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## INTRODUCTION

The Downtown Bozeman Transportation Study was initiated in 2020 with Part I being completed in December 2020. It evaluated design concepts for the recommended improvements in the 2019 Downtown Bozeman Improvement Plan (DBIP) for the following downtown streets: Babcock Street, Main Street and Mendenhall Street.

Sanderson Stewart is currently contracted with the Downtown Bozeman Partnership to complete the Babcock \& Mendenhall Safety Improvements Study, which consists of data analysis and a traffic safety study focusing on corridor and intersection improvements along Babcock Street and Mendenhall Street. This report will provide a summary of the data analysis and safety solutions for the corridors and intersections.

## SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

A study was performed to evaluate the downtown Bozeman operational and safety existing conditions and concerns, specifically for the corridors of Mendenhall Street and Babcock Street, between Tracy Avenue and Black Avenue. The corridors were studied, and a sign inventory was performed to help determine existing conditions for evaluation and recommended improvements. The Traffic volumes were collected and evaluated to determine the AM, noon and PM peak hours of travel which correlated with 8:30-9:30 AM, II:45-I2:45 PM, and 4:45-5:45 PM, respectively. Intersection capacity calculations were performed to determine that all intersections operate at an acceptable level of service, a qualitative measure of performance of an intersection abased on speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver and comfort and convenience. No vehicular traffic signal warrants were met.

A speed study was performed to determine travel speeds along the corridors. It was found that 85 percent of traffic travels between 27 and 30 mph on both corridors of Mendenhall Street and Babcock Street. Pedestrian and bicycle volumes were collected and evaluated to determine the AM, noon, and PM peak hours of travel. There was no clue morning peak hour for pedestrians/bicyclists, but a noon peak hour of 12:15-I:I5 PM was evident with a smaller peak at 2:15-3:I5 PM. Pedestrian level of service, which measures connectivity, directness and safety were found to be acceptable on Mendenhall Street, Main Street and Babcock Street.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A crash analysis was performed to determine crash trends regarding frequency and severity at intersections and along the corridors. A historical crash rate higher than predicted was found at Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue. It was determined that pedestrian crashes typically resulted in injuries. There were four (4) pedestrian crashes in the study area, and several rear-end collisions resulting from a lead vehicle stopping for a pedestrian. Corridor crashes typically involved right angle crashes involving vehicles leaving access points, rear-end collisions and pedestrian/bicycle collisions, with the latter resulting in the most severe crashes.

A summary of FHWA's pedestrian safety countermeasures was provided. For roadways in the project area, per FHWA guidance, it is suggested that high visibility crosswalk markings, parking restrictions on crosswalk approaches, adequate nighttime lighting level and pedestrian crossing warning signs always be considered. Additionally, consideration should be given to raised crosswalks, in-street pedestrian crossing signs, and curb extensions. Each project intersection was evaluated for presence of the suggested countermeasures, and two (2) study area intersections, Tracy

Avenue/Mendenhall and Babcock Street/Black Street were used as example intersections. Graphics to illustrate the application of potential countermeasures and costs were provided. Recommendations to the study area were provided to help improve safety in downtown Bozeman, including the installation of curb bulb outs/extensions, increased crosswalk signs and pavement markings, lighting and restricting parking.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

## Streets

Babcock Street (eastbound) and Mendenhall Street (westbound) are both one-way streets with two (2) travel lanes, Main Street has a four-lane section with two travel lanes in each direction, and the north/south streets through downtown generally have two-lane sections with two-way traffic. All downtown streets generally provide parallel parking on both sides of the street and there is consistent sidewalk throughout the project area.

There are painted striped crosswalks across all legs of every intersection in the downtown area. Pedestrian crossings at Main Street intersections are controlled by traffic signals. There are curb bulb-outs on some corners for pedestrian crossings along Babcock Street, but no other permanent pedestrian facilities currently exist in the study area. Temporary painted curb bulb-outs with delineators were installed during the summer of 2022 at the Babcock Street/Black Avenue intersection.

Mendenhall Street and Babcock Street have transit stops, and on Mendenhall Street there is a transit slip lane between the Tracy Avenue and Black Avenue cross streets, allowing buses to stop in a protected area and providing passenger safety without impacting traffic negatively.

## Sign Inventory

A sign inventory was performed for the study area and details all signs on the corridors of Mendenhall Street and Babcock Street between North 5th Avenue and Willson Avenue. The inventory is provided for knowledge regarding existing signs, to coordinate wayfinding information and to help consolidate signage in the downtown area. Appendix A includes Exhibits A and B that detail the location of signs on the two corridors.

## Traffic \& Pedestrian Data and Analysis

Weekday AM, noon, and PM peak hour vehicle turning movement and bike/pedestrian counts were collected for study area intersections on Wednesday, July 13, 2022. The following study area intersections were evaluated because they are the heaviest traveled corridors located in the heart of downtown, where there is a focus on redevelopment and the most potential for traffic modifications such as traffic signals and bicycle corridors:

- Mendenhall Street/Black Avenue
- Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue
- Main Street/Black Avenue
- Main Street/Tracy Avenue
- Babcock Street/Black Avenue
- Babcock Street/Tracy Avenue

The traffic data was collected using Miovision Scout video-based systems. In general, the weekday AM, noon, and PM vehicle peak hour periods were found to occur from 8:30-9:30 AM, II:45 AM-I2:45 PM, and 4:45-5:45 PM. Raw count data was adjusted for seasonal variation using MDT seasonal adjustment factors. Figure I (page 4) summarizes the Existing Conditions (2022) peak hour turning movement volumes for the AM, noon, and PM peak hours. Bike and pedestrian peak hours were slightly different than the vehicle peak hours, with no clear peak in the morning and the highest-volume hour of $12: 15-1: I 5$ PM, with a second smaller peak from 2:I5-3:I5 PM. Figure 2 (page 5 ) shows Existing Conditions (2022) bike/pedestrian counts for those peak hours, as well as AM volumes during the vehicle peak hour of 8:30-9:30 AM. Detailed vehicle traffic and bike/pedestrian count data worksheets are included in Appendix $B$.

Truck traffic was observed during the peak hours previously mentioned. During the AM, noon and PM peak hours, truck traffic on Babcock Street compromised $1.8 \%$, I.4\% and I.5\% of all traffic, respectively. During the AM, noon and PM peak hours on Mendenhall Street, truck traffic was observed to be $5.2 \%, 2.7 \%$ and $2.0 \%$ of traffic, respectively. On Main Street, during the AM, noon and PM peak hours, trucks were 2.8\%/3.0\% (eastbound/westbound), 2.5\%/4.0\% (eastbound/westbound), and I.6\%/0.7\% (eastbound/westbound) of traffic, respectively. Truck traffic on Tracy Avenue at Mendenhall Street was highest on the southbound approaches during all peak hours, with the AM peak, noon and PM peak hours making up $15.4 \%, 9.7 \%$ and $5.1 \%$ of all traffic, respectively.

## Couplet Roadways \& Conversions

Babcock Street and Mendenhall Street are couplets serving downtown Bozeman. Couplets are two parallel one-way roadways that run in opposite directions to provide two-way mobility in a specific area and typically connect to roadways with two-way traffic. They are established to provide greater capacity for vehicles and provide an opportunity to reduce pedestrian crossing distances by adding curb extensions or narrowing travel lanes. They typically have fewer intersection turning movements that may increase safety and improve pedestrian crossing safety as vehicles are approaching from one less direction. They also provide an opportunity to create bicycle lanes and/or, in Bozeman's context, on-street parking.

Disadvantages of couplets include increased travel time and out of direction travel for local residents, delays for emergency vehicles, and without appropriate traffic management strategies, they may provide context for increased vehicle speeds. One-way streets are typically associated with higher speeds and multi-lane one-way streets create a multiple threat condition for pedestrians crossing a road. Additionally, left-turning motor vehicle drivers may be less cautious when turning from a one-way street, and therefore less inclined to notice a pedestrian.

In terms of pedestrian safety, there are benefits to both one-way and two-way streets, and so the decision to convert a one-way street to two-way is context sensitive. FHWA highlighted one-way/two-way street conversions in a case study, PedSafe 2013, Pedestrian Safety Guide and Countermeasures Selection System, and suggested one-way streets should have traffic calming features to reduce vehicle speeds and design features, such as curb extensions and turning radius reductions, to discourage high vehicular speeds.
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Figure I: Existing Conditions (2022) Vehicle Turning Movements for Peak Hours
Downtown Bozeman Safety Study
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Figure 2: Existing Conditions (2022) Pedestrian/Bicycle Turning Movements for Peak Hours Downtown Bozeman Safety Study

## Parking

Main Street has on-street parallel parking on both sides of the street throughout the project corridor, with parking at some intersections less than 20 feet from the crosswalks. Babcock Street has on-street parallel parking on the south side throughout the project area and on the north side of the roadway east of Bozeman Avenue and west of Black Avenue. Parking extends to approximately 30 feet from crosswalks, and the intersection with Tracy Avenue has bulb-outs on each corner with the exception of the southwest corner. Mendenhall Street has parallel parking on both sides of the street throughout the project area with the exception of the block between Black Avenue and Tracy Avenue, where a transit island is present. The distance of on-street parking on Mendenhall Street varies but is typically approximately 20 feet from the crosswalks. There are several locations in downtown Bozeman where trucks double park in traffic lanes for unloading and/or loading. Consideration should be given to providing a 15 -minute loading/unloading space in areas that have frequent double-parked trucks that are unloading/loading at local businesses.

## On-Street Bicycle Lanes

Under existing conditions there are no on-street bicycle lanes in the downtown study area. Some roadways have "sharrows," pavement markings designating that vehicles and cyclists share the road. In the summer the City provides bicycle racks located in on-street parking stalls to encourage bicycling. Consideration should be given to consistently painting sharrows on downtown roads to bring awareness to bicyclists and drivers that they are sharing the roadways.

In the 2019 DBIP study, one concept was to remove the north side on-street parking on Babcock Street and replace it with a two-way cycle track to provide cyclists a separated space instead of sharing the roadway and/or sidewalks.
Narrowed drive lanes were suggested to provide traffic calming to lower speeds and allow room for the cycle track. The report also recognized that providing a cycle track was a challenge with the width constraints on Babcock Street the presence of numerous driveway egresses, the existing traffic control at intersections which presently is for eastbound only traffic and would result in the loss of 8 I on-street parking spaces. Due to the mentioned challenges, sharrows were recommended in both lanes for Babcock Street and Mendenhall Street in the 2019 DBIP, and in the southern lane of Mendenhall Street and as a secondary option on Babcock Street (to create a cycle track) in the Phase I Downtown Bozeman study. Consideration should be given to applying sharrow pavement markings uniformly throughout downtown.

## Vehicle Intersection Capacity

Existing Conditions (2022) vehicle intersection capacity calculations were performed for the study area intersections using Synchro, Version II, which is based on the Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition (Transportation Research Board, 2016). Level of service (LOS) is defined as a quality measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, generally in terms of such service measures as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort, and convenience. LOS is a qualitative measure of the performance of an intersection with values ranging from LOS A, which indicates good operation and low vehicle delays, to LOS F, which indicates congestion and longer vehicle delays. LOS C is typically considered a minimum acceptable threshold for operations in Montana-based communities, though exceptions are made in certain cases.

The results of the Existing Conditions (2022) vehicle intersection capacity calculations showed that all intersections and approaches operate at LOS C or better during all three peak hours. Projected 95th percentile queues are minimal on all
approaches. Figure I also shows the Existing Conditions (2022) LOS results at each intersection. A detailed capacity summary table and capacity calculation worksheets for each of the study area intersections can be found in Appendix C.

## Signal Warrant Analysis

Traffic signal warrants were evaluated at the four (4) stop-controlled intersections of Mendenhall Street and Babcock Street with Tracy Avenue and Black Avenue using criteria outlined in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) for the Existing Conditions (2022) vehicular traffic volume scenario. The MUTCD presents several warrants that can be considered based on traffic volumes, school crossings, crash history, and others. For the purposes of this analysis, all but Warrants 5 and 9 (School Crossing and Intersection Near a Railroad Grade Crossing) were evaluated because there are no school or railroad crossings near the intersections. Satisfaction of the Peak Hour warrant alone should not be considered as warranting a signal, as it is primarily meant for application at office complexes, manufacturing plants, or other high-occupancy vehicle facilities that attract or discharge large numbers of vehicles over a short time.

Signal warrants are not close to being met at any of the four (4) intersections when evaluated with Existing Conditions (2022) volumes. Traffic signal warrant worksheets can be found in Appendix D.

## Speed Data

Speed data was gathered using StatTrak Data Collectors and Houston Radar Stats Analyzer on July II-I5, 2022, on Babcock Street between Black Avenue and Bozeman Avenue, Babcock Street between South 3rd Avenue and South Grand Avenue, Mendenhall Street between North 3rd Avenue and North Grand Avenue, and Mendenhall Street between North Bozeman Avenue and Rouse Avenue. Posted speeds on all roadways are 25 mph . 50th percentile and 85th percentile speeds, the speeds that 50 percent of traffic and 85 percent of traffic are observed to travel at or below during free-flow conditions, were collected in addition to maximum speeds and are illustrated in Table I below.

Table I: Speed Data

|  | Mendenhall - <br> 3rd \& Grand | Mendenhall - <br> Bozeman \& Rouse | Babcock - <br> Black \& Bozeman | Babcock - <br> 3rd \& Grand |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | $7 / \mathrm{II}-13 / 2022$ | $7 / 13-15 / 2022$ | $7 / I 3-15 / 2022$ | $7 / \mathrm{II}-13 / 2022$ |
| Direction of Vehicles | Westbound | Westbound | Eastbound | Eastbound |
| ADT (veh) | 5,148 | 4,355 | 5,774 | 4,497 |
| 85th Percentile Speed (mph) | 30 | 27 | 28 | 30 |
| Max speed (mph) | 49 | 55 | 49 | 48 |
| 50th Percentile Speed $(\mathrm{mph})$ | 26 | 23 | 24 | 26 |

85th percentile speeds are used to help establish appropriate speed limits. It should be noted that the radar unit on Mendenhall Street between 3 rd Avenue and Grand Avenue had sporadic high speeds ( 8 data points over 70 mph ), so that data was manually removed from the analysis. Speed data summary sheets can be found in Appendix E.

Eighty-fifth (85th) percentile speeds collected on Mendenhall Street and Babcock Street exceeded the posted speed limit of 25 mph , with 85 th percentile speeds being 27 mph and 28 mph within the immediate downtown area (Bozeman Avenue and Rouse Avenue) and slightly higher ( 30 mph ) further outside of the center of downtown (3rd Avenue and Grand Avenue).

## Pedestrian Level of Service

Motor vehicles on roadways have a level of service (LOS) that is a quality measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, generally in terms of such service measures as speed and travel time, freedom to manuever, traffic interuptions, and comfort and convenience. Similarly, an algorithm to determine pedestrian LOS has been created with considerations including a combination of connectivity, directness, safety and capacity measures. Table 2 below presents the pedestrian LOS for the downtown intersections on Mendenhall Street and Babcock Street. Generally, pedestrians do not have a long wait before being able to cross with either a break in traffic or vehicles yielding to pedestrians. The LOS was higher on Main Street, most likely due to signalized pedestrian crossings providing more protection.

Table 2: Pedestrian Level of Service

| Road Segment | Pedestrian Level <br> of Service |
| :---: | :---: |
| Mendenhall <br> Tracy to Black | 2.05 (B) |
| Main <br> Tracy to Black | 1.25 (A) |
| Babcock <br> Tracy to Black | I.68 (B) |

## CRASH HISTORY

Crashes for corridor segements and study area intersections were evaluated to determine any trends with regards to frequency or severity and potential safety treatments.

## Intersection Crash History

Historical intersection and corridor crash data was obtained from MDT for the 5-year period from January I, 2014, through December 3I, 20I8. Crash data was collected from the City of Bozeman Police Department from January I, 2019 through October 2022 and evaluated separately. The data was analyzed for the purposes of calculating intersection crash and severity rates and evaluating corridor and intersection collision type trends. Tables 3 (page 9) and 4 (page 10) illustrate the results of the historical crash analysis.

Intersection crash rates were calculated on the standard basis of crashes per million vehicles entering (MVE) for each intersection. The MVE metric was estimated based on 2022 peak hour traffic counts and published historical ADT
volumes from the MDT website. Crash rates for the study area intersections ranged from 0.17 crashes/MVE to 0.86 crashes/MVE.

As a means of evaluating the historical crash frequency rates, Sanderson Stewart calculated expected rates using the predictive crash rate formulas in the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Highway Safety Manual (HSM). The process involves calculating the number of crashes predicted in a year based on traffic demand (AADTs) and various physical and traffic environment-based conditions such as lane configurations, traffic signal phasing, and approach speeds. The calculations result in a crashes-per-year prediction. Sanderson Stewart then back calculated a frequency rate on the basis of MVE for the sake of comparison with the actual historical crash rate. The results of the calculations for this study showed that the historical crash rate was slightly higher than the predicted crash rate at the intersection of Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue. The historical crash rates were lower than the predicted crash rates at all other study area intersections. The HSM rate predictions and 5-year crash totals for each intersection are summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Crash Frequency and Severity, 2014-2018

| Intersection | $\begin{gathered} 2014-2018 \\ D E V^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ | Reported Crashes ${ }^{2}$ | Crash Type |  |  | Crash Data ${ }^{3}$ |  |  | HSM Predictions ${ }^{4}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | PDO | Injury | Fatality | Average <br> Crash <br> Frequency <br> (Crash/Yr) | Crash <br> Rate <br> (Crash/ MVE) | Severity <br> Index | Predicted <br> Average Crash <br> Frequency <br> (Crash/Yr) | Predicted <br> Crash Rate <br> (Crash/ MVE) |
| Mendenhall St/Black Ave | 3078 | I | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0.20 | 0.18 | 3.00 | 0.94 | 0.84 |
| Mendenhall St/Tracy Ave | 3178 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1.00 | 0.86 | 1.40 | 0.92 | 0.79 |
| Main St/Black Ave | 13097 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0.80 | 0.17 | 2.00 | 1.49 | 0.31 |
| Main St/Tracy Ave | 15095 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1.00 | 0.18 | 1.80 | 2.72 | 0.49 |
| Babcock St/Black Ave | 4029 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0.40 | 0.27 | 1.00 | 1.14 | 0.78 |
| Babcock St/Tracy Ave | 3853 | 4 | 3 | I | 0 | 0.80 | 0.57 | 1.50 | 1.16 | 0.82 |

${ }^{\top}$ Daily Entering Volume (DEV) estimated from 2022 peak hour counts and 2014 through 2018 MDT published ADTs

${ }^{3}$ Crash rates expressed as crashes per million vehicles entering (MVE)
${ }^{4}$ Rates calculated using Highway Safety Manual (HSM) Ist Edition predictive methodology using SPICE tool

Severity index is defined as the weighted average by crash severity, including fatality, injury, and property damage only (PDO) crashes. The highest severity index was 3.00 at the intersection of Mendenhall Street/Black Avenue due to the only crash resulting in injuries. At the intersection of Main Street/Black Avenue the severity index was 2.00 , due to 2 of 4 (50\%) of crashes resulting in injuries. Overall, pedestrian crashes typically resulted in injuries, with 2 of 4 (50\%) pedestrian crashes resulting in severe injuries. The two severe injury related pedestrian crashes occurred at the intersections of Babcock Street/Tracy Avenue and Mendenhall Street/Black Avenue with dry pavement and clear weather conditions, and the latter pedestrian crash occurred in the dark. Severity index calculation results are also shown in Table 3.

