ | 89 | 315. | 78 | 351 | 168 |
|  | 12.00 .001 | 88 |  | 108 |  | 198 |
|  | 12.55:00\| | 70 |  | 81 |  | 157 |
|  | 1230009 | 93 |  | 77 |  | 170 |
|  | 12:45:00 | 79 | 330 | 81 | 357 | 170 |
|  | 12.00.09 | 86 |  | 81 |  | 167 |
|  | 1315.00 | 68 |  | 73 |  | 159 |
|  | 13:30:00 | 80 |  | 89 |  | 169 |
|  | 13.45.00. | 91 | 343 | 95 | 339 | 185 |
|  | 14.0000 | 93 |  | 96 |  | 188 |
|  | 14:15:09 | 107 |  | 114 |  | 215 |
|  | 14:30:00 | 106 |  | 92 |  | 198. |
|  | 14.45:00. | 103 | 403 | 96 | 389 | 199 |
|  | 150000 | 129 |  | 106 |  | 235 |
|  | 15:15:00 | 112 |  | 88 |  | 210 |
|  | \$5:30.00 | 177 |  | $11 / 3$ |  | 230 |
|  | 15:45:00 | 101 | 459 | 97 | 414 | 198 |
|  | 160000 | 83 |  | 101 |  | 189 |
|  | 16:15:00 | 81. | - | 101 |  | 192 |
|  | $16: 3000$ | 97. | - | 97 |  | 184 |
|  | 16.45:00. | 103) ${ }^{\text {+ }}$ | + 368 | 77 | 376 | 180 |
| 7 | 17:00:00 | 86 |  | 88 |  | 184 |
|  | 17:15:00 | 80 |  | 74 |  | 154 |
|  | 17:30.00 | 66 |  | 77 |  | 143 |
|  | 17.45:00 | 79 | 32.1 | 71 | 310 | 150 |
|  | 18:00:00 | 81 |  | 85 |  | 169 |
|  | 18.75:001 | 53 |  | 59 |  | 112 |
|  | 1830:00 | 55 |  | 56 |  | 111 |
|  | 18:45:09 | 62 | 251 | 46 | 249 | 108 |
|  | 18000.00 | 51 |  | 47 |  | 98 |
|  | 10,15:00 | 38 |  | 36 |  | 74 |
|  | 18:30:00 | 44. |  | 35 |  | 79 |
|  | 19:45:00 | 36 | $\underline{17}$ | 27 | 145 | 65 |
|  | 20:00.00 | 40 |  | 22 |  | 62 |
|  | 2015000 | 38 |  | 28 |  | 66 |
|  | 20:30:00 | 36 |  | $\underline{27}$ |  | 63 |
|  | 20:45:00 | 29 | 143 | 26 | 303 | 65 |
|  | 2100000 | 35 |  | 14 |  | 48 |
|  | 21:15:00 | 24 |  | 21 |  | 45 |
|  | 21:30:00 | 15 |  | 21 |  | 36 |
|  | 21950.01 | 17 | 81 | 19 | 75 | 36 |
|  | 22:00:00 | 18. |  | 17. |  | 35 |
|  | 22:15:00 | 25 |  | 70 |  | 35 |
|  | 22:30:00, | 8 |  | 4 |  | 26 |
|  | 224500 | - 18 | $\underline{-10}$ | 10 | 54 | 28 |
|  | 23:00:00 | 16 |  | 10 |  | 26 |
|  | 23:35:00\| | -17 |  | 17 |  | 34 |
|  | 23.3000 | 16 |  | 12 |  | 28 |
|  | 23:45:00 | 15 | 64 | 13 | 52 | 28 |
| 24 Mr . Touls |  | 4770 |  | 4814 |  | 8684 |
| as Pask Mr AM Pask Hr T |  | $\begin{gathered} 11: 45 \\ 340 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 00 \\ & 373 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |


| File Nama: Stort Dato: <br> Start Time: <br> Sits Code: <br> Location 1: | $\begin{aligned} & 11-1019-072 \\ & 31 / 2011 \\ & \text { i2:00:00 AM } \\ & 072 \\ & \text { Peart Rd soutt } \end{aligned}$ | Wh of Erioy |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Trime | North | Hourly Total | Souts | Houriy Total | Total |
|  | 0,00:00 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
|  | $0.15: 00$ | 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |
|  | $0: 30 \cdot 0$ | 3 |  | 3 |  | 5 |
|  | 04500 | 1 | \| 6 | 2 | 8 | 3 |
|  | 1:00:00 | - 2 |  | 1 |  | 3 |
|  | 115500 | 3 |  | 2 |  | 5 |
|  | 1:30:00 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
|  | 1.4500 | 2 | 7. | 1 | 4 | 3 |
|  | 2:00.00 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
|  | 2:15.00 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 3 |
|  | 2:30:00 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 2 |
|  | 2:45:00 | 0 | 3. | 3 | 7 | 3 |
|  | 3.00.00 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 |
|  | 3.15:00 | $\square$ |  | 0 |  | 4 |
|  | 3:30:00 | - 1 |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | 3.4500 | - 4 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
|  | 400000 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 4 |
|  | 415.00 | 8 |  | 3 |  | 19 |
|  | 4:30.00 | 4 |  | 4 |  | 8 |
|  | 4:45:00 | 3 | 18 | 3 | 11 | 6 |
|  | 5.00 .001 | $\underline{9}$ |  | 0 |  | 9 |
|  | 5.1500 | 7. |  | 12 |  | 18 |
|  | 535000 | 13 |  | 15 |  | 28 |
|  | 5.45:00 | 7 | 36 | 8 | 36 | 15 |
|  | 0:00:00 | 21 |  | 13 |  | 34 |
|  | 8:15:00 | 15 |  | 20 |  | 35 |
|  | 6:30.00 | 22 |  | 21 |  | 43 |
|  | 6:45:00 | 23 | 81 | 25 | 79 | 48 |
|  | 7:00:00 | 40 |  | 19. |  | 50 |
|  | 7:15:00 | 43 |  | 32 |  | 75 |
|  | 73000 | 40 |  | 24 |  | 64 |
|  | 74500 | 31 | 154 | 34 | 109 | 65 |
|  | 8.0000 | 35 |  | 18 |  | 53 |
|  | 8:15:00 | 45 |  | 20 |  | 85 |
|  | $8: 3000$ | 29. |  | 26 |  | 55 |
|  | 8.45001 | 53 | 152 | 24 | 88 | 77 |
|  | 0.0000 | 33. |  | 29 |  | 62 |
|  | 915:00 | 37. |  | 47 |  | 84 |
|  | 930001 | 44 |  | 27 |  | 71 |
|  | 8.45 .09 | 30 | 14.4 | 42 | 145 | 72 |
|  | 10,00:00 | 39 |  | 35 |  | 74 |
|  | 10.15.00 | 33. |  | 42 |  | 75 |
|  | 103000 | 28 |  | 24 |  | 52 |
|  | 10:45.00 | 24 | 124 | 28 | 129 | 52 |
|  | 110000 | 29 |  | 32 |  | 81 |
|  | 11.15:00 | 22 |  | 30 |  | 52 |
|  | 11:30:00 | 20 |  | 33 |  | 53 |
|  | 11:45:00 | 25 | 86 | 26 | 121 | 51 |
|  | 12:00.00 | 41 |  | 53 |  | 64 |
|  | 12:15:00. | 33 |  | 39 |  | 78 |
|  | 12:30:00 | 44 |  | 55 |  | 39 |
|  | 124500 | 45 | 189 | 36. | 186 | 84 |
|  | 13:00:00 | 40 |  | 57. |  | 97 |
|  | 1315:00 | 36 |  | 39 |  | 75 |
|  | 13.3000 | 40 |  | 56 |  | 96 |
|  | 13.4500 | 32 | 148 | 52 | 204 | 84 |
|  | 14.00:00 | 44 |  | 50. |  | 94 |
|  | 14.15:00 | 49 |  | 48 |  | 87 |
|  | 14:3000 | 39 |  | 46. |  | 85 |
|  | 144500 | 38 | 170 | 53 | 187 | 91 |
|  | 15:00.00 | 46 |  | 57 |  | 103 |
|  | 15.15 .00 | 63 |  | 34 |  | 117 |
|  | 15:3000 | 48 |  | 42. |  | 80 |
|  | 15:45:00 | 44 | 201 | 50. | 203 | 94 |
|  | 16:00:00 | 40 |  | 53 |  | 93 |
|  | 15515:00 | 58 |  | 62 |  | 120 |
|  | 16:30:00 | 48 |  | 46 |  | 95 |
|  | 16.45:00. | 31 | 178 | 53 | 214 | 84 |
|  | 1700:00 | 33 |  | 65 |  | 95 |
|  | 17:15:00 | 35 |  | 53 |  | 88 |
|  | 17:30:00 | 43. |  | 43 |  | 86 |
|  | 127400 | 32 | 143 | 36 | 187 | 68 |
|  | 18.00.00. | 20 |  | 48 |  | 66 |
|  | 18,15:00 | 24 |  | 33 |  | 57 |
|  | 18.30 .00 | 25 |  | 36 |  | 61 |
|  | 18.4500 | 27 | ${ }^{86}$ | 28 | 143 | 55 |
|  | 18.0000 | 28 |  | 33 |  | 62 |
|  | 19.15:00 | -14 |  | 44 |  | 58 |
|  | 19:30:00 | 9 |  | 24 |  | 33 |
|  | 19.4500 | 14 | 65 | 20 | 121 | 34 |
|  | 20.0000 | 14 |  | 12 |  | 28 |
|  | 20.15.00 | 13 |  | 23 |  | 36 |
|  | 20.30600 | 8 |  | 29 |  | 28 |
|  | 20.45.00 | ${ }_{6} 6$ | 41 | 12 | 77 | 28 |
|  | 21:00:00 | 13 |  | 12 |  | 25 |
|  | 21.15 .00 | 3. |  | 14 |  | 17 |
|  | 2130.009 | 14. |  | 14 |  | 28 |
|  | 21:45:00 | 8 | 38 | 17 | 57 | 25 |
|  | 22:00.00 | 4 |  | 11 |  | 15 |
|  | 22:15:00. | 8 |  | 11 |  | 19 |
|  | 22:30:00 | 8 |  | 6. |  | 12 |
|  | 22:4500 | - | 22 | 5 | 33 | 8 |
|  | 2300:00 | 7 |  | 7 |  | 14 |
|  | 23:15:00 | - 3 |  | 4 |  |  |
|  | 23.3000 | $\underline{-5}$ |  | 8 |  | 13 |
|  | 23.45.00\| | 4 | 191 | 3 | 22 |  |
| 24 Hr . Totais |  | 2132 |  | 2392 |  | 4524 |
| AM Poak Hr |  | ${ }^{8} / 45$ |  | 11:45 |  |  |
| AM Foak Hr To |  | \$67 |  | 173 |  |  |