Sanderson Stewart performed an analysis of intersection collision classification to determine if any patterns could be identified. Table 4 on page 10 illustrates the results of the types of crashes in the study area. There is a history of rearend crashes on the Main Street intersections and the intersection of Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue. The intersection of Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue also had 2 of 5 (40\%) of crashes due to right-angle collisions. The intersections
along Babcock Street and Main Street each had I sideswipe, same direction crash. There were 4 pedestrian crashes at the six (6) intersections, including one at each of the following intersections: Babcock Street/Tracy Avenue, Main Street/Black Avenue, Main Street/Tracy Avenue and Mendenhall Street/Black Avenue.

Table 4: Intersection Crash History - Collision Type, 2014-2018

|  | Collision Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rear <br> End | Right <br> Angle | LT, SD | SS, SD | Pedestrian | Other | Total |
| Mendenhall St/Black Ave |  |  |  |  | I |  | I |
| Mendenhall St/Tracy Ave | 2 | 2 | I |  |  |  | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| Main St/Black Ave | 2 |  |  | l | I |  | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| Main St/Tracy Ave | 2 | I |  | l | I |  | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| Babcock St/Black Ave |  | I |  | l |  |  | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| Babcock St/Tracy Ave |  | I |  | l | I | I | $\mathbf{4}$ |

*Crashes reported from January I, 2014 to December 3I, 2018

Rear-end collisions commonly occur at signalized intersections because the signalized control is dynamic, and thereby requires drivers to recognize and react to changing conditions in real time. High speeds approaching signalized intersections allow drivers less response time, which creates an opportunity for an increased chance of rear-end collisions. Another potential contributing factor for rear-end collisions at a signalized intersection is a yellow change interval that is too short for the prevailing operating speeds in that corridor.

Based on the application of yellow change interval formulas from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Traffic Engineering Handbook with assumed 25 mph thru-movement operating speeds, it was calculated that the minimum "design" yellow change intervals of 3.0 seconds for the approaches are adequate. For intersections where the 85th percentile speeds are closer to 30 mph , then the 3.0 second yellow clearance may be inadequate. Consideration should be given to increasing the yellow clearances to 3.2 seconds to conform to ITE recommendations that more closely match the 85 th percentile speeds of 30 mph .

The unsignalized intersection of Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue had 2 of 5 (40\%) of crashes due to rear-end collisions, and 2 of 5 ( $40 \%$ ) due to right-angle collisions. Both rear-end collisions involved westbound vehicles. One (I) rear-end collision occurred when a westbound vehicle hit a parked vehicle in snowy conditions. The other rear-end collision occurred when a westbound vehicle failed to yield to the vehicle in front of it during dark, lighted conditions with dry pavement and clear weather. More information would need to be provided to determine exact crash causes.

Right-angle collisions often occur at unsignalized intersections after a driver stops at a stop sign and then proceeds when it is unsafe to do so due to limited sight distance or inadequately judging gaps in vehicles. At the intersection of Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue both crashes involved a westbound vehicle colliding with a southbound vehicle. It may be possible that higher speeds on Mendenhall Street make it difficult for minor road drivers to judge vehicle gaps. Increasing visibility for the intersection on the minor roadway may also help to improve safety. More visible pavement markings and the application of a larger stop sign on Tracy Avenue may call more attention to the intersection to help increase safety. Although not necessarily the cause of right-angle collisions with southbound vehicles, on the south approach of this intersection it is possible that sight distance may be prohibited to the east by the trees located on the
southeast quadrant of the intersection. Consideration should be given to maintaining and pruning the trees to help improve sight distance and improve safety.

Sideswipe, same direction crashes typically occur at intersections when there are not dedicated turn lanes and when vehicles switch lanes to avoid slowing or queued vehicles approaching a turning movement. At the unsignalized intersection of Babcock Street/Tracy Avenue, one (I) sideswipe, same direction crash occurred due to an eastbound vehicle colliding with a vehicle that was changing lanes. The other sideswipe crash at Babcock Street/Black Avenue involved an eastbound vehicle hitting a parked car during clear daylight conditions. More detailed crash data would be needed to determine the exact causes of the crashes.

The intersections of Main Street/Black Avenue and Main Street/Tracy Avenue had one (I) sideswipe, same direction crash. The crashes at both Main Street/Black Avenue and Main Street/Tracy Avenue involved westbound parked vehicles entering the traffic lane and being sideswiped by a passing vehicle.

The four (4) pedestrian crashes occurring at the study area intersections (Babcock Street/Tracy Avenue, Main Street/Black Avenue, Main Street/Tracy Avenue and Mendenhall Street/Black Avenue) typically occurred with clear weather conditions and dry pavement and all crashes resulted in injuries. Two (2) crashes involved vehicles making a left-turn and the other two (2) crashes involved vehicles traveling straight before hitting the pedestrian. More crash information would need to be provided to determine exact causes and potential safety countermeasures, however enhanced pedestrian crossings and lower vehicle speeds through the high pedestrian traveled intersections may help improve pedestrian safety.

Crash data was collected from the City of Bozeman Police Department for the period of January I, 2019 through October 2 I, 2022 for the intersections of Babcock Street/Tracy Avenue, Babcock Street/Black Avenue, Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue and Mendenhall Street/Black Avenue. Collision types for corridor crashes are provided in Table 5 below:

Table 5: Intersection Crash History -- Collision Type, 2019-2022

| Intersection | Collision Type |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SS, SD | LT, SD | Rear End | Right <br> Angle | Fixed <br> Object | Pedestrian |
| Mendenhall Street/ <br> Black Avenue | 2 | 4 | I | I | 4 | I |
| Mendenhall Street/ <br> Tracy Ave | I |  | I | 2 | I |  |
| Babcock Street/ <br> Black Avenue | 2 | I | I | 5 | I |  |
| Babcock Street/ <br> Tracy Ave | 4 | 3 | 2 | I | I |  |

*Crashes reported from January I, 2019 to October 2I, 2022

Common crash types were sideswipe, same direction crashes that occurred when vehicles were switching lanes and failed to yield to a vehicle in the adjacent lane. Left-turn, same direction crashes commonly occurred when vehicles were making a left-turn from the far travel lane on the one-way roadway and collided with a vehicle in the internal lane. There were several rear-end collisions, often occurring when the lead vehicles were stopping for a pedestrian, and several right-angle collisions involving a left-turning vehicle colliding with a through moving vehicle. One pedestrian crash was recorded. Crash severity was not available from this crash database.

## Corridor Crash History

Corridor crash data was evaluated for the five-year period of January I, 2014 to December 3I, 2018 to determine trends along the downtown corridors of Babcock Street and Mendenhall Street between Willson Avenue and Rouse Avenue. Previously referenced Black Avenue and Tracy Avenue intersection-related crashes are included in Table 6 (below) which summarizes crash data, but will not be discussed in detail.

Babcock Street, between Willson Avenue and Rouse Avenue, had two (2) non-intersection related crashes. Both crashes (one coded as sideswipe, same direction and the other as a rear-end collision) involved a vehicle colliding with a parked car and resulted in no injuries. The remaining crashes occurred at intersections or accesses along Babcock Street. There were 2 of 24 ( $8 \%$ ) crashes involving pedestrians/bicyclists and both resulted in injuries. Fifteen (I5) of 24 (63\%) crashes were right-angle collisions and 5 of 15 (33\%) right-angle collisions resulted in injuries. The most severe crashes on Babcock Street were a pedestrian related crash with an eastbound vehicle near Tracy Avenue and a rightangle collision that resulted in a severe injury at Babcock Street/Willson Avenue. This crash involved an eastbound and a southbound vehicle.

Table 6: Corridor Crash History - Collision Type, 2014-2018

| Corridor | Rear <br> End | Fell <br> from <br> Vehicle | Fixed <br> Object | LT, SD | SS,SD | Right <br> Angle | Backing <br> Vehicle | Pedestrian | Bicycle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | Total $\mid$

*Crashes reported from January I, 2014 to December 3I, 2018

On Mendenhall Street, between Willson Avenue and Rouse Avenue, there were two (2) crashes that were not intersection related. Both crashes involved vehicles colliding with parked vehicles; one crash was reported as a sideswipe, same direction and the other as a rear-end collision and both crashes resulted in property damage only. The remainder of the crashes along the corridor of Mendenhall Street occurred at intersections. There were two bicycle related crashes that occurred at the intersections of Mendenhall Street/Willson Avenue and Mendenhall Street/Bozeman Avenue. Both bicycle crashes resulted in injuries.

When evaluating crashes, it is important to consider both crash frequency and severity. Table 7 (page I3) provides the breakdown of crash severity for crashes along the Babcock Street and Mendenhall Street corridors. On Babcock Street, between Willson Avenue and Rouse Avenue, I7 of 24 (7I\%) crashes were property damage only with the remaining $29 \%$ resulting in various levels of severity. Mendenhall Street had 4 of $14(29 \%)$ crashes resulting in some type of injury.

Table 7: Summary of Crash Severity for Corridor Crashes, 2014-20I8

| Corridor | Crash Severity |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Property <br> Damage Only | Possible <br> Injury Crash | Suspected <br> Minor Injury | Suspected <br> Severe Injury |
| Babcock Street <br> S Willson Ave - S Rouse Ave | 17 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| W Mendenhall Street <br> S Willson Ave - S Rouse Ave | 10 | 2 | 1 | 1 |

*Crashes reported from January I, 2014 to December 3I, 2018
The most frequent crash types that resulted in injuries are presented in Table 8 (below). On Babcock Street the most severe crashes were caused by right-angle and pedestrian collisions. Mendenhall Street had the most severe injury crashes because of pedestrian and bicycle collisions. Pedestrian and bicycle safety countermeasures may help reduce the severity of crashes.

Table 8: Most Frequent Cause of Corridor Crashes by Severity

| Corridor | Possible Injury <br> Crash | Suspected <br> Minor Injury | Suspected <br> Severe Injury |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Babcock St | Right Angle | Pedestrian <br> Right Angle (3) | Pedestrian <br> Right Angle |
| Mendenhall St | Rear End (2) <br> Bicycle | Bicycle | Pedestrian |

*Crashes reported from January I, 2014 to December 3I, 2018

It is important to note that all the previous evaluations are speculative, and more detailed information about individual crashes would be needed to determine exact causes for each collision.

## Pedestrian Safety Countermeasures for Crash Reductions

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has created a Best Practices Toolbox of countermeasures and their potential effectiveness to reduce pedestrian crashes. Signalization, geometric and operational countermeasures are provided in the Toolbox with their targeted crash type (fatality, injury, property damage only or all) and calculated crash reduction factor (CRF), the percentage crash reduction that might be expected after implementing a given countermeasure.

The countermeasures that may be applicable to Mendenhall Street, Main Street and Babcock Street are summarized in Table 9 on page I4. More specific information on applications in Bozeman follow in the report.

Table 9: Best Practices Toolbox of Countermeasures for Pedestrian Safety, FHWA

| Countermeasure | Crash Severity | CRF for Pedestrian Crashes (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signalization Countermeasures |  |  |
| Add exclusive pedestrian phasing | All | 34 |
| Replace Walk/Don't Walk Signals with Pedestrian Countdown Signal Heads | All | 25 |
| Modify signal phasing (implement a leading pedestrian interval) | All | 5 |
| Geometric Countermeasures |  |  |
| Install Raised Pedestrian Crossing | All | 30 |
|  | Fatal/Injury | 36 |
| Signs/Markings/Operational Countermeasures |  |  |
| Add Intersection Lighting | All | 21 (nighttime crashes) |
|  | Injury | 27 (nighttime crashes) |
| Prohibit Right Turn on Red |  | 3 |
| Prohibit Left Turns |  | 10 |
| Restrict on-street parking near intersections | All | 30 |

## Uncontrolled Crossing Pedestrian Safety Countermeasures

FHWA's Best Practices Toolbox includes the Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Crossing Locations (2018) to address safety issues at locations where pedestrian facilities intersect with uncontrolled roadways. The guide helps assist with selecting appropriate countermeasures based on roadway volumes, posted speeds and lane configurations to improve crossing safety. For a two-lane roadway, with posted speeds of 30 mph or below with AADT of less than 9,000 vehicles per day, the following pedestrian crash countermeasures should always be implemented if feasible:

- High visibility crosswalk markings
- Parking restrictions on crosswalk approaches
- Adequate nighttime lighting levels
- Pedestrian crossing warning signs

Additionally, consideration should also be given to the following countermeasures:

- Raised crosswalks
- In-street pedestrian crossing sign
- Curb extensions

The evaluated countermeasures help address conflicts with crossing locations，vehicle speeds，inadequate conspicuity／visibility，drivers not yielding to pedestrians，and insufficient separation of pedestrians from traffic as shown in Table 10 （below）from the guide．

Table 10：Safety Issues Addressed Per Countermeasure，FHWA

| Pedestrian Crash Countermeasure for Uncontrolled Crossings | Safety Issue Addressed |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Conflicts at crossing locations | Excessive Vehicle Speed | Inadequate Conspicuityl Visibility | Drivers not yielding to pedestrians in crosswalks | Insufficient separation from traffic |
| Crosswalk Visibility Enhancement | \％ | \％ | \％ | \％ | 大 |
| High－visibility crosswalk markings＊ | ＊ |  | \％ | \％ |  |
| Parking restriction on crosswalk approach＊ | 大 |  | 宕 | 安 |  |
| Improved nighttime lighting＊ | \％ |  | \％ |  |  |
| Advance yield here to pedestrian sign and yield line＊ | 害 |  | \％ | ＊ | 穴 |
| In－Street pedestrian crossing sign＊ | ＊ | ＊ | \％ | ＊ |  |
| Curb Extension＊ | \％ | \％ | \％ |  | ＊ |
| Raised Crosswalk | ＊ | 害 | 穴 | \％ |  |
| Pedestrian Refuge Island | \％ | 实 | 实 |  | ＊ |
| Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon | 大 | 穴 | 害 | ＊＊ |  |
| Road Diet | \％ | ＊ | 穴 |  | \％ |
| Rectangular Rapid－Flashing Beacon | ＊ |  | 충 | 穴 | 容 |

＊These countermeasures make up the STEP Countermeasures．Crossing visibility enhancements and multiple countermeasures may be implemented at a location as part of crosswalk visibility enhancements．

## PEDESTRIAN SAFETY COUNTERMEASURES

FHWA has compiled proven pedestrian safety countermeasures including crosswalk visibility enhancements；these enhancements include high visibility crosswalks，lighting，and signing and pavement markings to make crosswalks，and users，more visible to drivers．

## High Visibility Crosswalk Markings

High visibility crosswalk markings use patterns（bar pairs，continental，ladder）that are visible to both the driver and pedestrian from farther away compared to traditional transverse line crosswalks．Both FHWA and the National Association of City Transportation Officials（NACTO）suggest the use of retroreflective pavement markings to improve safety．Retroreflective materials such as inlay or thermoplastic tape，instead of paint or brick，should be used for highly reflective crosswalk markings to improve safety，particularly at night．They should be provided at all established mid－ block pedestrian crossings and considered at all uncontrolled intersections．Their application is anticipated to reduce pedestrian injury crashes up to $40 \%$ ．

## Parking Restrictions on Crosswalk Approach

The FHWA acknowledges that on-street parking has an important relationship to pedestrian and motorist's safety. Onstreet parking can create a buffer, separating pedestrians from vehicular traffic on the adjacent roadway and reducing motorist's travel speeds. However, on-street parking also blocks visibility between the pedestrians and the motorists, particularly for children.

Parking restrictions can include the removal of parking spots close to an intersection, installation of new "parking prohibited" pavement markings or curb paint and signs. The suggested minimum setback is 20 feet in advance of a crosswalk where speeds are 25 mph or less. Thirty (30) foot setbacks are recommended for speeds between 26 and 35 mph , which would be more appropriate for the Downtown Bozeman intersections. The negative aspects of restricting curb parking are that it may eliminate a parking space for motorists, which may be opposed by nearby business owners, and potential increases in speeds for vehicles, which is also undesirable for pedestrians. Restricting on-street parking near intersections has been proven to reduce pedestrian crashes by $30 \%$.

## Adequate Nighttime Lighting Levels

To provide adequate nighttime lighting levels, consideration should be given to placing lights in advance of midblock and intersection crosswalks on both approaches to illuminate the front of the pedestrian and avoid creating a silhouette. Intersection lighting has been proven to reduce all pedestrian nighttime crashes by $21 \%$ and injury pedestrian nighttime crashes by $27 \%$.

## Crosswalk Warning Signs

Crosswalk warning signs are advanced crosswalk yield signs that are placed $20-50$ feet in advance of a marked crosswalk to indicate where vehicles are required to yield to pedestrians. To supplement the signing, a yield bar (commonly referred to as "shark's teeth") pavement marking can be used to indicate where vehicles are required to yield. Advanced crosswalk signs are typically used when a crossing is unexpected, such as mid-block. They have shown a reduction of $25 \%$ in pedestrian crashes.

## Raised Crosswalks

Raised crosswalks are ramped speed tables spanning the entire width of the roadway to make the pedestrian more prominent in the driver's field of vision. The crossing is marked with paint or special paving materials. These crosswalks may reduce vehicle speeds, improve motorist yielding and allow the pedestrian to cross at grade. The raised crosswalk is flush with the height of the sidewalk and is typically at least ten feet wide so a vehicle's front and back tires can be on the table at the same time. Drainage needs to be given careful consideration. Raised crosswalks may not be appropriate for primary emergency vehicle routes and can be a concern for snowplowing. They have shown a $45 \%$ reduction in pedestrian crashes.

## In-Street Pedestrian Signs

In-street yield to pedestrian signing may be appropriate on 2 - or 3 -lane roads where speed limits are 30 mph or less. They serve to remind road users of laws regarding yielding to pedestrians and are typically placed in between travel lanes. They can be a concern for snowplowing due to their location in the middle of the roadway. There currently is no crash reduction factor calculated for in-street pedestrian signs.

## Curb Extensions

An alternative to improve safety and maintain parking is to provide curb extensions, also referred to as bulb-outs, at pedestrian crossings. Curb extensions extend the sidewalk or curb line out into the parking lane, which reduces the street width. They shorten the distance for pedestrians to cross, allow the pedestrians to be more visible to motorists approaching intersections, and provide protection for pedestrians trying to view approaching vehicles instead of walking into a lane of traffic.

Curb extensions can improve accessibility for emergency vehicles as intersections are kept clear of parked cars. They can also be used to place landscaping or streetscaping. Curb extensions must not extend into travel lanes and should not extend into bicycle lanes. There currently is no crash reduction factor calculated for curb extensions.

## City of Bozeman Pedestrian Safety Countermeasures

Mendenhall Street and Babcock Street were evaluated to determine which of the suggested countermeasures from FHWA's Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Crossing Locations are currently installed at the uncontrolled crossings of Bozeman Avenue, Black Avenue and Tracy Avenue. Table II below illustrates the countermeasures currently installed.

Table I I: Pedestrian Countermeasures Currently in Use in Bozeman

| Treatment | Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Babcock/ <br> Bozeman | Babcock/ <br> Black | Babcock/ <br> Tracy | Mendenhall/ <br> Bozeman | Mendenhall <br> /Black | Mendenhall <br> /Tracy |
| High Visibility Crosswalk Markings |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Parking Restrictions on Crosswalk Approach | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Adequate Nighttime Lighting Levels | $\checkmark$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Crosswalk Warning Signs |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Raised Crosswalks |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-Street Pedestrian Crossing Sign |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Curb Extension |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |

## Application of Pedestrian Countermeasures

Sanderson Stewart met with the Downtown Bozeman Partnership staff on October 25, 2022 and discussed the feasibility of applying uniform pedestrian countermeasures at downtown intersections. To provide information on application and cost, the intersections of Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue and Babcock Street/Black Avenue were selected as examples. At the intersection of Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue the following countermeasures were evaluated: High Visibility Crosswalks, Crosswalk Warning Signs, In-Street Pedestrian Crossing Sign and Curb Extensions. The intersection of Babcock Street/Black Avenue was used to evaluate the following countermeasures: High Visibility Pavement Markings, Parking Restriction on Crosswalk Approach (via a curb bulb-out), Nighttime Lighting Levels, and InStreet Pedestrian Crossing Signs.

Figures 3 and 4 on pages 19 and 20 provide a bird's eye view and perspective image for the two intersections with the application of the discussed pedestrian countermeasures. Raised medians were not considered due to drainage and plowing concerns. Utility work was estimated, and prices are provided based upon recent construction projects in Bozeman. Table 12 below provides the anticipated crash reduction factor and estimated cost for implementation. Check marks are present in boxes where these treatments are presently installed.

Table 12: Pedestrian Safety Treatments and Cost on Mendenhall Street and Babcock Street

| Treatment | Babcock Street/ <br> Black Avenue | Mendenhall Street/ <br> Tracy Ave |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High Visibility Crosswalk Markings | $\checkmark$ | Cost $\$ 18,000$ <br> CRF: 40\% (ped injury crashes) |
| Parking Restrictions on Crosswalk Approach | Cost: $\$ 15,500 *$ <br> CRF: $30 \%$ (ped crashes) | $\checkmark$ |
| Adequate Nighttime Lighting Levels | Cost: $\$ 20,000$ <br> CRF: $42 \%$ (ped crashes) | $\checkmark$ |
| Crosswalk Warning Signs | $\checkmark$ | Cost: $\$ 800$ <br> CRF: 25\% (ped crashes) |
| Raised Crosswalks | Cost: Not evaluated <br> CRF: 45\% (ped crashes) | Cost: Not evaluated <br> CRF: 45\% (ped crashes) |
| In-Street Pedestrian Crossing Sign | Cost: $\$ 1,200$ each <br> CRF: Unknown | Cost: $\$ 1,200$ each <br> CRF: Unknown |
| Curb Extension | Cost: $\$ 10,800$ <br> CRF: Unknown |  |

*At Babcock Street/Black Avenue, a curb extension was built to help restrict parking on the crosswalk approach.


Figure 3: Application of Pedestrian Countermeasures at Babcock Street/Black Avenue


Figure 4: Application of Pedestrian Countermeasures at Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Conclusions

The preceding analysis has evaluated the safety and operations for the downtown Bozeman corridors of Babcock Street, Main Street and Mendenhall Street. An evaluation of Existing Conditions (2022) intersection capacity showed that at all intersections function at LOS C or better during the AM, noon, and PM peak hours. Pedestrian LOS was calculated to be LOS B or better at the study area intersections. A signal warrant analysis resulted in no warrants being met for the study area unsignalized intersections.

Speed data was gathered on six different segments of downtown streets and 85 th percentile speeds were observed to be between 27 and 30 mph . The posted speed limit on downtown roadways is 25 mph .

A crash history analysis found that the historical crash rate was slightly higher than the predicted crash rate at the intersection of Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue. The historical crash rates were lower than the predicted crash rates at all other study area intersections. There were crash trends including rear-end, right-angle, sideswipe, same direction, left-turn, same direction, and pedestrian/bicycle collisions in the study area, with the most severe crashes occurring due to pedestrian and bicycle crashes and right-angle collisions.

FHWA guidance for pedestrian safety countermeasures were discussed and applied to the two example intersections of Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue and Babcock Street/Black Avenue. Information was provided about the crash reduction factors for the treatments and the estimated costs of application. It is suggested that these improvements be installed at other study area intersections for consistency and improved safety.

## Recommendations

The following list of recommendations is based on the analysis results from this study and the professional judgment of the author:

At the intersection of Babcock Street/Black Avenue:

- Install high visibility pavement markings on all approaches and crosswalk warning signs and in-street pedestrian crossing signs on the eastbound approach.
- Install lighting on the northeast and southwest corners and curb extensions on the Northeast, Northwest, and Southeast corners to help improve pedestrian safety.
- Continue to evaluate intersection operations for warrants for signalization.
- Coordinate these improvements with the bike boulevard project (through the City's transportation term contract) to avoid any design conflicts.

At the intersection of Mendenhall Street/Tracy Avenue:

- Install high visibility pavement markings on all approaches and larger stop signs on Tracy Avenue to call more attention to the intersection.
- Install advanced crosswalk warning signs and in-street pedestrian crossing signs on the westbound approach to improve pedestrian safety.
- Maintain the tree on the southeast corner of the intersection to provide adequate sight distance.
- Install curb extensions on the west side of the intersection to improve pedestrian safety.

Throughout the downtown area:

- Provide adequately sized I5-minute loading/unloading spaces at locations where trucks frequently double park.
- Install sharrows uniformly on downtown streets.
- Restrict parking within 30' of all crosswalk approaches.
- Consolidate signage in the downtown area.
- Install lighting at intersections for pedestrian safety.
- Install high-visibility pavement marks, crosswalk warning signs, in-street pedestrian signs, curb extensions and lighting at other study area intersections for consistency and to improve safety.
- Increase the yellow clearance intervals to 3.2 seconds to match the 85 th percentile speeds of 30 mph .
- Consideration should be given to continue an ongoing review of metrics.
- All transportation-related improvements shall be designed in accordance with City of Bozeman and/or MDT standards (where applicable) and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).
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EXISTING VOLUMES VEHICLE AND BIKE/PEDESTRIAN COUNTS (2022)

## INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT SUMMARY

General Information

| Counted By: | Wyatt Brown | Intersection: | Mendenhall Street \& N Tracy Avenue |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |  | Bozeman/MDT |
| Date Performed: | Wednesday, July 13,2022 | Jurisdiction: |  |
| Count Time Period: | AM Peak Hour (8:30-9:30 AM) | 18098.33 | Project Description: |
| Project Number: | N Tracy Avenue | Babcock \& Mendenhall Safety |  |
| North/South Street: |  |  | Mendenhall Street |

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

|  | N Tracy Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | N Tracy Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | W Mendenhall Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | E Mendenhall Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total |  |
| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |  |
| 8:30 AM | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 14 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 4 | 70 | 6 | 0 | 80 | 102 |
| 8:45 AM | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 12 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 6 | 63 | 12 | 0 | 81 | 106 |
| 9:00 AM | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 17 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3 | 63 | 11 | 0 | 77 | 106 |
| 9:15 AM | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 17 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3 | 61 | 5 | 0 | 69 | 92 |
| Grand Total | 16 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 35 | 25 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 257 | 34 | 0 | 307 | 406 |
| Medium Truck \% | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 4.9 |  |
| Heavy Truck \% | 25.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.8 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |  |
| Total Truck \% | 25.0 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 5.2 |  |
| Total \% | 3.9 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 63.3 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 75.6 | 100.0 |
| PHF | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |  |  | 0.95 |



| INTERSECTION 'TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Counted By: <br> Agency/Company: <br> Date Performed: <br> Count Time Period: |  |  |  | Wyatt B <br> Sanderso <br> Wednes <br> Noon Pe | Brown son Stew sday, July Peak Ho | wart <br> aly 13, 20 <br> our (11:4 | 202 AM | 12:45 | PM) |  | Interse | ction: |  |  | Menden Bozema | nhall Str | eet \& N | Tracy | Avenue |  |  |
| Project Number: <br> North/South Street: |  |  |  | 18098.33 N Tracy | y Avenue |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Project } \\ & \text { East/W } \end{aligned}$ | Descri Vest Stre | tion: <br> et: |  | Babcoc Mender | k \& Me | ndenhall <br> eet | Safet |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | N Tracy Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | N Tracy Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | W Mendenhall Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | E Mendenhall Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total |  |
| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |  |
| 11:45 AM | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 22 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 7 | 96 | 20 | 0 | 123 | 164 |
| 12:00 PM | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 21 | 18 | 0 | 39 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 4 | 94 | 12 | 0 | 110 | 167 |
| 12:15 PM | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 30 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 6 | 103 | 13 | 0 | 122 | 166 |
| 12:30 PM | 11 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 18 | 12 | 0 | 30 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 7 | 105 | 20 | 0 | 132 | 183 |
| Grand Total | 41 | 30 | 0 | 1 | 72 | 0 | 63 | 58 | 0 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 398 | 65 | 0 | 487 | 680 |
| Medium Truck \% | 0.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 8.3 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 2.7 |  |
| Heavy Truck \% | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Truck \% | 14.6 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 8.3 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 2.7 |  |
| Total \% | 6.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 17.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 58.5 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 71.6 | 100.0 |
| PHF | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |  | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  | 0.93 |





## INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT SUMMARY

General Information

| Counted By: | Wyatt Brown | Intersection: | E Mendenhall Street \& N Black Avenue |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |  |  |
| Date Performed: | Wednesday, July 13,2022 | Jurisdiction: | Bozeman/MDT |
| Count Time Period: | AM Peak Hour (8:30-9:30 AM) | Project Description: | Babcock \& Mendenhall Safety |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |  | East/West Street: |
|  |  | E Mendenhall Street |  |
| North/South Street: | N Black Avenue |  |  |

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

|  | N Black Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | N Black Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | E Mendenhall Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | E Mendenhall Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total |  |
| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |  |
| 8:30 AM | 19 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 18 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3 | 60 | 7 | 0 | 70 | 117 |
| 8:45 AM | 23 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 20 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 | 64 | 7 | 0 | 76 | 128 |
| 9:00 AM | 13 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 17 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3 | 63 | 5 | 0 | 71 | 109 |
| 9:15 AM | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 15 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 2 | 65 | 4 | 0 | 71 | 94 |
| Grand Total | 62 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 42 | 28 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 252 | 23 | 0 | 288 | 448 |
| Medium Truck \% | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 2.9 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 7.7 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.9 |  |
| Heavy Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Truck \% | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 2.9 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 7.7 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.9 |  |
| Total \% | 13.8 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 56.3 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 64.3 | 100.0 |
| PHF | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.70 |  |  | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |  | 0.88 |



| INTERSECTION 'TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Counted By: <br> Agency/Company: <br> Date Performed: <br> Count Time Period: |  |  |  | Wyatt B <br> Sanders <br> Wednes <br> Noon P | Brown son Stew day, Jul Peak Ho | wart <br> ly 13,20 <br> our (11: | 202 AM | 12:45 | PM) |  | Interse | ction: |  |  | E Mend | denhall | Street \& | N Bla | ck Aven |  |  |
| Project Number: <br> North/South Street: |  | N Black Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Project } \\ & \text { East/W } \end{aligned}$ | Descri Vest Stre | tion: <br> et: |  | Babcoc E Mend | k \& Me denhall | ndenhal | Safet |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | N Black Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | N Black Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | E Mendenhall Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | E Mendenhall Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total |  |
| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |  |
| 11:45 AM | 12 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 30 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 7 | 93 | 15 | 0 | 115 | 171 |
| 12:00 PM | 14 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 28 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 6 | 86 | 17 | 0 | 109 | 160 |
| 12:15 PM | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 28 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3 | 97 | 8 | 0 | 108 | 163 |
| 12:30 PM | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 30 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 4 | 104 | 11 | 0 | 119 | 166 |
| Grand Total | 54 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 58 | 58 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 380 | 51 | 0 | 451 | 660 |
| Medium Truck \% | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 10.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 |  |
| Heavy Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Truck \% | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 10.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 |  |
| Total \% | 8.2 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.1 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 17.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 57.6 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 68.3 | 100.0 |
| PHF | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |  |  | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |  |  | 0.96 |





## INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT SUMMARY

## General Information

| Counted By: | Wyatt Brown | Intersection: | Main Street \& Tracy Avenue |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |  |  |
| Date Performed: | Wednesday, July 13,2022 | Jurisdiction: | Bozeman/MDT |
| Count Time Period: | AM Peak Hour (8:30-9:30 AM) | Project Description: | Babcock \& Mendenhall Safety |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |  |  |
|  |  | East/West Street: | Main Street |
| North/South Street: | Tracy Avenue |  |  |

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

|  | N Tracy Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | S Tracy Avenue <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  | W Main Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | E Main Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | Int. <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total |  |
| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  |  |
| 8:30 AM | 4 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 92 | 7 | 0 | 106 | 7 | 71 | 6 | 0 | 84 | 215 |
| 8:45 AM | 6 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 23 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 99 | 7 | 1 | 114 | 4 | 73 | 7 | 0 | 84 | 231 |
| 9:00 AM | 4 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 18 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 79 | 6 | 0 | 92 | 7 | 85 | 3 | 0 | 95 | 220 |
| 9:15 AM | 4 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 98 | 4 | 0 | 112 | 4 | 97 | 2 | 0 | 103 | 240 |
| Grand Total | 18 | 34 | 16 | 1 | 69 | 16 | 14 | 17 | 0 | 47 | 31 | 368 | 24 | 1 | 424 | 22 | 326 | 18 | 0 | 366 | 906 |
| Medium Truck \% | 5.6 | 2.9 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 |  |
| Heavy Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 |  |
| Total Truck \% | 5.6 | 2.9 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Total \% | 2.0 | 3.8 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 7.6 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 3.4 | 40.6 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 46.8 | 2.4 | 36.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 40.4 | 100.0 |
| PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |  |  | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |  |  | 0.94 |




## INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT SUMMARY

## General Information

| Counted By: | Wyatt Brown | Intersection: | Main Street \& Tracy Avenue |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |  |  |
| Date Performed: | Wednesday, July 13,2022 | Jurisdiction: | Bozeman/MDT |
| Count Time Period: | PM Peak Hour (4:45-5:45 PM) | Project Description: | Babcock \& Mendenhall Safety |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |  |  |
|  |  | East/West Street: | Main Street |
| North/South Street: | Tracy Avenue |  |  |

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

|  | N Tracy Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | S Tracy Avenue <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  | W Main Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | E Main Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | Int. <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total |  |
| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  |  |
| 4:45 PM | 7 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 21 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 19 | 8 | 125 | 9 | 0 | 142 | 4 | 92 | 1 | 0 | 97 | 279 |
| 5:00 PM | 4 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 19 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 21 | 11 | 104 | 4 | 0 | 119 | 5 | 111 | 6 | 0 | 122 | 281 |
| 5:15 PM | 7 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 17 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 18 | 3 | 117 | 8 | 0 | 128 | 3 | 106 | 3 | 0 | 112 | 275 |
| 5:30 PM | 5 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 115 | 3 | 0 | 125 | 3 | 102 | 1 | 0 | 106 | 261 |
| Grand Total | 23 | 28 | 23 | 0 | 74 | 14 | 26 | 31 | 0 | 71 | 29 | 461 | 24 | 0 | 514 | 15 | 411 | 11 | 0 | 437 | 1096 |
| Medium Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  |
| Heavy Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |  |
| Total Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |  |
| Total \% | 2.1 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 6.8 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 2.6 | 42.1 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 46.9 | 1.4 | 37.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 39.9 | 100.0 |
| PHF | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |  |  | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |  | 0.98 |



## INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT SUMMARY

General Information

| Counted By: | Wyatt Brown |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart | E Main Street \& Black Avenue |  |
| Date Performed: | Wednesday, July 13,2022 | Jurisdiction: | Bozeman/MDT |
| Count Time Period: | AM Peak Hour (8:30-9:30 AM) | 18098.33 | Project Description: |
| Project Number: | Black Avenue | Babcock \& Mendenhall Safety |  |
| North/South Street: |  | East/West Street: | E Main Street |