File Name: 14-1019-139
Slant Date: 2.232011
Star Tina: 12.00 .60 am
Site Code: 739
Location 1: Jimmie Ker Bivd, west of Sunland Gin Red.
263

$\begin{array}{lll}\text { PM Pasik Hr } \\ \text { PM Peah Mr Total } & \begin{array}{c}\text { 16:45 } \\ 594\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}15: 00 \\ 468\end{array}\end{array}$

YEAR 2020 NEEDS
NETWORK PERFORMANCE
AND VOLUME ESTIMATES
Level of Service

- LOS A－B
- LOS C
－LOS D
- LOS E
XX－Das F
（thousands）
七－9 ヨyก૭I」

YEAR 2030 NEEDS
NETWORK PERFORMANCE
AND VOLUME ESTIMATES

|  | $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ 1 \\ \dot{\jmath} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ש } \\ \text { © } \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



# Arizona Cities by <br> Population 

Get a list of Arizona cities by population. The data are from the US Census 2010 dataset. Below are Arizona cities ranked 1 through 451. You can copy and paste this list directly into your favorite spreadsheet program. Don't you just adore lovely numbers listed nicely in columns \& rows? We do!

| Arizona Cities by Population Rank | City | Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Phoenix | 1,445,632 |
| 2 | Tucson | 520,116 |
| 3 | Mesa | 439,041 |
| 4 | Chandler | 236,123 |
| 5 | Glendale | 226,721 |
| 6 | Scottsdale | 217,385 |
| 7 | Gilbert | 208,453 |
| 8 | Tempe | 161,719 |
| 9 | Peoria | 154,065 |
| 10 | Surprise | 117,517 |
| 11 | Yuma | 93,064 |
| 12 | San Tan Valley | 81,321 |


| 13 | Avondale | 76,238 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Casas Adobes | 66,795 |
| 15 | Flagstaff | 65,870 |
| 16 | Goodyear | 65,275 |
| 17 | Lake Havasu City | 52,527 |
| 18 | Buckeye | 50,876 |
| 19 | Catalina Foothills | 50,796 |
| 20 | Casa Grande | 48,571 |
| 21 | Sierra Vista | 43,888 |
| 22 | Maricopa | 43,482 |
| 23 | Oro Valley | 41,011 |
| 24 | Prescott | 39,843 |
| 25 | Bullhead City | 39,540 |
| 26 | Prescott Valley | 38,822 |
| 27 | Sun City | 37,499 |
| 28 | Apache Junction | 35,840 |
| 29 | Marana | 34,961 |
| 30 | El Mirage | 31,797 |
| 31 | Kingman | 28,068 |
| 32 | Drexel Heights | 27,749 |
| 33 | Oueen Creek | 26,361 |
| 34 | Fortuna Foothills | 26,265 |
| 35 | Florence | 25,536 |
| 36 | San Luis | 25,505 |
| 37 | Sahuarita | 25,259 |
| 38 | Sun City West | 24,535 |
| 39 | Fountain Hills | 22,489 |


| 40 | Anthem | 21,700 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 41 | Green Valley | 21,391 |
| 42 | Nogales | 20,837 |
| 43 | Rio Rico | 18,962 |
| 44 | Douglas | 17,378 |
| 45 | Tanque Verde | 16,901 |
| 46 | Eloy | 16,631 |
| 47 | Flowing Wells | 16,419 |
| 48 | Payson | 15,301 |
| 49 | New River | 14,952 |
| 50 | Sierra Vista <br> Southeast | 14,797 |
| 51 | Fort Mohave | 14,364 |
| 52 | Somerton | 14,287 |
| 53 | Sun Lakes | 13,975 |
| 54 | Paradise Valley | 12,820 |
| 55 | Tucson Estates | 12,192 |
| 56 | New Kingman-Butler | 12,134 |
| 57 | Coolidge | 11,825 |
| 58 | Verde Village | 11,605 |
| 59 | Cottonwood | 11,265 |
| 60 | Camp Verde | 10,873 |
| 61 | Chino Valley | 10,817 |
| 62 | Show Low | 10,660 |
| 63 | Arizona City | 10,475 |
| 64 | Vail | 10,208 |
| 65 | Gold Canyon | 10,159 |
| 66 | Sedona | 10,031 |