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

|  | N Black Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | S Black Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | E Main Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | E Main Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total |  |
| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  |  |
| 8:30 AM | 4 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 82 | 8 | 0 | 95 | 5 | 83 | 4 | 0 | 92 | 215 |
| 8:45 AM | 4 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 92 | 9 | 1 | 106 | 5 | 79 | 3 | 0 | 87 | 222 |
| 9:00 AM | 5 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 13 | 81 | 9 | 0 | 103 | 6 | 94 | 3 | 0 | 103 | 240 |
| 9:15 AM | 5 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 96 | 11 | 0 | 114 | 7 | 106 | 4 | 0 | 117 | 266 |
| Grand Total | 18 | 36 | 18 | 0 | 72 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 54 | 29 | 351 | 37 | 1 | 418 | 23 | 362 | 14 | 0 | 399 | 943 |
| Medium Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 |  |
| Heavy Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Total Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 |  |
| Total \% | 1.9 | 3.8 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 3.1 | 37.2 | 3.9 | 0.1 | 44.3 | 2.4 | 38.4 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 42.3 | 100.0 |
| PHF | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |  | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |  | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  |  | 0.89 |



| INTERSECTION 'TURNING MOVEMEN' COUN' SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Counted By: <br> Agency/Company: <br> Date Performed: <br> Count Time Period: |  |  |  | Wyatt B <br> Sanderson <br> Wednes <br> Noon P | Brown son Stey sday, Ju Peak Ho | wart | $\begin{aligned} & .022 \\ & 45 \mathrm{AM} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $-12: 45$ | $\mathrm{PM})$ |  | Intersec | ction: |  |  | E Main <br> Bozem | Street <br> an/MD | \& Black <br> T | Aven |  |  |  |
| Project Number: <br> North/South Street: | Black Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Project } \\ & \text { East/W } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Descrip } \\ & \text { Xest Stre } \end{aligned}$ | eet: |  | Babcoc E Main | k \& Me Street | ndenha | Safe |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | N Black Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | S Black Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | E Main Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | E Main Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Int. } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total |  |
| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  |  |
| 11:45 AM | 6 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 22 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 17 | 6 | 103 | 12 | 0 | 121 | 7 | 126 | 3 | 0 | 136 | 296 |
| 12:00 PM | 5 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 7 | 90 | 11 | 0 | 108 | 7 | 114 | 7 | 0 | 128 | 273 |
| 12:15 PM | 6 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 26 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 19 | 3 | 133 | 14 | 0 | 150 | 8 | 131 | 3 | 0 | 142 | 337 |
| 12:30 PM | 6 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 24 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 18 | 8 | 119 | 13 | 0 | 140 | 8 | 123 | 3 | 0 | 134 | 316 |
| Grand Total | 23 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 93 | 12 | 35 | 23 | 0 | 70 | 24 | 445 | 50 | 0 | 519 | 30 | 494 | 16 | 0 | 540 | 1222 |
| Medium Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 |  |
| Heavy Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 |  |
| Total Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 |  |
| Total \% | 1.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 1.0 | 2.9 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 2.0 | 36.4 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 42.5 | 2.5 | 40.4 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 44.2 | 100.0 |
| PHF | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |  |  | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |  |  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |  | 0.91 |





## INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT SUMMARY

## General Information

| Counted By: | Wyatt Brown |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart | Intersection: | Wabcock Street \& S Tracy Avenue |
| Date Performed: | Wednesday, July 13, 2022 | Jurisdiction: | Bozeman/MDT |
| Count Time Period: | AM Peak Hour (8:30-9:30 AM) | Project Description: | Babcock \& Mendenhall Safety |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |  |  |
|  |  | East/West Street: | W Babcock Street |
| North/South Street: | S Tracy Avenue |  |  |

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

|  | S Tracy Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | S Tracy Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | W Babcock Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | W Babcock Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | Int. <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total |  |
| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |  |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 18 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 86 | 4 | 0 | 93 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 119 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 6 | 17 | 0 | 23 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 112 | 4 | 0 | 119 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 153 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 22 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 82 | 4 | 0 | 90 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 125 |
| 9:15 AM | 0 | 3 | 17 | 0 | 20 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 72 | 7 | 0 | 83 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 114 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 23 | 60 | 0 | 83 | 28 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 14 | 352 | 19 | 0 | 385 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 511 |
| Medium Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Heavy Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total \% | 0.0 | 4.5 | 11.7 | 0.0 | 16.2 | 5.5 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 2.7 | 68.9 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 75.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| PHF | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |  | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |  |  | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.83 |




## INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT SUMMARY

## General Information

| Counted By: | Wyatt Brown | Intersection: | W Babcock Street \& S Tracy Avenue |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |  |  |
| Date Performed: | Wednesday, July 13, 2022 | Jurisdiction: | Bozeman/MDT |
| Count Time Period: | PM Peak Hour (4:45-5:45 PM) | Project Description: | Babcock \& Mendenhall Safety |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |  |  |
|  |  | East/West Street: | W Babcock Street |
| North/South Street: | S Tracy Avenue |  |  |

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

|  | S Tracy Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | S Tracy Avenue <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  | W Babcock Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | W Babcock Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | Int. <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total |  |
| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |  |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 80 | 12 | 0 | 96 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 120 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 11 | 20 | 0 | 31 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 103 | 5 | 0 | 112 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 154 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 97 | 5 | 0 | 106 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 131 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 17 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 85 | 3 | 0 | 90 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 124 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 35 | 37 | 0 | 72 | 22 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 14 | 365 | 25 | 0 | 404 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 529 |
| Medium Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Heavy Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total \% | 0.0 | 6.6 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 13.6 | 4.2 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 2.6 | 69.0 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 76.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| PHF | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.58 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.86 |



## INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT SUMMARY

General Information

| Counted By: | Wyatt Brown |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart | W Babcock Street \& S Black Avenue |  |
| Date Performed: | Wednesday, July 13,2022 | Jurisdiction: | Bozeman/MDT |
| Count Time Period: | AM Peak Hour (8:30-9:30 AM) | Project Description: | Babcock \& Mendenhall Safety |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |  |  |
|  |  | East/West Street: | W Babcock Street |
| North/South Street: | S Black Avenue |  |  |

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

|  | S Black Avenue <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  | S Black Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | W Babcock Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | W Babcock Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total |  |
| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |  |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 92 | 4 | 0 | 102 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 123 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 112 | 6 | 0 | 127 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 152 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 10 | 77 | 4 | 0 | 91 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 121 |
| 9:15 AM | 0 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 73 | 4 | 0 | 82 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 108 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 34 | 15 | 1 | 50 | 36 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 30 | 354 | 18 | 0 | 402 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 504 |
| Medium Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Heavy Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total \% | 0.0 | 6.7 | 3.0 | 0.2 | 9.9 | 7.1 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 6.0 | 70.2 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 79.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| PHF | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.83 |



| INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT SUMMARY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  |  |  |
| Counted By: | Wyatt Brown | Intersection: | W Babcock Street \& S Black Avenue |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |  |  |
| Date Performed: | Wednesday, July 13, 2022 | Jurisdiction: | Bozeman/MDT |
| Count Time Period: | Noon Peak Hour (11:45 AM - 12:45 PM) |  |  |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 | Project Description: | Babcock \& Mendenhall Safety |
| North/South Street: | S Black Avenue | East/West Street: | W Babcock Street |

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

|  | S Black Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | S Black Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | W Babcock Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | W Babcock Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Int. } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total |  |
| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |  |
| 11:45 AM | 0 | 9 | 8 | 1 | 18 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 15 | 112 | 6 | 0 | 133 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 170 |
| 12:00 PM | 0 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 23 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 15 | 110 | 6 | 0 | 131 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 174 |
| 12:15 PM | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 120 | 6 | 0 | 135 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 164 |
| 12:30 PM | 0 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 17 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 117 | 6 | 0 | 141 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 176 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 45 | 24 | 2 | 71 | 37 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 57 | 459 | 24 | 0 | 540 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 684 |
| Medium Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Heavy Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total \% | 0.0 | 6.6 | 3.5 | 0.3 | 10.4 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 8.3 | 67.1 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 78.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |  | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.97 |



|  | INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT SUMMARY |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| General Information |  |  |  |
| Counted By: | Wyatt Brown | Intersection: | W Babcock Street \& S Black Avenue |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart | Jorisdiction: | Bozeman/MDT |
| Date Performed: | Wednesday, July 13,2022 | Project Description: | Babcock \& Mendenhall Safety |
| Count Time Period: | PM Peak Hour $(4: 45-5: 45 \mathrm{PM})$ | East/West Street: | W Babcock Street |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |  |  |
| North/South Street: | S Black Avenue |  |  |

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

|  | S Black Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | S Black Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | W Babcock Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | W Babcock Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-turn | Total |  |
| Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |  |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 18 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 5 | 84 | 6 | 0 | 95 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 130 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 24 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 9 | 114 | 8 | 0 | 131 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 179 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 17 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 6 | 98 | 6 | 0 | 110 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 144 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 18 | 11 | 0 | 29 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 6 | 96 | 7 | 0 | 109 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 156 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 50 | 37 | 1 | 88 | 38 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 26 | 392 | 27 | 0 | 445 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 609 |
| Medium Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Heavy Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Truck \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total \% | 0.0 | 8.2 | 6.1 | 0.2 | 14.4 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 4.3 | 64.4 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 73.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 |  |  | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.85 |



















## CAPACITY CALCULATIONS -

 EXISTING (2022)| Intersection | Approach | Existing (2022) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  |  | Noon Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
|  |  | Avg Delay (s/veh) | LOS | 95th \% Queue (veh) | Avg Delay (s/veh) | LOS | 95th \% <br> Queue <br> (veh) | Avg <br> Delay <br> (s/veh) | LOS | 95th \% <br> Queue <br> (veh) |
| Intersection Control |  | Two-W ay Stop-Control (NB/SB) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br> Tracy Avenue | WB | 0.9 | A | 1 | 1.2 | A | 1 | 0.6 | A | 1 |
|  | NB | 12.5 | B | 1 | 23.4 | C | 2 | 18.2 | C | 1 |
|  | SB | 11.8 | B | 1 | 15.2 | C | 1 | 14.9 | B | 1 |
|  | Intersection | 3.7 | A | -- |  |  |  | 4.0 | A | -- |
| Intersection Control |  | Two-W ay Stop-Control (NB/SB) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mendenhall Street \& Black Avenue | WB | 0.7 | A | 1 | 0.9 | A | 1 | 0.7 | A | 1 |
|  | NB | 13.0 | B | 1 | 17.7 | C | 2 | 17.3 | C | 1 |
|  | SB | 11.1 | B | 1 | 13.2 | B | 1 | 13.8 | B | 1 |
|  | Intersection | 4.7 | A | -- | 5.6 | A | -- | 4.4 | A | -- |
| Intersection Control |  | Signalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Main Street \& Tracy Avenue | EB | 6.2 | A | 2 | 8.4 | A | 4 | 7.4 | A | 3 |
|  | WB | 0.4 | A | 1 | 0.7 | A | 2 | 0.5 | A | 2 |
|  | NB | 24.3 | C | 2 | 25.2 | C | 3 | 26.3 | C | 3 |
|  | SB | 24.7 | C | 3 | 25.9 | C | 4 | 26.3 | C | 3 |
|  | Intersection | 6.2 | A | -- | 7.9 | A | -- | 7.2 | A | -- |
| Intersection Control |  | Signalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Main Street \& Black Avenue | EB | 0.6 | A | 2 | 0.8 | A | 2 | 0.6 | A | 1 |
|  | WB | 7.2 | A | 2 | 7.8 | A | 4 | 6.9 | A | 3 |
|  | NB | 22.7 | C | 2 | 26.4 | C | 3 | 26.8 | C | 3 |
|  | SB | 23.0 | C | 3 | 27.2 | C | 4 | 26.9 | C | 3 |
|  | Intersection | 6.3 | A | -- | 7.3 | A | -- | 6.8 | A | -- |
| Intersection Control |  | Two-W ay Stop-Control (NB/SB) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Babcock Street \& Tracy Avenue | EB | 0.5 | A | 0 | 0.6 | A | 1 | 0.5 | A | 1 |
|  | NB | 11.5 | B | 1 | 13.4 | B | 1 | 12.5 | B | 1 |
|  | SB | 13.5 | B | 1 | 17.7 | C | 2 | 13.8 | B | 1 |
|  | Intersection | 3.5 | A | -- | 5.3 | A | -- | 3.5 | A | -- |
| Intersection Control |  | Two-W ay Stop-Control (NB/SB) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Babcock Street \& Black Avenue | EB | 0.4 | A | 0 | 0.4 | A | 0 | 0.5 | A | 1 |
|  | NB | 11.4 | B | 1 | 13.9 | B | 1 | 13.2 | B | 1 |
|  | SB | 13.6 | B | 1 | 16.2 | C | 1 | 15.8 | C | 1 |
|  | Intersection | 2.8 | A | -- | 3.5 | A | -- | 4.3 | A | -- |

Queues
7: Tracy Ave \& Main St

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  | EBT |
|  | WBT | NBT | SBT |  |
| Lane Group | 451 | 389 | 50 | 73 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.29 | 0.41 |
| v/c Ratio | 3.2 | 2.0 | 26.1 | 30.8 |
| Control Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Delay | 3.2 | 2.0 | 26.1 | 30.8 |
| Total Delay | 24 | 15 | 14 | 24 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 48 | 24 | 43 | 59 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 362 | 282 | 299 | 282 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 2254 | 2292 | 435 | 451 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.11 | 0.16 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
7: Tracy Ave \& Main St
09/27/2022

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \% | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | (1) |  |  | * 1 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 25 | 368 | 31 | 18 | 326 | 22 | 17 | 14 | 16 | 17 | 34 | 18 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 25 | 368 | 31 | 18 | 326 | 22 | 17 | 14 | 16 | 17 | 34 | 18 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 0.96 |  | 0.93 | 0.98 |  | 0.93 | 0.94 |  | 0.93 | 0.94 |  | 0.93 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1750 | 1709 | 1750 | 1750 | 1709 | 1750 | 1750 | 1654 | 1750 | 1668 | 1709 | 1668 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 27 | 391 | 33 | 19 | 347 | 23 | 18 | 15 | 17 | 18 | 36 | 19 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 6 |
| Cap, veh/h | 134 | 1760 | 146 | 113 | 1827 | 119 | 146 | 113 | 100 | 110 | 187 | 84 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 125 | 2751 | 228 | 94 | 2855 | 186 | 383 | 538 | 474 | 240 | 889 | 397 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 235 | 0 | 216 | 203 | 0 | 186 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1612 | 0 | 1493 | 1631 | 0 | 1505 | 1395 | 0 | 0 | 1526 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 4.3 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.11 |  | 0.15 | 0.09 |  | 0.12 | 0.36 |  | 0.34 | 0.25 |  | 0.26 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 1085 | 0 | 956 | 1096 | 0 | 963 | 359 | 0 | 0 | 381 | 0 | 0 |
| VIC Ratio(X) | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1085 | 0 | 956 | 1096 | 0 | 963 | 492 | 0 | 0 | 526 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 5.6 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 1.4 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 6.1 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 24.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | C | A | A | C | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 451 |  |  | 389 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 73 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 6.2 |  |  | 0.4 |  |  | 24.3 |  |  | 24.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 53.3 |  | 21.7 |  | 53.3 |  | 21.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), $s$ |  | *5.3 |  | 5.9 |  | * 5.3 |  | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | *41 |  | 23.1 |  | *41 |  | 23.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s |  | 6.6 |  | 4.8 |  | 2.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 3.0 |  | 0.3 |  | 2.6 |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr Delay |  |  | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes

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

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | * $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 个 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 257 | 16 | 25 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 16 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 257 | 16 | 25 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 16 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 18 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 18 | 22 | 0 | 41 | 41 | 0 | 22 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 25 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 271 | 17 | 26 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 17 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 个 |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 19 | 352 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 28 | 60 | 23 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 19 | 352 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 28 | 60 | 23 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 14 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 26 | 26 | 0 | 16 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 23 | 424 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 34 | 72 | 28 | 0 |



Queues
12: Black Ave \& Main St

|  | - | $\leftarrow$ | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 470 | 449 | 60 | 80 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.33 | 0.43 |
| Control Delay | 2.4 | 3.3 | 26.5 | 30.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 2.4 | 3.3 | 26.5 | 30.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 19 | 25 | 17 | 26 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 32 | 47 | 48 | 62 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 282 | 376 | 300 | 296 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 2154 | 2312 | 413 | 424 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.19 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 38 | 351 | 29 | 14 | 362 | 23 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 36 | 18 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 38 | 351 | 29 | 14 | 362 | 23 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 36 | 18 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 0.97 |  | 0.90 | 0.95 |  | 0.90 | 0.90 |  | 0.88 | 0.90 |  | 0.88 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1750 | 1709 | 1750 | 1750 | 1723 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 43 | 394 | 33 | 16 | 407 | 26 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 40 | 20 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 185 | 1577 | 131 | 86 | 1792 | 112 | 152 | 142 | 115 | 121 | 212 | 91 |
| Arrive On Green | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 211 | 2590 | 215 | 57 | 2941 | 184 | 365 | 592 | 478 | 255 | 884 | 380 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 241 | 0 | 229 | 236 | 0 | 213 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1526 | 0 | 1489 | 1672 | 0 | 1511 | 1435 | 0 | 0 | 1519 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.18 |  | 0.14 | 0.07 |  | 0.12 | 0.33 |  | 0.33 | 0.25 |  | 0.25 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 986 | 0 | 907 | 1069 | 0 | 920 | 409 | 0 | 0 | 425 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 986 | 0 | 907 | 1069 | 0 | 920 | 464 | 0 | 0 | 484 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 0.99 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 22.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 23.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | C | A | A | C | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 470 |  |  | 449 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 80 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 0.6 |  |  | 7.2 |  |  | 22.7 |  |  | 23.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$, s | 51.0 | 24.0 | 51.0 | 24.0 |
| Change Period $(Y+R c), s$ | ${ }^{*} 5.3$ | 6.0 | $* 5.3$ | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | $* 43$ | 21.0 | $* 43$ | 21.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 2.0 | 5.0 | 6.8 | 4.3 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 3.3 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 0.2 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 6.3
HCM 6th LOS A

## Notes

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

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | * $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 252 | 13 | 28 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 62 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 252 | 13 | 28 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 62 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 8 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 25 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 286 | 15 | 32 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 70 |