| 67 | Winslow | 9,655 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 68 | Saddlebrooke | 9,614 |
| 69 | Safford | 9,566 |
| 70 | Picture Rocks | 9,563 |
| 71 | Valencia West | 9,355 |
| 72 | Tuba City | 8,611 |
| 73 | Golden Valley | 8,370 |
| 74 | Catalina | 7,569 |
| 75 | Globe | 7,532 |
| 76 | Page | 7,247 |
| 77 | Tolleson | 6,545 |
| 78 | Wickenburg | 6,363 |
| 79 | Youngtown | 6,156 |
| 80 | Village of Oak Creek (Big Park) | 6,147 |
| 81 | Avra Valley | 6,050 |
| 82 | Corona de Tucson | 5,675 |
| 83 | South Tucson | 5,652 |
| 84 | Snowflake | 5,590 |
| 85 | Three Points | 5,581 |
| 86 | Bisbee | 5,575 |
| 87 | Guadalupe | 5,523 |
| 88 | Litchfield Park | 5,476 |
| 89 | Williamson | 5,438 |
| 90 | Doney Park | 5,395 |
| 91 | Summit | 5,372 |
| 92 | Paulden | 5,231 |
| 93 | Kayenta | 5,189 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Splits and Phases: 1: Peart Rd \& Jimmie Kerr Blvd


|  | 4 |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | 「 |
| Volume (vph) | 11 | 332 | 594 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1703 | 1792 | 1792 | 1524 | 1703 | 1524 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.310 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 556 | 1792 | 1792 | 1524 | 1703 | 1524 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | 12 |  | 12 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 12 | 369 | 660 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA | NA | Perm | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 | 8 |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 6 |
| Total Split (s) | 8.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Act Efft Green (s) | 29.4 | 32.6 | 31.2 | 31.2 | 5.8 | 5.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.83 | 0.92 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.02 | 0.22 | 0.42 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.05 |
| Control Delay | 1.7 | 1.7 | 7.5 | 3.0 | 13.1 | 8.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 1.7 | 1.7 | 7.5 | 3.0 | 13.1 | 8.4 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | B | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 1.7 | 7.4 |  | 10.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A | A |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 4 | 54 | \#280 | 6 | 11 | 9 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 12631 | 390 |  | 833 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) | 325 |  |  | 125 |  | 50 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 592 | 1657 | 1582 | 1347 | 773 | 698 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.02 | 0.22 | 0.42 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 35.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 5.4 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 41.3\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 5: Jimmie Kerr Blvd \& Tanger Dr


2: Cox Rd/I-10 EB On/Off Ramps \& Jimmie Kerr Blvd

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 18.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Vol, veh/h | 82 | 251 | 0 | 0 | 556 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 0 | 33 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | Stop |
| Storage Length | 250 | - | - | 250 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 80 | 85 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 80 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 85 | 90 | 80 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Mvmt Flow | 102 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 618 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 0 | 41 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  | Minor1 |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 632 | 0 | 0 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 1125 | 1132 | 295 | 1125 | 1125 | 625 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 500 | 500 | - | 625 | 625 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 625 | 632 | - | 500 | 500 | - |
| Follow-up Headway | 2.254 | - | - | 2.254 | - | - | 3.554 | 4.054 | 3.354 | 3.554 | 4.054 | 3.354 |
| Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver | 932 | - | - | 1244 | - | - | 179 | 200 | 735 | 179 | 202 | 478 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 546 | 537 | - | 466 | 471 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 466 | 468 | - | 546 | 537 |  |
| Time blocked-Platoon, \% |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver | 932 | - | - | 1244 | - | - | 150 | 178 | 735 | 164 | 180 | 478 |
| Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | 150 | 178 | - | 164 | 180 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 486 | 478 | - | 415 | 471 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 426 | 468 | - | 486 | 478 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 2.4 | 0 | 0 | 110.4 |
| HCM LOS |  | A | F |  |


| Minor Lane / Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 0 | 932 | - | - | 1244 | - | - | 173 | 478 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | + | 0.11 | - | - | - | - | - | 1.011 | 0.058 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 0 | 9.339 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 125.7 | 13 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A |  |  | A |  | F | B |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | + | 0.369 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 8.221 | 0.183 |

Notes
~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; \$ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, slveh | 4.8 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Movement | 1 | 278 | 79 | 79 | 497 | 1 | 60 | 1 | 179 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |  |
| Sign Control | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| RT Channelized | - | -175 | 250 | - | - | - | - | 70 | - | - | - |  |  |
| Storage Length | 200 | - | 175 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, $\%$ | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 80 | 80 | 90 | 90 | 85 | 90 | 85 | 90 | 90 | 90 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Mumt Flow | 1 | 309 | 99 | 99 | 552 | 1 | 71 | 1 | 211 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  | Minor1 |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 553 | 0 | 0 | 309 | 0 | 0 | 1062 | 1062 | 309 | 1062 | 1061 | 553 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 311 | 311 | - | 750 | 750 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 751 | 751 | - | 312 | 311 |  |
| Follow-up Headway | 2.254 | - | - | 2.254 | - | - | 3.554 | 4.054 | 3.354 | 3.554 | 4.054 | 3.354 |
| Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver | 997 | - | - | 1229 | - | - | 198 | 220 | 722 | 198 | 220 | 525 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 691 | 651 | - | 397 | 413 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 397 | 413 | - | 690 | 651 |  |
| Time blocked-Platoon, \% |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver | 997 | - | - | 1229 | - | - | 184 | 202 | 722 | 131 | 202 | 525 |
| Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | 184 | 202 | - | 131 | 202 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 690 | 650 | - | 397 | 380 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 363 | 380 | - | 487 | 650 |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 1.2 | 19.8 | 22.7 |
| HCM LOS |  | $C$ | $C$ |  |


| Minor Lane / Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 292 | 722 | 997 | - | - | 1229 | - | - | 207 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.486 | 0.194 | 0.001 | - | - | 0.08 | - | - | 0.016 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 28.4 | 11.2 | 8.615 | - | - | 8.185 | - | - | 22.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | D | B | A |  |  | A |  | C |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 2.502 | 0.717 | 0.003 | - | - | 0.262 | - | - | 0.049 |

## Notes

~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; \$ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\hat{1}$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  | \% | $\hat{1}$ |  |
| Volume (vph) | 13 | 383 | 20 | 21 | 320 | 83 | 23 | 38 | 9 | 212 | 12 | 31 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1703 | 1778 | 0 | 1703 | 1737 | 0 | 0 | 1734 | 0 | 1703 | 1599 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.907 |  | 0.700 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1703 | 1778 | 0 | 1703 | 1737 | 0 | 0 | 1598 | 0 | 1255 | 1599 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 5 |  |  | 21 |  |  | 11 |  |  | 39 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 16 | 451 | 0 | 26 | 474 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 249 | 54 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 20.0 | 20.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.2 | 16.5 |  | 10.2 | 16.5 |  |  | 15.2 |  | 15.2 | 15.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.23 | 0.37 |  | 0.23 | 0.37 |  |  | 0.34 |  | 0.34 | 0.34 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.04 | 0.68 |  | 0.07 | 0.72 |  |  | 0.16 |  | 0.58 | 0.09 |  |
| Control Delay | 15.6 | 21.8 |  | 15.8 | 22.9 |  |  | 11.2 |  | 21.2 | 7.0 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 15.6 | 21.8 |  | 15.8 | 22.9 |  |  | 11.2 |  | 21.2 | 7.0 |  |
| LOS | B | C |  | B | C |  |  | B |  | C | A |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 21.6 |  |  | 22.5 |  |  | 11.2 |  |  | 18.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 3 | 79 |  | 4 | 81 |  |  | 11 |  | 41 | 2 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (t) | 15 | \#299 |  | 21 | \#285 |  |  | 42 |  | \#155 | 21 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 4350 |  |  | 12631 |  |  | 1291 |  |  | 849 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) | 165 |  |  | 140 |  |  |  |  |  | 120 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 585 | 665 |  | 585 | 660 |  |  | 556 |  | 431 | 575 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.03 | 0.68 |  | 0.04 | 0.72 |  |  | 0.16 |  | 0.58 | 0.09 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 44.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 20.6 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 48.6\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Peart Rd \& Jimmie Kerr Blvd


|  | 4 |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | 「 |
| Volume (vph) | 11 | 410 | 458 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1703 | 1792 | 1792 | 1524 | 1703 | 1524 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.394 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 706 | 1792 | 1792 | 1524 | 1703 | 1524 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | 12 |  | 12 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 12 | 456 | 509 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA | NA | Perm | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 | 8 |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 6 |
| Total Split (s) | 8.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Act Efft Green (s) | 29.4 | 32.6 | 31.2 | 31.2 | 5.8 | 5.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.83 | 0.92 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.02 | 0.28 | 0.32 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.05 |
| Control Delay | 1.7 | 1.8 | 4.7 | 3.0 | 13.1 | 8.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 1.7 | 1.8 | 4.7 | 3.0 | 13.1 | 8.4 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | B | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 1.8 | 4.7 |  | 10.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A | A |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 4 | 70 | \#168 | 6 | 11 | 9 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 12631 | 390 |  | 833 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) | 325 |  |  | 125 |  | 50 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 700 | 1657 | 1582 | 1347 | 773 | 698 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.02 | 0.28 | 0.32 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 35.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 3.5 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 34.1\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 5: Jimmie Kerr Blvd \& Tanger Dr