Queues
7: Tracy Ave \& Main St

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\leftarrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 553 | 531 | 83 | 114 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.58 |
| Control Delay | 4.2 | 2.6 | 35.5 | 38.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 4.2 | 2.6 | 35.5 | 38.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 40 | 26 | 35 | 48 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 77 | 36 | 74 | 93 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 362 | 282 | 299 | 282 |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 2092 | 2101 | 363 | 379 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.30 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\hat{*}^{+}$ |  |  | $\hat{*}^{+1}$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | \$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 24 | 448 | 53 | 22 | 441 | 42 | 29 | 36 | 13 | 39 | 42 | 28 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 24 | 448 | 53 | 22 | 441 | 42 | 29 | 36 | 13 | 39 | 42 | 28 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 0.91 |  | 0.82 | 0.96 |  | 0.82 | 0.86 |  | 0.83 | 0.85 |  | 0.83 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1695 | 1709 | 1750 | 1750 | 1695 | 1682 | 1695 | 1709 | 1750 | 1682 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 25 | 472 | 56 | 23 | 464 | 44 | 31 | 38 | 14 | 41 | 44 | 29 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 97 | 1624 | 188 | 94 | 1667 | 155 | 169 | 187 | 60 | 161 | 160 | 90 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 83 | 2644 | 307 | 79 | 2713 | 252 | 435 | 739 | 238 | 409 | 632 | 355 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 294 | 0 | 259 | 281 | 0 | 250 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1615 | 0 | 1418 | 1613 | 0 | 1430 | 1412 | 0 | 0 | 1396 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 6.8 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.09 |  | 0.22 | 0.08 |  | 0.18 | 0.37 |  | 0.17 | 0.36 |  | 0.25 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 1038 | 0 | 872 | 1037 | 0 | 879 | 417 | 0 | 0 | 412 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1038 | 0 | 872 | 1037 | 0 | 879 | 441 | 0 | 0 | 436 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 7.6 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 2.4 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 8.3 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 25.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | C | A | A | C | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 553 |  |  | 531 |  |  | 83 |  |  | 114 |  |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 8.4 |  |  | 0.7 |  |  | 25.2 |  | 25.9 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$, s | 57.5 | 27.5 | 57.5 | 27.5 |
| Change Period $(Y+R c), s$ | ${ }^{*} 5.3$ | 5.9 | $* 5.3$ | 5.9 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | $* 51$ | 23.1 | $* 51$ | 23.1 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 9.3 | 7.2 | 2.0 | 5.5 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 4.0 | 0.5 | 3.8 | 0.4 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 7.9 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | A |

## Notes

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

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | * $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 个 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 398 | 24 | 58 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 41 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 398 | 24 | 58 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 41 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 42 | 0 | 71 | 71 | 0 | 42 | 39 | 0 | 83 | 83 | 0 | 39 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 428 | 26 | 62 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 44 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | + $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | 个 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 31 | 451 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 49 | 80 | 50 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 31 | 451 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 49 | 80 | 50 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 33 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 33 | 38 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 38 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 33 | 475 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 52 | 84 | 53 | 0 |



Queues
12: Black Ave \& Main St

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\leftarrow$ | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 570 | 594 | 76 | 101 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.28 | 0.27 | 0.42 | 0.55 |
| Control Delay | 2.7 | 4.1 | 35.3 | 38.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 2.7 | 4.1 | 35.3 | 38.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 30 | 42 | 32 | 41 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 42 | 80 | 68 | 85 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 282 | 376 | 300 | 296 |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 2012 | 2228 | 340 | 340 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.28 | 0.27 | 0.22 | 0.30 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * $\uparrow$ |  |  | * $\downarrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 50 | 445 | 24 | 16 | 494 | 30 | 23 | 35 | 12 | 35 | 35 | 23 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 50 | 445 | 24 | 16 | 494 | 30 | 23 | 35 | 12 | 35 | 35 | 23 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 0.97 |  | 0.82 | 0.91 |  | 0.82 | 0.76 |  | 0.70 | 0.74 |  | 0.70 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1750 | 1709 | 1750 | 1750 | 1709 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 55 | 489 | 26 | 18 | 543 | 33 | 25 | 38 | 13 | 38 | 38 | 25 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 195 | 1631 | 86 | 75 | 1841 | 110 | 137 | 184 | 55 | 148 | 133 | 73 |
| Arrive On Green | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 229 | 2580 | 136 | 47 | 2912 | 174 | 345 | 785 | 233 | 381 | 566 | 312 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 285 | 0 | 285 | 314 | 0 | 280 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1451 | 0 | 1495 | 1655 | 0 | 1478 | 1363 | 0 | 0 | 1259 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.19 |  | 0.09 | 0.06 |  | 0.12 | 0.33 |  | 0.17 | 0.38 |  | 0.25 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 967 | 0 | 945 | 1091 | 0 | 934 | 377 | 0 | 0 | 354 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 967 | 0 | 945 | 1091 | 0 | 934 | 392 | 0 | 0 | 369 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 0.97 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ (50\%),veh/ln | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 26.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | C | A | A | C | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 570 |  |  | 594 |  |  | 76 |  |  | 101 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 0.8 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  | 26.4 |  |  | 27.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$, s | 59.0 | 26.0 | 59.0 | 26.0 |
| Change Period $(Y+R c), s$ | ${ }^{*} 5.3$ | 6.0 | $* 5.3$ | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | $* 53$ | 21.0 | $* 53$ | 21.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 2.0 | 7.1 | 9.3 | 5.3 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 4.3 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 0.3 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 7.3
HCM 6th LOS A

## Notes

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

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | * $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 个 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 380 | 20 | 58 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 54 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 380 | 20 | 58 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 54 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 18 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 18 | 58 | 0 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 58 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 396 | 21 | 60 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 56 |





Queues
7: Tracy Ave \& Main St

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $4$ | $\dagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 524 | 445 | 73 | 75 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.44 | 0.43 |
| Control Delay | 3.3 | 2.4 | 37.3 | 32.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 3.3 | 2.4 | 37.3 | 32.8 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 32 | 16 | 30 | 26 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 60 | 35 | 68 | 64 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 362 | 282 | 299 | 282 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 2286 | 2404 | 389 | 405 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*} \uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }^{*} \uparrow$ |  |  | 4 |  |  | ¢ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 24 | 461 | 29 | 11 | 411 | 15 | 31 | 26 | 14 | 23 | 28 | 23 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 24 | 461 | 29 | 11 | 411 | 15 | 31 | 26 | 14 | 23 | 28 | 23 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 0.92 |  | 0.85 | 0.96 |  | 0.85 | 0.91 |  | 0.89 | 0.90 |  | 0.89 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1750 | 1723 | 1750 | 1750 | 1736 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1559 | 1695 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 24 | 470 | 30 | 11 | 419 | 15 | 32 | 27 | 14 | 23 | 29 | 23 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 103 | 1813 | 114 | 67 | 1959 | 69 | 188 | 148 | 65 | 136 | 159 | 106 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 90 | 2862 | 180 | 35 | 3094 | 109 | 543 | 628 | 278 | 343 | 675 | 450 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 274 | 0 | 250 | 234 | 0 | 211 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1636 | 0 | 1496 | 1701 | 0 | 1537 | 1449 | 0 | 0 | 1468 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 5.9 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.09 |  | 0.12 | 0.05 |  | 0.07 | 0.44 |  | 0.19 | 0.31 |  | 0.31 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 1082 | 0 | 948 | 1122 | 0 | 973 | 401 | 0 | 0 | 400 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1082 | 0 | 948 | 1122 | 0 | 973 | 453 | 0 | 0 | 453 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 6.8 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 7.4 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 26.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | C | A | A | C | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 524 |  |  | 445 |  |  | 73 |  |  | 75 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 7.4 |  |  | 0.5 |  |  | 26.3 |  |  | 26.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$, s | 59.1 | 25.9 | 59.1 | 25.9 |
| Change Period $(Y+R c), s$ | ${ }^{*} 5.3$ | 5.9 | ${ }^{*} 5.3$ | 5.9 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | $* 51$ | 23.1 | $* 51$ | 23.1 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 8.2 | 5.2 | 2.0 | 5.0 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 3.7 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 0.3 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 7.2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | A |

## Notes

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



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 个 |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 25 | 365 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 22 | 37 | 35 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 25 | 365 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 22 | 37 | 35 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 9 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 9 | 25 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 25 |
| Sign Control Fr | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 29 | 424 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 26 | 43 | 41 | 0 |


| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  |  |  |  | Minor1 |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 9 | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | 509 | 251 | 318 | 517 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  |  | - | 500 | - | 9 | 9 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  |  | - | 9 | - | 309 | 508 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.18 | - | - |  |  | - | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - |  |  | - | 5.5 | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | 6.5 | 5.5 | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.24 | - | - |  |  | - | 4 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1595 | - | - |  |  | 0 | 470 | 755 | 616 | 465 | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  |  | 0 | 546 | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  |  | 0 | - | - | 682 | 542 | 0 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1581 | - | - |  |  | - | 450 | 748 | 544 | 445 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - |  |  | - | 450 | - | 544 | 445 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  |  | - | 527 | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | 599 | 524 | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.5 |  |  |  |  | 12.5 |  |  | 13.8 |  |  |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBLn1 | EBL | EBT | EBR SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 539 | 1581 | - | - 491 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.114 | 0.018 | - | - 0.171 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 12.5 | 7.3 | 0.1 | - 13.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | B | A | A | - B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.4 | 0.1 | - | - 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Queues
12: Black Ave \& Main St

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\leftarrow$ | $\dagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 492 | 464 | 73 | 76 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.24 | 0.19 | 0.45 | 0.44 |
| Control Delay | 1.8 | 3.3 | 38.7 | 33.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 1.8 | 3.3 | 38.7 | 33.5 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 16 | 28 | 31 | 27 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 24 | 54 | 69 | 65 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) | 282 | 376 | 300 | 296 |
| Turn Bay Length ( ft ) |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 2091 | 2418 | 339 | 346 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.24 | 0.19 | 0.22 | 0.22 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }^{4} \uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}{ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 46 | 403 | 33 | 11 | 430 | 14 | 36 | 24 | 12 | 28 | 24 | 23 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 46 | 403 | 33 | 11 | 430 | 14 | 36 | 24 | 12 | 28 | 24 | 23 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 0.95 |  | 0.85 | 0.92 |  | 0.85 | 0.85 |  | 0.83 | 0.85 |  | 0.83 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1750 | 1709 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | 1654 | 1750 | 1750 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 47 | 411 | 34 | 11 | 439 | 14 | 37 | 24 | 12 | 29 | 24 | 23 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 197 | 1618 | 133 | 66 | 2005 | 63 | 204 | 122 | 52 | 155 | 121 | 95 |
| Arrive On Green | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 229 | 2532 | 208 | 34 | 3138 | 99 | 616 | 537 | 227 | 425 | 531 | 415 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 251 | 0 | 241 | 244 | 0 | 220 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1496 | 0 | 1473 | 1717 | 0 | 1553 | 1379 | 0 | 0 | 1372 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.19 |  | 0.14 | 0.05 |  | 0.06 | 0.51 |  | 0.16 | 0.38 |  | 0.30 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 1007 | 0 | 941 | 1141 | 0 | 993 | 378 | 0 | 0 | 371 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1007 | 0 | 941 | 1141 | 0 | 993 | 404 | 0 | 0 | 397 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 0.98 | 0.00 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 26.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 26.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | C | A | A | C | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 492 |  |  | 464 |  |  | 73 |  |  | 76 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 0.6 |  |  | 6.9 |  |  | 26.8 |  |  | 26.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | c |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$, s | 59.6 | 25.4 | 59.6 | 25.4 |
| Change Period $(Y+R c), s$ | ${ }^{*} 5.3$ | 6.0 | $* 5.3$ | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | $* 53$ | 21.0 | $* 53$ | 21.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 2.0 | 5.4 | 7.1 | 5.1 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 3.6 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 0.3 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 6.8
HCM 6th LOS
A

## Notes

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



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow \uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 27 | 392 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 50 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 27 | 392 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 38 | 38 | 50 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 15 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 15 | 32 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 32 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 32 | 461 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 59 | 0 |



|  | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach | 65.0 | 65.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Crosswalk Length (ft) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Crosswalk Width (ft) | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Total Number of Lanes Crossed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Right-Turn Islands | PretimedPretimed Pretimed Pretimed |  |  |  |
| Type of Control | 4 | 8 | 2 | 6 |
| Corresponding Signal Phase | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Effective Walk Time (s) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size A (ft) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size B (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Curb Radius (ft) | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 |
| Right Corner Total Area (sq.ft) | 16 | 23 | 46 | 36 |
| Ped. Left-Right Flow Rate (p/h) | 16 | 23 | 46 | 37 |
| Ped. Right-Left Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. R. Sidewalk Flow Rate (p/h) | 25 | 18 | 17 | 17 |
| Veh. Perm. L. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 31 | 22 | 16 | 18 |
| Veh. Perm. R. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Veh. RTOR Flow in Walk (v/h) | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| 85th percentile speed (mph) | 570.8 | 595.7 | 511.2 | 677.1 |
| Right Corner Area per Ped (sq.ft) | A | A | A | A |
| Right Correr Quality of Service | 616.5 | 436.8 | 193.0 | 242.9 |
| Ped. Circulation Area (sq.ft) | A | A | A | A |
| Crosswalk Circulation Code | 27.3 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 27.3 |
| Pedestrian Delay (s/p) | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair |
| Pedestrian Compliance Code | 2.36 | 2.35 | 1.80 | 1.80 |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk Score | B | B | B | B |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS |  |  |  |  |


| Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach Direction | EB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 6.9 |
| Level of Service | B |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 257 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 22 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning | No |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.64 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.40 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 16.80 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 6.95 |
|  |  |
| Approach |  |
| Approach Direction | WB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 6.9 |
| Level of Service | B |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 257 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 41 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning | No |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.64 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.40 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 16.80 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 6.95 |


| Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach Direction | EB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 17.0 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 50 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 352 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 16 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning | No |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 17.29 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.82 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.57 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 34.24 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 17.00 |
|  |  |
| Approach |  |
| Approach Direction | WB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 9.0 |
| Level of Service | B |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 36 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 352 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 26 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning No |  |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 13.29 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.73 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.48 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 19.22 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 9.02 |


|  | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach | 60.0 | 60.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Crosswalk Length (ft) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Crosswalk Width (ft) | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Total Number of Lanes Crossed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Right-Turn Islands | Pretimed Pretimed Pretimed Pretimed |  |  |  |
| Type of Control | 4 | 8 | 2 | 6 |
| Corresponding Signal Phase | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Effective Walk Time (s) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size A (ft) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size B (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Curb Radius (ft) | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 |
| Right Corner Total Area (sq.ft) | 46 | 8 | 32 | 59 |
| Ped. Left-Right Flow Rate (p/h) | 47 | 9 | 32 | 59 |
| Ped. Right-Left Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. R. Sidewalk Flow Rate (p/h) | 38 | 14 | 18 | 18 |
| Veh. Perm. L. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 29 | 23 | 18 | 18 |
| Veh. Perm. R. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Veh. RTOR Flow in Walk (v/h) | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| 85th percentile speed (mph) | 447.2 | 522.8 | 883.1 | 328.5 |
| Right Corner Area per Ped (sq.ft) | A | A | A | A |
| Right Correr Quality of Service | 203.5 | 1169.1 | 276.9 | 149.0 |
| Ped. Circulation Area (sq.ft) | A | A | A | A |
| Crosswalk Circulation Code | 27.3 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 27.3 |
| Pedestrian Delay (s/p) | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair |
| Pedestrian Compliance Code | 2.40 | 2.36 | 1.81 | 1.82 |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk Score | B | B | B | B |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS |  |  |  |  |


| Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach Direction | EB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 6.7 |
| Level of Service | B |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 252 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 25 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning | No |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.64 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.40 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 16.53 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 6.68 |
|  |  |
| Approach |  |
| Approach Direction | WB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 6.7 |
| Level of Service | B |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 252 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 22 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning No |  |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.64 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.40 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 16.53 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 6.68 |


| Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach Direction | EB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 10.9 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 354 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 21 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning | No |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.76 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.51 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 22.99 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 10.93 |
|  |  |
| Approach |  |
| Approach Direction | WB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 10.9 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 354 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 6 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning No |  |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.76 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.51 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 22.99 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 10.93 |


|  | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach | 65.0 | 65.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Crosswalk Length (ft) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Crosswalk Width (ft) | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Total Number of Lanes Crossed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Right-Turn Islands | PretimedPretimed Pretimed Pretimed |  |  |  |
| Type of Control | 4 | 8 | 2 | 6 |
| Corresponding Signal Phase | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Effective Walk Time (s) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size A (ft) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size B (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Curb Radius (ft) | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 |
| Right Corner Total Area (sq.ft) | 48 | 73 | 213 | 236 |
| Ped. Left-Right Flow Rate (p/h) | 49 | 73 | 213 | 235 |
| Ped. Right-Left Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. R. Sidewalk Flow Rate (p/h) | 24 | 22 | 29 | 39 |
| Veh. Perm. L. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 53 | 42 | 13 | 28 |
| Veh. Perm. R. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Veh. RTOR Flow in Walk (v/h) | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| 85th percentile speed (mph) | 119.2 | 98.0 | 107.3 | 108.3 |
| Right Corner Area per Ped (sq.ft) | A | A | A | A |
| Right Correr Quality of Service | 171.0 | 115.2 | 33.7 | 28.4 |
| Ped. Circulation Area (sq.ft) | A | A | C | C |
| Crosswalk Circulation Code | 32.2 | 32.2 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| Pedestrian Delay (s/p) | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor |
| Pedestrian Compliance Code | 2.43 | 2.42 | 1.86 | 1.88 |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk Score | B | B | B | B |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS |  |  |  |  |


| Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach Direction | EB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 12.9 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 398 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 39 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning | No |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.80 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.55 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 26.48 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 12.93 |
|  |  |
| Approach |  |
| Approach Direction | WB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 12.9 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 398 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 83 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning No |  |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.80 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.55 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 26.48 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 12.93 |


| Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach Direction | EB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 22.3 |
| Level of Service | D |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 50 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 451 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 38 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning | No |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 17.29 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.89 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.66 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 50.07 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 22.32 |
|  |  |
| Approach |  |
| Approach Direction | WB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 12.7 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 36 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 451 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 35 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning No |  |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 13.29 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.81 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.56 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 25.78 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 12.74 |