2: Cox Rd/I-10 EB On/Off Ramps \& Jimmie Kerr Blvd

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 21.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Vol, veh/h | 87 | 322 | 0 | 0 | 437 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 0 | 110 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | Stop |
| Storage Length | 250 | - | - | 250 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 85 | 85 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 80 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 85 | 90 | 85 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Mvmt Flow | 102 | 379 | 0 | 0 | 486 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 129 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  | Minor1 |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 496 | 0 | 0 | 379 | 0 | 0 | 1075 | 1080 | 379 | 1075 | 1075 | 491 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 584 | 584 | - | 491 | 491 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 491 | 496 |  | 584 | 584 | - |
| Follow-up Headway | 2.254 | - | - | 2.254 | - | - | 3.554 | 4.054 | 3.354 | 3.554 | 4.054 | 3.354 |
| Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver | 1047 | - | - | 1158 | - | - | 194 | 214 | 659 | 194 | 216 | 570 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 491 | 492 | - | 552 | 542 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 552 | 539 | - | 491 | 492 | - |
| Time blocked-Platoon, \% |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver | 1047 | - | - | 1158 | - | - | 139 | 193 | 659 | 180 | 195 | 570 |
| Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | 139 | 193 | - | 180 | 195 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 443 | 444 | - | 498 | 542 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 427 | 539 | - | 443 | 444 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 1.9 | 0 | 0 | 86.6 |
| HCM LOS |  | A | F |  |


| Minor Lane / Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 0 | 1047 | - | - | 1158 | - | - | 209 | 570 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | + | 0.098 | - | - | - | - | - | 1.023 | 0.151 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 0 | 8.811 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 116.5 | 12.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A |  |  | A |  | F | B |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | + | 0.324 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 9.253 | 0.53 |

Notes
~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; \$ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Vol, veh/h | 1 | 300 | 113 | 113 | 383 | 1 | 57 | 1 | 176 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | 200 | - | 175 | 250 | - | - | - | - | 70 | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 85 | 85 | 90 | 90 | 80 | 90 | 85 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 333 | 133 | 133 | 426 | 1 | 71 | 1 | 207 | 1 | 1 | 1 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  | Minor1 |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 427 | 0 | 0 | 333 | 0 | 0 | 1029 | 1029 | 333 | 1028 | 1028 | 426 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 336 | 336 | - | 692 | 692 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 693 | 693 | - | 336 | 336 | - |
| Follow-up Headway | 2.254 | - | - | 2.254 | - | - | 3.554 | 4.054 | 3.354 | 3.554 | 4.054 | 3.354 |
| Pot Capacity-1 Maneuver | 1111 | - | - | 1204 | - | - | 208 | 230 | 700 | 209 | 230 | 620 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 670 | 635 | - | 428 | 439 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 427 | 439 | - | 670 | 635 | - |
| Time blocked-Platoon, \% |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Capacity-1 Maneuver | 1111 | - | - | 1204 | - | - | 189 | 204 | 700 | 134 | 204 | 620 |
| Mov Capacity-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | 189 | 204 | - | 134 | 204 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 669 | 634 | - | 428 | 391 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 378 | 391 | - | 471 | 634 | - |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 19.8 |  |  | 22 |  |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  |


| Minor Lane / Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 294 | 700 | 1111 | - | - | 1204 | - | - | 215 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.481 | 0.197 | 0.001 | - | - | 0.11 | - | - | 0.016 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 28.1 | 11.4 | 8.244 | - | - | 8.361 | - | - | 22 |
| HCM Lane LOS | D | B | A |  |  | A |  | C |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 2.461 | 0.729 | 0.003 | - | - | 0.371 | - | - | 0.047 |

## Notes

~ : Volume Exceeds Capacity; \$ : Delay Exceeds 300 Seconds; Error : Computation Not Defined

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\hat{1}$ |  |  | \$ |  | \% | $\hat{F}$ |  |
| Volume (vph) | 42 | 262 | 97 | 137 | 270 | 134 | 29 | 41 | 29 | 106 | 86 | 7 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1703 | 1714 | 0 | 1703 | 1699 | 0 | 0 | 1697 | 0 | 1703 | 1771 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.881 |  | 0.676 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1703 | 1714 | 0 | 1703 | 1699 | 0 | 0 | 1516 | 0 | 1212 | 1771 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 32 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 24 |  |  | 5 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 52 | 412 | 0 | 161 | 458 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 125 | 117 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 15.0 | 38.0 |  | 20.0 | 43.0 |  | 22.0 | 22.0 |  | 22.0 | 22.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.0 | 33.6 |  | 12.4 | 42.3 |  |  | 15.5 |  | 15.5 | 15.5 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.13 | 0.44 |  | 0.16 | 0.55 |  |  | 0.20 |  | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.23 | 0.54 |  | 0.59 | 0.48 |  |  | 0.38 |  | 0.51 | 0.32 |  |
| Control Delay | 34.0 | 18.1 |  | 39.0 | 13.2 |  |  | 25.4 |  | 36.0 | 28.3 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 34.0 | 18.1 |  | 39.0 | 13.2 |  |  | 25.4 |  | 36.0 | 28.3 |  |
| LOS | C | B |  | D | B |  |  | C |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 19.9 |  |  | 19.9 |  |  | 25.4 |  |  | 32.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 23 | 125 |  | 74 | 131 |  |  | 42 |  | 55 | 47 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (t) | 50 | 229 |  | 124 | 227 |  |  | 77 |  | 101 | 81 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 4350 |  |  | 12631 |  |  | 1291 |  |  | 849 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) | 165 |  |  | 140 |  |  |  |  |  | 120 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 222 | 770 |  | 333 | 958 |  |  | 355 |  | 269 | 397 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.23 | 0.54 |  | 0.48 | 0.48 |  |  | 0.35 |  | 0.46 | 0.29 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Length: 76.6
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.59
Intersection Signal Delay: 22.4
Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 55.7\%
ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 1: Peart Rd \& Jimmie Kerr Blvd



Splits and Phases: 1: Peart Rd \& Jimmie Kerr Blvd


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 1 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Volume (vph) | 42 | 262 | 155 | 253 | 270 | 134 | 36 | 48 | 41 | 106 | 144 | 7 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1703 | 1685 | 0 | 1703 | 1699 | 0 | 1703 | 1792 | 1524 | 1703 | 1780 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.581 |  |  | 0.642 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1703 | 1685 | 0 | 1703 | 1699 | 0 | 1041 | 1792 | 1524 | 1151 | 1780 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 38 |  |  | 35 |  |  |  | 194 |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 52 | 485 | 0 | 298 | 458 | 0 | 45 | 60 | 51 | 125 | 189 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 15.0 | 31.0 |  | 25.0 | 41.0 |  | 14.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 14.0 | 20.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.1 | 26.3 |  | 18.0 | 40.8 |  | 23.8 | 15.2 | 15.2 | 24.6 | 17.9 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.12 | 0.31 |  | 0.21 | 0.48 |  | 0.28 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.29 | 0.21 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.26 | 0.89 |  | 0.83 | 0.55 |  | 0.12 | 0.19 | 0.12 | 0.32 | 0.51 |  |
| Control Delay | 40.3 | 48.6 |  | 53.7 | 20.6 |  | 21.6 | 34.1 | 0.6 | 24.1 | 37.6 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 40.3 | 48.6 |  | 53.7 | 20.6 |  | 21.6 | 34.1 | 0.6 | 24.1 | 37.6 |  |
| LOS | D | D |  | D | C |  | C | C | A | C | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 47.8 |  |  | 33.7 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 32.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th ( ft ) | 28 | 251 |  | 160 | 191 |  | 17 | 30 | 0 | 51 | 100 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 56 | \#448 |  | \#259 | 299 |  | 37 | 58 | 0 | 88 | 149 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 4350 |  |  | 12631 |  |  | 1291 |  |  | 849 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 165 |  |  | 140 |  |  |  |  |  | 120 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 202 | 545 |  | 403 | 831 |  | 369 | 318 | 430 | 396 | 374 |  |
| 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 | 0.26 | 0.89 |  | 0.74 | 0.55 |  | 0.12 | 0.19 | 0.12 | 0.32 | 0.51 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 85.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 36.5 |  |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 73.9\% |  |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Peart Rd \& Jimmie Kerr Blvd