|  | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach | 60.0 | 60.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Crosswalk Length (ft) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Crosswalk Width (ft) | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Total Number of Lanes Crossed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Right-Turn Islands | Pretimed Pretimed Pretimed Pretimed |  |  |  |
| Type of Control | 4 | 8 | 2 | 6 |
| Corresponding Signal Phase | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Effective Walk Time (s) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size A (ft) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size B (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Curb Radius (ft) | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 |
| Right Corner Total Area (sq.ft) | 127 | 44 | 185 | 251 |
| Ped. Left-Right Flow Rate (p/h) | 127 | 44 | 185 | 251 |
| Ped. Right-Left Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. R. Sidewalk Flow Rate (p/h) | 50 | 16 | 23 | 35 |
| Veh. Perm. L. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 24 | 30 | 12 | 23 |
| Veh. Perm. R. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Veh. RTOR Flow in Walk (v/h) | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| 85th percentile speed (mph) | 96.7 | 103.4 | 139.0 | 76.3 |
| Right Corner Area per Ped (sq.ft) | A | A | A | A |
| Right Correr Quality of Service | 62.8 | 193.5 | 39.8 | 27.2 |
| Ped. Circulation Area (sq.ft) | A | A | C | C |
| Crosswalk Circulation Code | 32.2 | 32.2 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| Pedestrian Delay (s/p) | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor |
| Pedestrian Compliance Code | 2.49 | 2.43 | 1.82 | 1.87 |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk Score | B | B | B | B |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS |  |  |  |  |


| Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach Direction | EB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 12.1 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 380 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 58 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning | No |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.78 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.53 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 24.99 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 12.06 |
|  |  |
| Approach |  |
| Approach Direction | WB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 12.1 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 380 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 29 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning No |  |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.78 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.53 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 24.99 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 12.06 |


| Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach Direction | EB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 20.7 |
| Level of Service | D |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 459 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 91 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning | No |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.88 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.65 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 44.97 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 20.74 |
|  |  |
| Approach |  |
| Approach Direction | WB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 15.7 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 459 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 18 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning No |  |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.84 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.60 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 32.21 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 15.72 |


|  | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach | 65.0 | 65.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Crosswalk Length (ft) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Crosswalk Width (ft) | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Total Number of Lanes Crossed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Right-Turn Islands | PretimedPretimed Pretimed Pretimed |  |  |  |
| Type of Control | 4 | 8 | 2 | 6 |
| Corresponding Signal Phase | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Effective Walk Time (s) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size A (ft) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size B (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Curb Radius (ft) | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 |
| Right Corner Total Area (sq.ft) | 19 | 43 | 111 | 161 |
| Ped. Left-Right Flow Rate (p/h) | 20 | 43 | 111 | 161 |
| Ped. Right-Left Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. R. Sidewalk Flow Rate (p/h) | 24 | 11 | 31 | 23 |
| Veh. Perm. L. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 29 | 15 | 14 | 23 |
| Veh. Perm. R. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Veh. RTOR Flow in Walk (v/h) | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| 85th percentile speed (mph) | 259.1 | 158.5 | 216.6 | 181.9 |
| Right Corner Area per Ped (sq.ft) | A | A | A | A |
| Right Correr Quality of Service | 443.5 | 207.7 | 66.4 | 44.9 |
| Ped. Circulation Area (sq.ft) | A | A | A | B |
| Crosswalk Circulation Code | 32.2 | 32.2 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| Pedestrian Delay (s/p) | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor |
| Pedestrian Compliance Code | 2.41 | 2.38 | 1.83 | 1.82 |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk Score | B | B | B | B |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS |  |  |  |  |


| Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach Direction | EB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 15.6 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 454 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 31 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning | No |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.84 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.60 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 31.70 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 15.56 |
|  |  |
| Approach |  |
| Approach Direction | WB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 15.6 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 454 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 52 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning No |  |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.84 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.60 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 31.70 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 15.56 |


| Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach Direction | EB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 18.0 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 50 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 365 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 25 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning | No |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 17.29 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.83 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.58 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 35.99 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 18.04 |
|  |  |
| Approach |  |
| Approach Direction | WB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 9.4 |
| Level of Service | B |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 36 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 365 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 21 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning No |  |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 13.29 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.74 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.49 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 19.98 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 9.41 |


|  | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach | 60.0 | 60.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| Crosswalk Length (ft) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Crosswalk Width (ft) | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Total Number of Lanes Crossed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Right-Turn Islands | Pretimed Pretimed Pretimed Pretimed |  |  |  |
| Type of Control | 4 | 8 | 2 | 6 |
| Corresponding Signal Phase | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Effective Walk Time (s) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size A (ft) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size B (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Curb Radius (ft) | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 |
| Right Corner Total Area (sq.ft) | 65 | 24 | 84 | 165 |
| Ped. Left-Right Flow Rate (p/h) | 65 | 25 | 84 | 166 |
| Ped. Right-Left Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. R. Sidewalk Flow Rate (p/h) | 46 | 11 | 36 | 28 |
| Veh. Perm. L. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 33 | 14 | 12 | 23 |
| Veh. Perm. R. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Veh. RTOR Flow in Walk (v/h) | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| 85th percentile speed (mph) | 224.5 | 171.7 | 315.9 | 138.0 |
| Right Corner Area per Ped (sq.ft) | A | A | A | A |
| Right Correr Quality of Service | 123.7 | 360.4 | 87.9 | 43.1 |
| Ped. Circulation Area (sq.ft) | A | A | A | B |
| Crosswalk Circulation Code | 32.2 | 32.2 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| Pedestrian Delay (s/p) | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor |
| Pedestrian Compliance Code | 2.44 | 2.37 | 1.83 | 1.83 |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk Score | B | B | B | B |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS |  |  |  |  |


| Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach Direction | EB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 13.5 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 409 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 29 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning | No |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.81 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.56 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 27.44 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 13.50 |
|  |  |
| Approach |  |
| Approach Direction | WB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 13.5 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 409 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 28 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning No |  |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.81 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.56 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 27.44 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 13.50 |


| Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach Direction | EB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 12.6 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 392 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 32 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning | No |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.79 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.54 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 25.98 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 12.63 |
|  |  |
| Approach |  |
| Approach Direction | WB |
| Median Present? | No |
| Approach Delay(s) | 12.6 |
| Level of Service | C |
| Crosswalk |  |
| Length (ft) | 40 |
| Lanes Crossed | 2 |
| Veh Vol Crossed | 392 |
| Ped Vol Crossed | 14 |
| Yield Rate(\%) | 50 |
| Ped Platooning No |  |
|  |  |
| Critical Headway (s) | 14.43 |
| Prob of Delayed X-ing | 0.79 |
| Prob of Blocked Lane | 0.54 |
| Delay for adq Gap | 25.98 |
| Avg Ped Delay (s) | 12.63 |

TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS -
EXISTING (2022)

| TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS |  | Existing Volumes (2022) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | E Mendenhall Street \& N Tracy Avenue | E Mendenhall Street \& N Black Avenue | E Babcock Street \& S Tracy Avenue | E Babcock Street \& S Black Avenue |
| 1. Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume |  | x | x | x | x |
| 2. Four-Hour Vehicular Volume |  | x | x | x | x |
| 3. Peak Hour |  | x | x | x | x |
| 4. Pedestrian Volume |  | x | x | x | x |
| 5. School Crossing |  | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 6. Coordinated Signal System |  | x | x | x | x |
| 7. Crash History |  | x | x | x | x |
| 8. Roadway Network |  | x | x | x | x |
| 9. Intersection Near a Grade Crossing |  | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Signals Warranted | Yes |  |  |  |  |
|  | No | x | x | x | x |

## Warrant 1: Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume

General Information

| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Mendenhall Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Tracy Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Existing (2022) |


| Hour <br> Begin | Avg. Entering Volume |  |  |  | Major Street Total (Both Approaches) | Higher Volume Minor Approach |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NB | SB | EB | WB |  |  |
| 0:00 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 29 | 29 | 7 |
| 1:00 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 3 |
| 2:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 1 |
| 3:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1 |
| 4:00 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 3 |
| 5:00 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 27 | 27 | 14 |
| 6:00 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 66 | 66 | 9 |
| 7:00 | 40 | 34 | 0 | 182 | 182 | 40 |
| 8:00 | 43 | 40 | 0 | 293 | 293 | 43 |
| 9:00 | 82 | 41 | 0 | 296 | 296 | 82 |
| 10:00 | 103 | 67 | 0 | 318 | 318 | 103 |
| 11:00 | 86 | 77 | 0 | 409 | 409 | 86 |
| 12:00 | 130 | 77 | 0 | 488 | 488 | 130 |
| 13:00 | 89 | 75 | 0 | 444 | 444 | 89 |
| 14:00 | 97 | 71 | 0 | 385 | 385 | 97 |
| 15:00 | 72 | 65 | 0 | 417 | 417 | 72 |
| 16:00 | 76 | 62 | 0 | 422 | 422 | 76 |
| 17:00 | 73 | 56 | 0 | 514 | 514 | 73 |
| 18:00 | 84 | 75 | 0 | 335 | 335 | 84 |
| 19:00 | 64 | 45 | 0 | 259 | 259 | 64 |
| 20:00 | 42 | 29 | 0 | 240 | 240 | 42 |
| 21:00 | 36 | 30 | 0 | 194 | 194 | 36 |
| 22:00 | 23 | 16 | 0 | 122 | 122 | 23 |
| 23:00 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 65 | 65 | 11 |
| TOTAL | 1181 | 899 | 0 | 5547 | 5547 | 1189 |

Condition A - Minimum Vehicular Volume ( $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ Columns):
Major Street Total $>600$ and Higher Minor Street Total $>150$ for 8 hours?
Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic (100\% Columns):
Major Street Total $>900$ and Higher Minor Street Total $>75$ for 8 hours?
Combination of Conditions A \& B ( $\mathbf{8 0} \%$ Columns):
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Major Street Total }>480 \text { and Higher Minor Street Total }>120 \text { for } 8 \text { hours? } & \text { No } & \mathbf{1} \\ \text { Major Street Total }>720 \text { and Higher Minor Street Total }>60 \text { for } 8 \text { hours? } & \text { No } & \mathbf{0}\end{array}$
Warrant 1 Satisfied?

No
No

No



## Warrant 4: Pedestrian Volume

| General Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Mendenhall Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Tracy Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Design Year (2042) |

This warrant is intended for application where the traffic volume on a major street is so heavy that pedestrians experience excessive delay in crossing the major street.

| Hour <br> Begin | Major Street <br> Total Traffic | Pedestrian Volume <br> Crossing Major Street |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0: 00$ | 43 | 0 |
| $1: 00$ | 31 | 0 |
| $2: 00$ | 10 | 0 |
| $3: 00$ | 9 | 0 |
| $4: 00$ | 12 | 0 |
| $5: 00$ | 40 | 4 |
| $6: 00$ | 98 | 16 |
| $7: 00$ | 270 | 30 |
| $8: 00$ | 435 | 53 |
| $9: 00$ | 440 | 61 |
| $10: 00$ | 473 | 67 |
| $11: 00$ | 608 | 110 |
| $12: 00$ | 725 | 187 |
| $13: 00$ | 660 | 214 |
| $14: 00$ | 572 | 160 |
| $15: 00$ | 620 | 135 |
| $16: 00$ | 627 | 100 |
| $17: 00$ | 764 | 108 |
| $18: 00$ | 498 | 158 |
| $19: 00$ | 385 | 227 |
| $20: 00$ | 357 | 207 |
| $21: 00$ | 288 | 199 |
| $22: 00$ | 181 | 28 |
| $23: 00$ | 97 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 8,243 | 2064 |
|  |  |  |



For each of any 4 hours of an average day, do the plotted points representing representing the vehicles per hour on the major street and the corresponding pedestrians per hour crossing the major street fall above the curve in Figure 4C-5?

For 1 hour of an average day, does the plotted point representing vehicles per hour on the major street and the corresponding pedestrians per hour crossing the major street fall above the curve in Figure 4C-7?

## Warrant 4 Satisfied?

No

## General Information

| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Mendenhall Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Tracy Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Existing (2022) |

## Warrant 5: School Crossing

This warrant is intended for application where the fact that school children (elementary through high school
students) cross the major street is the principle reason to consider installing a traffic signal. This warrant shall
not be applied at locations where the distance to the nearest traffic control signal along the major street is less
than 300 feet, unless it can be shown that the proposed traffic signal would not restrict the progressive movement of traffic.
Is the number of adequate gaps in the major crossing traffic steam during the primary crossing
period less than the number of minutes in that crossing period?
Do 20 or more students cross at this location during the highest crossing hour?

$$
\text { Warrant } 5 \text { Satisfied? N/A }
$$

## Warrant 6: Coordinated Signal System

This warrant is intended for application where installation of a traffic signal would help to provide proper
platooning of vehicles and therefore provide progressive movement in a coordinated signal system.
Are any adjacent traffic signals located so far away that they do not provide a necessary degree of platooning and/or progressive operation?

Warrant 6 Satisfied? No

## Warrant 7: Crash Experience

This warrant is intended for application where the severity and frequency of crashes are the principal reasons to consider installing a traffic control signal

| Have adequate trials of alternatives failed to reduce the crash frequency? |
| :--- |
| Have 5 or more crashes, of types susceptible to correction by a signal, occurred within a 12 -month <br> period? <br> Is Condition A criterion met for $80 \%$ columns of Warrant 1 met? <br> Is Condition B criterion met for $80 \%$ columns of Warrant 1 met? |
| Are observed pedestrian volumes equal to or greater than $80 \%$ of what is required for Warrant 4?  <br> Warrant 7 Satisfied? No |


| General Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Mendenhall Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Tracy Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Existing (2022) |

## Warrant 8: Roadway Network

This warrant is intended for application where installation of a traffic signal could be justified in order to encourage concentration and organization of traffic flow on a roadway network

Do two or more of the intersecting routes at this location have at least one of the following characteristics:
A. It is part of the street or highway system that serves as the principal roadway network for through traffic flow; or
B. It includes rural or suburban highways outside, entering, or traversing a City; or
C. It appears as a major route on an official plan.

## No

Does this intersection have an existing or immediately projected total entering volume of a least 1000 vehicles during a weekday typical peak hour and have a 5 -year projected traffic volume that meets one or more of Warrants 1,2 , and 3 during an average weekday?

Does this intersection have an existing or immediately projected total entering volume of at least 1000 vph for each of any 5 hours of a Saturday or Sunday?

Warrant 8 Satisfied?
No

## Warrant 9: Intersection Near a Grade Crossing

This warrant is intended for application where none of the conditions described in the other eight traffic signal warrants are met, but the proximity to the intersection of a grade crossing on an intersection approach controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic signal.

Does a grade crossing exist on an approach controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign whereby the center of the track nearest to the intersection is within 140 feet of the stop or yield line?

No


During the highest traffic volume hour during which the rail traffic uses the crossing, does the plotted point representing vehicles per hour on the major street and the corresponding vehicles per hour on the minor-street approach that crosses the track fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-9 or 4C-10 (whichever is applicable) for the existing combination of approach lanes over the track and the distance D , which is the clear storage distance? N/A

Warrant 9 Satisfied? N/A

## Warrant 1: Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume

General Information

| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Mendenhall Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Black Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Existing (2022) |


| Hour Begin | Avg. Entering Volume |  |  |  | Major Street Total (Both Approaches) | Higher Volume <br> Minor <br> Approach |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NB | SB | EB | WB |  |  |
| 0:00 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 6 |
| 1:00 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 3 |
| 2:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1 |
| 3:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 4:00 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| 5:00 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 24 | 24 | 7 |
| 6:00 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 63 | 63 | 19 |
| 7:00 | 36 | 37 | 0 | 172 | 172 | 37 |
| 8:00 | 68 | 94 | 0 | 268 | 268 | 94 |
| 9:00 | 64 | 57 | 0 | 287 | 287 | 64 |
| 10:00 | 86 | 71 | 0 | 307 | 307 | 86 |
| 11:00 | 104 | 69 | 0 | 421 | 421 | 104 |
| 12:00 | 114 | 91 | 0 | 450 | 450 | 114 |
| 13:00 | 102 | 76 | 0 | 390 | 390 | 102 |
| 14:00 | 90 | 50 | 0 | 359 | 359 | 90 |
| 15:00 | 96 | 63 | 0 | 383 | 383 | 96 |
| 16:00 | 66 | 69 | 0 | 372 | 372 | 69 |
| 17:00 | 78 | 74 | 0 | 454 | 454 | 78 |
| 18:00 | 62 | 97 | 0 | 309 | 309 | 97 |
| 19:00 | 42 | 64 | 0 | 213 | 213 | 64 |
| 20:00 | 34 | 37 | 0 | 182 | 182 | 37 |
| 21:00 | 28 | 27 | 0 | 143 | 143 | 28 |
| 22:00 | 20 | 23 | 0 | 99 | 99 | 23 |
| 23:00 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 60 | 60 | 10 |
| TOTAL | 1131 | 1045 | 0 | 5007 | 5007 | 1236 |

Condition A - Minimum Vehicular Volume ( $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ Columns):
Major Street Total $>600$ and Higher Minor Street Total $>150$ for 8 hours?
Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic ( $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ Columns):
Major Street Total > 900 and Higher Minor Street Total > 75 for 8 hours?
Combination of Conditions A \& B ( $80 \%$ Columns):
Major Street Total > 480 and Higher Minor Street Total $>120$ for 8 hours?
Major Street Total > 720 and Higher Minor Street Total $>60$ for 8 hours?
Warrant 1 Satisfied?