Splits and Phases: 1: Peart Rd \& Jimmie Kerr Blvd



|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | 4 | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 快 | 「 | \％${ }^{1 / 1}$ | 䩒个 | F | \％${ }^{1+1}$ | 个4 | 「 | \％${ }^{1 / 1}$ | 性 | F |
| Volume（vph） | 42 | 262 | 363 | 710 | 270 | 134 | 61 | 73 | 92 | 106 | 372 | 7 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1703 | 4893 | 1524 | 3303 | 4893 | 1524 | 3303 | 3406 | 1524 | 3303 | 3406 | 1524 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.562 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1007 | 4893 | 1524 | 3303 | 4893 | 1524 | 3303 | 3406 | 1524 | 3303 | 3406 | 1524 |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 260 |  |  | 149 |  |  | 194 |  |  | 194 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 47 | 291 | 403 | 789 | 300 | 149 | 68 | 81 | 102 | 118 | 413 | 8 |
| Turn Type | pm＋pt | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Total Split（s） | 16.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 31.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 14.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 14.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Act Efft Green（s） | 28.5 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 23.4 | 38.4 | 38.4 | 10.2 | 16.2 | 16.2 | 10.2 | 16.2 | 16.2 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.34 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.28 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.12 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.12 | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| v／c Ratio | 0.11 | 0.27 | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.13 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.12 | 0.23 | 0.29 | 0.63 | 0.02 |
| Control Delay | 12.8 | 29.8 | 22.6 | 39.6 | 16.1 | 4.1 | 37.2 | 31.0 | 1.2 | 38.3 | 37.3 | 0.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 12.8 | 29.8 | 22.6 | 39.6 | 16.1 | 4.1 | 37.2 | 31.0 | 1.2 | 38.3 | 37.3 | 0.1 |
| LOS | B | C | C | D | B | A | D | C | A | D | D | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 24.8 |  |  | 29.7 |  |  | 20.5 |  |  | 37.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th（ft） | 11 | 50 | 73 | 211 | 39 | 0 | 18 | 20 | 0 | 31 | 115 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th（ft） | 28 | 77 | \＃223 | \＃294 | 60 | 37 | 38 | 40 | 0 | 58 | 164 | 0 |
| Internal Link Dist（tt） |  | 4350 |  |  | 12631 |  |  | 1291 |  |  | 849 |  |
| Turn Bay Length（ t ） | 300 |  | 300 | 300 |  | 300 | 300 |  | 300 | 300 |  | 300 |
| Base Capacity（vph） | 447 | 1070 | 536 | 1043 | 2242 | 779 | 401 | 703 | 468 | 401 | 703 | 468 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v／c Ratio | 0.11 | 0.27 | 0.75 | 0.76 | 0.13 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.29 | 0.59 | 0.02 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length： 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length： 83.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type：Semi Act－Uncoord |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v／c Ratio： 0.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay： 29.0 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS：C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 69．4\％ |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \＃95th percentile volume exceeds capacity，queue may be longer．Queue shown is maximum after two cycles． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases：1：Peart Rd \＆Jimmie Kerr Blvd


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 种 | 「 | \％${ }^{1 / 4}$ | 快 | 「 | 7＊ | 个 $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％${ }^{*}$ | ¢ $\uparrow$ | F |
| Volume（vph） | 13 | 383 | 75 | 149 | 320 | 83 | 331 | 336 | 634 | 212 | 67 | 31 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1703 | 4893 | 1524 | 3303 | 4893 | 1524 | 3303 | 3406 | 1524 | 3303 | 3406 | 1524 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.531 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 952 | 4893 | 1524 | 3303 | 4893 | 1524 | 3303 | 3406 | 1524 | 3303 | 3406 | 1524 |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 182 |  |  | 182 |  |  | 345 |  |  | 182 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 14 | 426 | 83 | 166 | 356 | 92 | 368 | 373 | 704 | 236 | 74 | 34 |
| Turn Type | pm＋pt | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Total Split（s） | 15.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 19.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 14.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Act Effct Green（s） | 25.2 | 15.1 | 15.1 | 10.1 | 27.5 | 27.5 | 18.6 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 10.1 | 26.3 | 26.3 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.30 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.12 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.22 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.12 | 0.31 | 0.31 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.04 | 0.49 | 0.20 | 0.42 | 0.22 | 0.15 | 0.51 | 0.31 | 0.92 | 0.60 | 0.07 | 0.06 |
| Control Delay | 20.7 | 34.6 | 1.0 | 39.9 | 24.2 | 0.5 | 35.4 | 19.8 | 32.0 | 43.8 | 20.1 | 0.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 20.7 | 34.6 | 1.0 | 39.9 | 24.2 | 0.5 | 35.4 | 19.8 | 32.0 | 43.8 | 20.1 | 0.2 |
| LOS | C | C | A | D | C | A | D | B | C | D | C | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 28.9 |  |  | 24.9 |  |  | 29.8 |  |  | 34.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th（tt） | 5 | 81 | 0 | 46 | 52 | 0 | 102 | 73 | 196 | 67 | 14 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th（ft） | 19 | 115 | 0 | 77 | 97 | 0 | 149 | 106 | \＃439 | 105 | 30 | 0 |
| Internal Link Dist（tt） |  | 4350 |  |  | 12631 |  |  | 1291 |  |  | 849 |  |
| Turn Bay Length（ t ） | 300 |  | 300 | 300 |  | 300 | 300 |  | 300 | 300 |  | 300 |
| Base Capacity（vph） | 373 | 876 | 422 | 394 | 1590 | 618 | 746 | 1464 | 851 | 394 | 1261 | 678 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v／c Ratio | 0.04 | 0.49 | 0.20 | 0.42 | 0.22 | 0.15 | 0.49 | 0.25 | 0.83 | 0.60 | 0.06 | 0.05 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length： 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length： 84.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type：Semi Act－Uncoord |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v／c Ratio： 0.92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay： 29.1 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS：C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 71．8\％ |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \＃95th percentile volume exceeds capacity，queue may be longer．Queue shown is maximum after two cycles． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases：1：Peart Rd \＆Jimmie Kerr Blvd



[^0]:    Notes: $(\mathrm{S})=$ Signal, $(\mathrm{MSS})=$ Minor Street Strop
    V/C shown if LOS E or F
    Queue is the reported 95th percentile lenght in feet