No

No
No



## Warrant 4: Pedestrian Volume

| General Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Mendenhall Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Black Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Design Year (2042) |

This warrant is intended for application where the traffic volume on a major street is so heavy that pedestrians experience excessive delay in crossing the major street.

| Hour <br> Begin | Major Street <br> Total Traffic | Pedestrian Volume <br> Crossing Major Street |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0: 00$ | 30 | 0 |
| $1: 00$ | 22 | 0 |
| $2: 00$ | 9 | 0 |
| $3: 00$ | 7 | 0 |
| $4: 00$ | 7 | 0 |
| $5: 00$ | 36 | 12 |
| $6: 00$ | 94 | 12 |
| $7: 00$ | 256 | 45 |
| $8: 00$ | 398 | 61 |
| $9: 00$ | 426 | 40 |
| $10: 00$ | 456 | 52 |
| $11: 00$ | 626 | 76 |
| $12: 00$ | 669 | 73 |
| $13: 00$ | 580 | 98 |
| $14: 00$ | 533 | 97 |
| $15: 00$ | 569 | 103 |
| $16: 00$ | 553 | 89 |
| $17: 00$ | 675 | 113 |
| $18: 00$ | 459 | 106 |
| $19: 00$ | 317 | 101 |
| $20: 00$ | 270 | 175 |
| $21: 00$ | 212 | 128 |
| $22: 00$ | 147 | 97 |
| $23: 00$ | 89 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 7,440 | $\mathbf{1 4 7 8}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 |



For each of any 4 hours of an average day, do the plotted points representing representing the vehicles per hour on the major street and the corresponding pedestrians per hour crossing the major street fall above the curve in Figure 4C-5?

For 1 hour of an average day, does the plotted point representing vehicles per hour on the major street and the corresponding pedestrians per hour crossing the major street fall above the curve in Figure 4C-7?

## Warrant 4 Satisfied?

No

## General Information

| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Mendenhall Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Black Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Existing (2022) |

## Warrant 5: School Crossing

This warrant is intended for application where the fact that school children (elementary through high school
students) cross the major street is the principle reason to consider installing a traffic signal. This warrant shall
not be applied at locations where the distance to the nearest traffic control signal along the major street is less
than 300 feet, unless it can be shown that the proposed traffic signal would not restrict the progressive movement of traffic.
Is the number of adequate gaps in the major crossing traffic steam during the primary crossing
period less than the number of minutes in that crossing period?
Do 20 or more students cross at this location during the highest crossing hour?

$$
\text { Warrant } 5 \text { Satisfied? N/A }
$$

## Warrant 6: Coordinated Signal System

This warrant is intended for application where installation of a traffic signal would help to provide proper
platooning of vehicles and therefore provide progressive movement in a coordinated signal system.
Are any adjacent traffic signals located so far away that they do not provide a necessary degree of platooning and/or progressive operation?

Warrant 6 Satisfied? No

## Warrant 7: Crash Experience

This warrant is intended for application where the severity and frequency of crashes are the principal reasons to consider installing a traffic control signal

| Have adequate trials of alternatives failed to reduce the crash frequency? |
| :--- |
| Have 5 or more crashes, of types susceptible to correction by a signal, occurred within a 12 -month <br> period? <br> Is Condition A criterion met for $80 \%$ columns of Warrant 1 met? <br> Is Condition B criterion met for $80 \%$ columns of Warrant 1 met? |
| Are observed pedestrian volumes equal to or greater than $80 \%$ of what is required for Warrant 4?  <br> Warrant 7 Satisfied? No |


| General Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Mendenhall Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Black Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Existing (2022) |

## Warrant 8: Roadway Network

This warrant is intended for application where installation of a traffic signal could be justified in order to encourage concentration and organization of traffic flow on a roadway network

Do two or more of the intersecting routes at this location have at least one of the following characteristics:
A. It is part of the street or highway system that serves as the principal roadway network for through traffic flow; or
B. It includes rural or suburban highways outside, entering, or traversing a City; or
C. It appears as a major route on an official plan.

## No

Does this intersection have an existing or immediately projected total entering volume of a least 1000 vehicles during a weekday typical peak hour and have a 5 -year projected traffic volume that meets one or more of Warrants 1,2 , and 3 during an average weekday?

Does this intersection have an existing or immediately projected total entering volume of at least 1000 vph for each of any 5 hours of a Saturday or Sunday?

Warrant 8 Satisfied?
No

## Warrant 9: Intersection Near a Grade Crossing

This warrant is intended for application where none of the conditions described in the other eight traffic signal warrants are met, but the proximity to the intersection of a grade crossing on an intersection approach controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic signal.

Does a grade crossing exist on an approach controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign whereby the center of the track nearest to the intersection is within 140 feet of the stop or yield line?

No


During the highest traffic volume hour during which the rail traffic uses the crossing, does the plotted point representing vehicles per hour on the major street and the corresponding vehicles per hour on the minor-street approach that crosses the track fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-9 or 4C-10 (whichever is applicable) for the existing combination of approach lanes over the track and the distance D , which is the clear storage distance? N/A

Warrant 9 Satisfied? N/A

## Warrant 1: Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume

General Information

| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Babcock Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Black Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Existing (2022) |


| Hour <br> Begin | Avg. Entering Volume |  |  |  | Major Street <br> Total (Both <br> Approaches) | Higher Volume <br> Minor <br> Approach |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 2 |
| $1: 00$ | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 3 |
| $2: 00$ | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| $3: 00$ | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| $4: 00$ | 1 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 1 |
| $5: 00$ | 7 | 5 | 46 | 0 | 46 | 7 |
| $6: 00$ | 13 | 24 | 90 | 0 | 90 | 24 |
| $7: 00$ | 23 | 35 | 269 | 0 | 269 | 35 |
| $8: 00$ | 31 | 76 | 383 | 0 | 383 | 76 |
| $9: 00$ | 58 | 91 | 352 | 0 | 352 | 91 |
| $10: 00$ | 61 | 117 | 358 | 0 | 358 | 117 |
| $11: 00$ | 84 | 124 | 430 | 0 | 430 | 124 |
| $12: 00$ | 93 | 127 | 502 | 0 | 502 | 127 |
| $13: 00$ | 78 | 107 | 433 | 0 | 433 | 107 |
| $14: 00$ | 67 | 97 | 378 | 0 | 378 | 97 |
| $15: 00$ | 76 | 84 | 393 | 0 | 393 | 84 |
| $16: 00$ | 68 | 56 | 371 | 0 | 371 | 68 |
| $17: 00$ | 52 | 71 | 402 | 0 | 402 | 71 |
| $18: 00$ | 33 | 60 | 289 | 0 | 289 | 60 |
| $19: 00$ | 23 | 33 | 194 | 0 | 194 | 33 |
| $20: 00$ | 16 | 28 | 128 | 0 | 128 | 28 |
| $21: 00$ | 11 | 19 | 75 | 0 | 75 | 19 |
| $22: 00$ | 4 | 7 | 44 | 0 | 44 | 7 |
| $23: 00$ | 6 | 10 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 10 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{8 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 9 4}$ |

Condition A - Minimum Vehicular Volume ( $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ Columns):
Major Street Total $>600$ and Higher Minor Street Total $>150$ for 8 hours?
Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic (100\% Columns):
Major Street Total > 900 and Higher Minor Street Total > 75 for 8 hours?
Combination of Conditions A \& B ( $\mathbf{8 0} \%$ Columns):
Major Street Total $>480$ and Higher Minor Street Total $>120$ for 8 hours?
Major Street Total > 720 and Higher Minor Street Total $>60$ for 8 hours?
Warrant 1 Satisfied?

No
No



## Warrant 4: Pedestrian Volume

| General Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Babcock Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Black Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Design Year (2042) |

This warrant is intended for application where the traffic volume on a major street is so heavy that pedestrians experience excessive delay in crossing the major street.

| Hour <br> Begin | Major Street <br> Total Traffic | Pedestrian Volume <br> Crossing Major Street |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0: 00$ | 12 | 0 |
| $1: 00$ | 12 | 0 |
| $2: 00$ | 4 | 0 |
| $3: 00$ | 4 | 0 |
| $4: 00$ | 12 | 0 |
| $5: 00$ | 68 | 4 |
| $6: 00$ | 134 | 15 |
| $7: 00$ | 400 | 24 |
| $8: 00$ | 569 | 33 |
| $9: 00$ | 523 | 85 |
| $10: 00$ | 532 | 76 |
| $11: 00$ | 639 | 92 |
| $12: 00$ | 746 | 120 |
| $13: 00$ | 643 | 86 |
| $14: 00$ | 562 | 85 |
| $15: 00$ | 584 | 73 |
| $16: 00$ | 551 | 59 |
| $17: 00$ | 597 | 61 |
| $18: 00$ | 429 | 45 |
| $19: 00$ | 288 | 36 |
| $20: 00$ | 190 | 24 |
| $21: 00$ | 111 | 6 |
| $22: 00$ | 65 | 6 |
| $23: 00$ | 28 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 7,703 | 930 |
|  |  |  |



For each of any 4 hours of an average day, do the plotted points representing representing the vehicles per hour on the major street and the corresponding pedestrians per hour crossing the major street fall above the curve in Figure 4C-5?

For 1 hour of an average day, does the plotted point representing vehicles per hour on the major street and the corresponding pedestrians per hour crossing the major street fall above the curve in Figure 4C-7?

## Warrant 4 Satisfied?

No

## General Information

| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Babcock Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Black Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Existing (2022) |

## Warrant 5: School Crossing

This warrant is intended for application where the fact that school children (elementary through high school
students) cross the major street is the principle reason to consider installing a traffic signal. This warrant shall
not be applied at locations where the distance to the nearest traffic control signal along the major street is less
than 300 feet, unless it can be shown that the proposed traffic signal would not restrict the progressive movement of traffic.
Is the number of adequate gaps in the major crossing traffic steam during the primary crossing
period less than the number of minutes in that crossing period?
Do 20 or more students cross at this location during the highest crossing hour?

$$
\text { Warrant } 5 \text { Satisfied? N/A }
$$

## Warrant 6: Coordinated Signal System

This warrant is intended for application where installation of a traffic signal would help to provide proper
platooning of vehicles and therefore provide progressive movement in a coordinated signal system.
Are any adjacent traffic signals located so far away that they do not provide a necessary degree of platooning and/or progressive operation?

Warrant 6 Satisfied? No

## Warrant 7: Crash Experience

This warrant is intended for application where the severity and frequency of crashes are the principal reasons to consider installing a traffic control signal

| Have adequate trials of alternatives failed to reduce the crash frequency? |
| :--- |
| Have 5 or more crashes, of types susceptible to correction by a signal, occurred within a 12 -month <br> period? <br> Is Condition A criterion met for $80 \%$ columns of Warrant 1 met? <br> Is Condition B criterion met for $80 \%$ columns of Warrant 1 met? |
| Are observed pedestrian volumes equal to or greater than $80 \%$ of what is required for Warrant 4?  <br> Warrant 7 Satisfied? No |


| General Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Babcock Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Black Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Existing (2022) |

## Warrant 8: Roadway Network

This warrant is intended for application where installation of a traffic signal could be justified in order to encourage concentration and organization of traffic flow on a roadway network

Do two or more of the intersecting routes at this location have at least one of the following characteristics:
A. It is part of the street or highway system that serves as the principal roadway network for through traffic flow; or
B. It includes rural or suburban highways outside, entering, or traversing a City; or
C. It appears as a major route on an official plan.

## No

Does this intersection have an existing or immediately projected total entering volume of a least 1000 vehicles during a weekday typical peak hour and have a 5 -year projected traffic volume that meets one or more of Warrants 1,2 , and 3 during an average weekday?

Does this intersection have an existing or immediately projected total entering volume of at least 1000 vph for each of any 5 hours of a Saturday or Sunday?

Warrant 8 Satisfied?
No

## Warrant 9: Intersection Near a Grade Crossing

This warrant is intended for application where none of the conditions described in the other eight traffic signal warrants are met, but the proximity to the intersection of a grade crossing on an intersection approach controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic signal.

Does a grade crossing exist on an approach controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign whereby the center of the track nearest to the intersection is within 140 feet of the stop or yield line?

No


During the highest traffic volume hour during which the rail traffic uses the crossing, does the plotted point representing vehicles per hour on the major street and the corresponding vehicles per hour on the minor-street approach that crosses the track fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-9 or 4C-10 (whichever is applicable) for the existing combination of approach lanes over the track and the distance D , which is the clear storage distance? N/A

Warrant 9 Satisfied? N/A

## Warrant 1: Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume

General Information

| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Babcock Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Black Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Existing (2022) |


| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Hour } \\ \text { Begin }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Avg. Entering Volume }\end{array}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Major Street } \\ \text { Total (Both } \\ \text { Approaches) }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Higher Volume } \\ \text { Minor }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$]$

Condition A - Minimum Vehicular Volume ( $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ Columns):
Major Street Total $>600$ and Higher Minor Street Total $>150$ for 8 hours?
Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic (100\% Columns):
Major Street Total > 900 and Higher Minor Street Total > 75 for 8 hours?
Combination of Conditions A \& B ( $\mathbf{8 0} \%$ Columns):
Major Street Total $>480$ and Higher Minor Street Total $>120$ for 8 hours?
Major Street Total > 720 and Higher Minor Street Total $>60$ for 8 hours?
Warrant 1 Satisfied?

No
No



## Warrant 4: Pedestrian Volume

| General Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Babcock Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Black Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Design Year (2042) |

This warrant is intended for application where the traffic volume on a major street is so heavy that pedestrians experience excessive delay in crossing the major street.

| Hour <br> Begin | Major Street <br> Total Traffic | Pedestrian Volume <br> Crossing Major Street |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0: 00$ | 13 | 0 |
| $1: 00$ | 12 | 0 |
| $2: 00$ | 4 | 0 |
| $3: 00$ | 4 | 0 |
| $4: 00$ | 7 | 0 |
| $5: 00$ | 80 | 7 |
| $6: 00$ | 156 | 3 |
| $7: 00$ | 413 | 15 |
| $8: 00$ | 602 | 31 |
| $9: 00$ | 548 | 55 |
| $10: 00$ | 608 | 71 |
| $11: 00$ | 753 | 94 |
| $12: 00$ | 822 | 153 |
| $13: 00$ | 706 | 120 |
| $14: 00$ | 609 | 106 |
| $15: 00$ | 667 | 103 |
| $16: 00$ | 606 | 59 |
| $17: 00$ | 664 | 64 |
| $18: 00$ | 443 | 24 |
| $19: 00$ | 312 | 37 |
| $20: 00$ | 190 | 40 |
| $21: 00$ | 119 | 12 |
| $22: 00$ | 67 | 9 |
| $23: 00$ | 28 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{V e h i c u l a r}$ | 8,433 | 1003 |
|  |  |  |

|


For each of any 4 hours of an average day, do the plotted points representing representing the vehicles per hour on the major street and the corresponding pedestrians per hour crossing the major street fall above the curve in Figure 4C-5?

For 1 hour of an average day, does the plotted point representing vehicles per hour on the major street and the corresponding pedestrians per hour crossing the major street fall above the curve in Figure 4C-7?

No

## General Information

| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Babcock Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Black Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Existing (2022) |

## Warrant 5: School Crossing

This warrant is intended for application where the fact that school children (elementary through high school
students) cross the major street is the principle reason to consider installing a traffic signal. This warrant shall
not be applied at locations where the distance to the nearest traffic control signal along the major street is less
than 300 feet, unless it can be shown that the proposed traffic signal would not restrict the progressive movement of traffic.
Is the number of adequate gaps in the major crossing traffic steam during the primary crossing
period less than the number of minutes in that crossing period?
Do 20 or more students cross at this location during the highest crossing hour?

$$
\text { Warrant } 5 \text { Satisfied? N/A }
$$

## Warrant 6: Coordinated Signal System

This warrant is intended for application where installation of a traffic signal would help to provide proper
platooning of vehicles and therefore provide progressive movement in a coordinated signal system.
Are any adjacent traffic signals located so far away that they do not provide a necessary degree of platooning and/or progressive operation?

Warrant 6 Satisfied? No

## Warrant 7: Crash Experience

This warrant is intended for application where the severity and frequency of crashes are the principal reasons to consider installing a traffic control signal


| General Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Company: | Sanderson Stewart |
| Date: | $9 / 27 / 2022$ |
| Project Number: | 18098.33 |
| Project Description: | Babcock and Mendenhall Safety Improvements |
| Jurisdiction: | City of Bozeman/MDT |
| Major Street Speed Limit: | 25 mph |
| Major Street (Approach Lanes): | Babcock Street (2 lane) |
| Minor Street (Approach Lanes): | Black Avenue (1 lane) |
| Analysis Year/Case: | Existing (2022) |

## Warrant 8: Roadway Network

This warrant is intended for application where installation of a traffic signal could be justified in order to encourage concentration and organization of traffic flow on a roadway network

Do two or more of the intersecting routes at this location have at least one of the following characteristics:
A. It is part of the street or highway system that serves as the principal roadway network for through traffic flow; or
B. It includes rural or suburban highways outside, entering, or traversing a City; or
C. It appears as a major route on an official plan.

## No

Does this intersection have an existing or immediately projected total entering volume of a least 1000 vehicles during a weekday typical peak hour and have a 5 -year projected traffic volume that meets one or more of Warrants 1,2 , and 3 during an average weekday?

Does this intersection have an existing or immediately projected total entering volume of at least 1000 vph for each of any 5 hours of a Saturday or Sunday?

Warrant 8 Satisfied?
No

## Warrant 9: Intersection Near a Grade Crossing

This warrant is intended for application where none of the conditions described in the other eight traffic signal warrants are met, but the proximity to the intersection of a grade crossing on an intersection approach controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic signal.

Does a grade crossing exist on an approach controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign whereby the center of the track nearest to the intersection is within 140 feet of the stop or yield line?

No


During the highest traffic volume hour during which the rail traffic uses the crossing, does the plotted point representing vehicles per hour on the major street and the corresponding vehicles per hour on the minor-street approach that crosses the track fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-9 or 4C-10 (whichever is applicable) for the existing combination of approach lanes over the track and the distance D , which is the clear storage distance? N/A

Warrant 9 Satisfied? N/A

SPEED DATA EXISTING (2022)

|  | Mendenhall - <br> 3rd \& Grand | Mendenhall - <br> Bozeman \& Rouse | Babcock - <br> Black \& Bozeman | Babcock - <br> 3rd \& Grand |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | $7 / \mathrm{II}-13 / 2022$ | $7 / 13-15 / 2022$ | $7 / 13-15 / 2022$ | $7 / \mathrm{II}-13 / 2022$ |
| Direction of Vehicles | Westbound | Westbound | Eastbound | Eastbound |
| ADT (veh) | 5,148 | 4,355 | 5,774 | 4,497 |
| 85th Percentile Speed $(\mathrm{mph})$ | 30 | 27 | 28 | 30 |
| Max speed $(\mathrm{mph})$ | 49 | 55 | 49 | 48 |
| 50th Percentile Speed $(\mathrm{mph})$ | 26 | 23 | 24 | 26 |

## TRAFFIC ANALYSIS REPORT

For Project: Mendenhall 3rd and Grand
Projects Notes/Address:
Location/Name: Merged
Report Generated: 1/19/2023 10:27:33 AM
Speed Intervals = 1 MPH
Time Intervals = Instant
Traffic Report From 7/11/2022 01:00:00 PM through 7/13/2022 01:59:59 PM

85th Percentile Speed $=30.0 \mathrm{MPH}$
85th Percentile Vehicles $=8,934$ counts
Max Speed $=79.0 \mathrm{MPH}$ on 7/13/2022 9:59:33 AM
Total Vehicles $=10,511$ counts
AADT: 5148.3
Volumes - weekly vehicle counts

|  | Time |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average Daily |  |
| AM Peak | $11: 00$ to $12: 00$ |
| PM Peak | $05: 00$ to $06: 00$ |

## Speed

Speed Limit: 25 MPH
85th Percentile Speed: 30.0 MPH
50th Percentile Speed: 26.0 MPH
10 MPH Pace Interval: 20.0 MPH to 30.0 MPH
Average Speed: 25.4 MPH

|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Count over limit | 1675 | 2569 | 1065 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| \% over limit | 54.0 | 49.6 | 47.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Avg Speeder | 28.8 | 28.8 | 29.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Class Counts

|  | Number | $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VEH_SM | 41 | 0.4 |
| VEH_MED | 10208 | 97.1 |
| VEH_LG | 262 | 2.5 |
| [ VEH SM = motorcycle, VEH MED $=$ sedan, VEH_LG = truck ] |  |  |

[ VEH_SM = motorcycle, VEH_MED = sedan, VEH_LG = truck ]
85th pctl (MPH)

85th pctl counts
115
342
342
371
346

| Total Cnts | Max Speed | Avg Speeder | \% Speeders |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 135 | 37 | 28.2 | 37.0\% |
| 402 | 37 | 28.4 | 41.8\% |
| 436 | 36 | 28.4 | 43.1\% |
| 407 | 40 | 28.7 | 55.3\% |
| 473 | 39 | 28.9 | 65.1\% |
| 327 | 43 | 28.9 | 60.9\% |
| 289 | 37 | 28.4 | 51.9\% |
| 221 | 44 | 30.1 | 60.2\% |
| 211 | 37 | 28.9 | 60.2\% |
| 127 | 39 | 29.4 | 64.6\% |
| 76 | 35 | 29.5 | 59.2\% |
| 31 | 37 | 30.1 | 71.0\% |
| 22 | 42 | 29.8 | 68.2\% |
| 7 | 33 | 30.0 | 100.0\% |
| 5 | 32 | 29.3 | 60.0\% |
| 8 | 39 | 29.4 | 87.5\% |
| 34 | 44 | 29.9 | 76.5\% |
| 69 | 39 | 29.6 | 69.6\% |
| 177 | 43 | 29.3 | 70.1\% |
| 242 | 46 | 28.8 | 57.4\% |
| 268 | 55 | 28.9 | 42.9\% |
| 298 | 51 | 28.9 | 37.9\% |
| 351 | 40 | 28.1 | 34.2\% |
| 387 | 56 | 28.5 | 33.9\% |
| 369 | 41 | 28.5 | 38.5\% |
| 358 | 59 | 29.0 | 42.7\% |
| 369 | 59 | 28.7 | 42.0\% |
| 376 | 47 | 28.6 | 45.2\% |
| 372 | 38 | 28.5 | 61.6\% |
| 353 | 42 | 28.7 | 65.2\% |
| 302 | 41 | 28.8 | 53.0\% |
| 314 | 44 | 28.7 | 58.0\% |
| 235 | 40 | 29.1 | 56.2\% |
| 152 | 40 | 28.8 | 65.8\% |
| 78 | 40 | 29.1 | 60.3\% |
| 34 | 36 | 29.6 | 76.5\% |
| 18 | 40 | 29.7 | 61.1\% |
| 9 | 31 | 29.4 | 77.8\% |
| 6 | 40 | 32.4 | 83.3\% |
| 10 | 30 | 28.2 | 60.0\% |
| 24 | 36 | 29.8 | 58.3\% |
| 70 | 38 | 30.1 | 67.1\% |
| 167 | 72 | 30.1 | 71.9\% |
| 217 | 49 | 28.9 | 59.9\% |
| 250 | 79 | 30.6 | 44.4\% |
| 292 | 66 | 29.3 | 45.9\% |
| 422 | 74 | 29.8 | 42.9\% |
| 434 | 62 | 29.4 | 40.8\% |
| 279 | 70 | 30.2 | 34.8\% |

30.01896

| Total Cnts | Max Speed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 3104 | 44 |
| 5176 | 59 |
| 2231 | 79 |

Avg Speeder
28.8
28.8
29.7

[^0]47.7\%

## TRAFFIC ANALYSIS REPORT

For Project: Mendenhall Bozeman and Rouse
Projects Notes/Address:
Location/Name: Merged
Report Generated: 1/19/2023 10:31:11 AM
Speed Intervals = 1 MPH
Time Intervals = Instant
Traffic Report From 7/13/2022 02:00:00 PM through 7/15/2022 02:59:59 PM

85th Percentile Speed $=27.0 \mathrm{MPH}$
85th Percentile Vehicles $=7,559$ counts
Max Speed $=55.0 \mathrm{MPH}$ on 7/13/2022 9:04:08 PM
Total Vehicles $=8,893$ counts
AADT: 4355.8
Volumes - weekly vehicle counts

|  | Time |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average Daily |  |
| AM Peak | $11: 00$ to $12: 00$ |
| PM Peak | $05: 00$ to $06: 00$ |

## Speed

Speed Limit: 25 MPH
85th Percentile Speed: 27.0 MPH
50th Percentile Speed: 23.0 MPH
10 MPH Pace Interval: 18.0 MPH to 28.0 MPH
Average Speed: 22.9 MPH

|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Count over limit | N/A | N/A | 460 | 1099 | 586 | N/A | N/A |
| \% over limit | N/A | N/A | 23.3 | 22.0 | 30.5 | N/A | N/A |
| Avg Speeder | N/A | N/A | 27.7 | 27.9 | 27.8 | N/A | N/A |

Class Counts

|  | Number | $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VEH_SM | 88 | 1.0 |
| VEH_MED | 8595 | 96.6 |
| VEH_LG | 210 | 2.4 |
| [ VEH_SM = motorcycle, VEH_MED $=$ sedan, VEH_LG = truck ] |  |  |

[ VEH_SM = motorcycle, VEH_MED = sedan, VEH_LG = truck ]

| Date/Time | Ending |  | 85th pctl (MPH) | 85th pctl counts | Total Cnts | Max Speed | Avg Speeder | \% Speeders |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7/13/2022 | 03:00:00 | PM | 27.0 | 139 | 163 | 33 | 27.6 | 23.3\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 04:00:00 | PM | 27.0 | 285 | 335 | 33 | 27.3 | 23.9\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 05:00:00 | PM | 27.0 | 269 | 317 | 33 | 27.8 | 24.6\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 06:00:00 | PM | 26.0 | 311 | 366 | 34 | 27.8 | 24.3\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 07:00:00 | PM | 26.0 | 219 | 258 | 37 | 27.6 | 24.0\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 08:00:00 | PM | 27.0 | 143 | 168 | 34 | 27.8 | 25.6\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 09:00:00 | PM | 26.0 | 139 | 163 | 35 | 28.0 | 22.1\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 10:00:00 | PM | 26.0 | 80 | 94 | 55 | 29.8 | 16.0\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 11:00:00 | pm | 26.0 | 58 | 68 | 36 | 27.8 | 19.1\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 12:00:00 | AM | 25.0 | 35 | 41 | 30 | 27.3 | 14.6\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 01:00:00 | AM | 26.0 | 22 | 26 | 30 | 27.2 | 19.2\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 02:00:00 | AM | 28.0 | 8 | 9 | 29 | 28.5 | 22.2\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 03:00:00 | AM | 26.0 | 9 | 11 | 29 | 27.7 | 27.3\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 04:00:00 | AM | 23.0 | 3 | 4 | 28 | 28.0 | 25.0\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 05:00:00 | AM | 26.0 | 6 | 7 | 28 | 26.4 | 71.4\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 06:00:00 | AM | 26.0 | 22 | 26 | 31 | 28.2 | 19.2\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 07:00:00 | AM | 29.0 | 36 | 42 | 33 | 28.5 | 40.5\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 08:00:00 | AM | 27.0 | 109 | 128 | 32 | 27.8 | 35.2\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 09:00:00 | AM | 28.0 | 173 | 204 | 37 | 27.9 | 42.6\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 10:00:00 | AM | 27.0 | 170 | 200 | 36 | 28.1 | 32.0\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 11:00:00 | AM | 27.0 | 185 | 218 | 34 | 27.8 | 30.3\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 12:00:00 | рм | 27.0 | 252 | 297 | 34 | 27.7 | 28.6\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 01:00:00 | pm | 27.0 | 288 | 339 | 42 | 28.2 | 23.0\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 02:00:00 | PM | 27.0 | 278 | 327 | 37 | 27.7 | 25.7\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 03:00:00 | PM | 26.0 | 304 | 358 | 36 | 27.6 | 23.7\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 03:00:00 | PM | 26.0 | 279 | 328 | 36 | 27.7 | 18.3\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 05:00:00 | pm | 26.0 | 416 | 489 | 40 | 28.5 | 17.6\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 06:00:00 | PM | 26.0 | 456 | 537 | 39 | 27.9 | 20.9\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 07:00:00 | PM | 26.0 | 334 | 393 | 36 | 27.7 | 17.3\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 08:00:00 | PM | 25.0 | 314 | 370 | 38 | 28.6 | 12.2\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 09:00:00 | PM | 25.0 | 247 | 291 | 35 | 28.1 | 12.7\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 10:00:00 | pM | 26.0 | 196 | 230 | 43 | 28.5 | 15.7\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 11:00:00 | PM | 25.0 | 86 | 101 | 32 | 27.6 | 13.9\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 12:00:00 | AM | 25.0 | 57 | 67 | 30 | 27.2 | 13.4\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 01:00:00 | AM | 25.0 | 37 | 43 | 30 | 29.0 | 14.0\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 02:00:00 | AM | 25.0 | 26 | 30 | 45 | 32.3 | 13.3\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 03:00:00 | AM | 25.0 | 16 | 19 | 33 | 28.3 | 15.8\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 04:00:00 | AM | 25.0 | 3 | 4 | 26 | 26.0 | 25.0\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 05:00:00 | AM | 29.0 | 4 | 5 | 30 | 29.0 | 60.0\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 06:00:00 | AM | 27.0 | 20 | 24 | 29 | 27.7 | 29.2\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 07:00:00 | AM | 27.0 | 40 | 47 | 39 | 28.6 | 34.0\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 08:00:00 | AM | 28.0 | 71 | 84 | 34 | 27.5 | 46.4\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 09:00:00 | AM | 28.0 | 105 | 123 | 32 | 27.9 | 39.8\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 10:00:00 | AM | 28.0 | 186 | 219 | 33 | 27.7 | 35.2\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 11:00:00 | AM | 27.0 | 230 | 270 | 33 | 27.6 | 32.6\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 12:00:00 | PM | 27.0 | 272 | 320 | 39 | 27.7 | 27.8\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 01:00:00 | PM | 27.0 | 277 | 326 | 42 | 28.1 | 25.8\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 02:00:00 | PM | 27.0 | 235 | 276 | 33 | 27.8 | 29.0\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 03:00:00 | pM | 27.0 | 112 | 132 | 33 | 27.7 | 30.3\% |
| 85 th percentile speeds, counts and total counts by day: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date/Time | Ending |  | 85th pctl (MPH) | 85th pctl cnts | Total Cnts | Max Speed | Avg Speeder | \% Speeders |
| 7/14/2022 | 12:00:00 | AM | 27.0 | 1677 | 1973 | 55 | 27.7 | 23.3\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 12:00:00 | AM | 27.0 | 4249 | 4999 | 43 | 27.9 | 22.0\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 02:59:59 | PM | 27.0 | 1633 | 1921 | 45 | 27.8 | 30.5\% |

## TRAFFIC ANALYSIS REPORT

For Project: Babcock Black and Bozeman
Projects Notes/Address:
Location/Name: Merged
Report Generated: 1/19/2023 10:05:20 AM
Speed Intervals = 1 MPH
Time Intervals = Instant
Traffic Report From 7/13/2022 03:00:00 PM through 7/15/2022 03:59:59 PM

85th Percentile Speed $=28.0 \mathrm{MPH}$
85th Percentile Vehicles $=10,021$ counts
Max Speed $=49.0 \mathrm{MPH}$ on 7/15/2022 2:42:33 PM
Total Vehicles $=11,789$ counts
AADT: 5774.2
Volumes - weekly vehicle counts

|  | Time |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average Daily | $11: 00$ to $12: 00$ |
| AM Peak | $05: 00$ to $06: 00$ |


| 5 Day | 7 Day |
| :--- | :--- |
| 3,929 | 3,929 |
| 425 | 425 |
| 523 | 523 |

## Speed

Speed Limit: 25 MPH
85th Percentile Speed: 28.0 MPH
50th Percentile Speed: 24.0 MPH
10 MPH Pace Interval: 18.0 MPH to 28.0 MPH
Average Speed: 23.6 MPH

|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Count over limit | N/A | N/A | 747 | 1775 | 1200 | N/A | N/A |
| \% over limit | N/A | N/A | 40.0 | 28.0 | 33.5 | N/A | N/A |
| Avg Speeder | N/A | N/A | 28.5 | 28.3 | 28.5 | N/A | N/A |

Class Counts

|  | Number | $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VEH_SM | 331 | 2.8 |
| VEH_MED | 11251 | 95.4 |
| VEH_LG | 207 | 1.8 |

[ VEH_SM = motorcycle, VEH_MED = sedan, VEH_LG = truck ]

| Date/Time | Ending |  | 85th pctl (MPH) | 85th pctl counts | Total Cnts | Max Speed | Avg Speeder | \% Speeders |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7/13/2022 | 04:00:00 | PM | 28.0 | 181 | 213 | 45 | 28.5 | 29.1\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 05:00:00 | PM | 29.0 | 314 | 369 | 45 | 28.4 | 39.6\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 06:00:00 | PM | 28.0 | 368 | 433 | 37 | 28.3 | 33.3\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 07:00:00 | PM | 28.0 | 264 | 311 | 45 | 28.3 | 41.5\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 08:00:00 | PM | 30.0 | 190 | 224 | 44 | 28.9 | 51.3\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 09:00:00 | PM | 28.0 | 125 | 147 | 35 | 28.0 | 42.9\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 10:00:00 | PM | 29.0 | 81 | 95 | 34 | 28.4 | 46.3\% |
| 7/13/2022 | 11:00:00 | PM | 30.0 | 45 | 53 | 39 | 29.1 | 52.8\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 12:00:00 | AM | 31.0 | 20 | 23 | 35 | 29.3 | 69.6\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 01:00:00 | AM | 29.0 | 19 | 22 | 33 | 28.4 | 54.5\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 02:00:00 | AM | 31.0 | 8 | 9 | 32 | 29.8 | 55.6\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 03:00:00 | AM | 21.0 | 4 | 5 | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 04:00:00 | AM | 26.0 | 1 | 1 | 26 | 26.0 | 100.0\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 05:00:00 | AM | 30.0 | 6 | 7 | 32 | 29.8 | 57.1\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 06:00:00 | AM | 30.0 | 46 | 54 | 35 | 29.1 | 72.2\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 07:00:00 | AM | 32.0 | 106 | 125 | 39 | 29.6 | 72.0\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 08:00:00 | AM | 31.0 | 259 | 305 | 38 | 29.2 | 61.0\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 09:00:00 | AM | 29.0 | 329 | 387 | 36 | 28.4 | 53.0\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 10:00:00 | AM | 28.0 | 328 | 386 | 35 | 27.7 | 35.5\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 11:00:00 | AM | 27.0 | 241 | 284 | 38 | 28.2 | 26.8\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 12:00:00 | PM | 27.0 | 366 | 431 | 48 | 28.4 | 27.1\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 01:00:00 | PM | 26.0 | 338 | 398 | 37 | 28.1 | 17.6\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 02:00:00 | pm | 27.0 | 386 | 454 | 40 | 28.1 | 28.0\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 03:00:00 | PM | 27.0 | 364 | 428 | 34 | 27.8 | 22.7\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 03:00:00 | PM | 27.0 | 361 | 425 | 40 | 27.9 | 25.9\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 05:00:00 | PM | 26.0 | 383 | 451 | 38 | 27.7 | 18.6\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 06:00:00 | PM | 27.0 | 522 | 614 | 43 | 28.2 | 26.2\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 07:00:00 | PM | 25.0 | 428 | 503 | 35 | 27.9 | 14.7\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 08:00:00 | pm | 25.0 | 332 | 391 | 35 | 27.6 | 14.3\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 09:00:00 | PM | 25.0 | 253 | 298 | 33 | 27.7 | 14.8\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 10:00:00 | PM | 26.0 | 193 | 227 | 38 | 28.1 | 19.4\% |
| 7/14/2022 | 11:00:00 | pm | 27.0 | 69 | 81 | 34 | 28.3 | 23.5\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 12:00:00 | AM | 27.0 | 48 | 57 | 35 | 28.5 | 29.8\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 01:00:00 | AM | 30.0 | 25 | 29 | 33 | 28.2 | 55.2\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 02:00:00 | AM | 28.0 | 20 | 24 | 33 | 28.2 | 37.5\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 03:00:00 | AM | 30.0 | 13 | 15 | 34 | 30.0 | 33.3\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 04:00:00 | AM | 32.0 | 3 | 4 | 34 | 32.0 | 75.0\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 05:00:00 | AM | 29.0 | 8 | 9 | 32 | 28.5 | 66.7\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 06:00:00 | AM | 32.0 | 42 | 50 | 46 | 30.2 | 82.0\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 07:00:00 | AM | 31.0 | 88 | 104 | 37 | 29.4 | 63.5\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 08:00:00 | AM | 30.0 | 207 | 243 | 40 | 28.8 | 70.4\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 09:00:00 | AM | 29.0 | 321 | 378 | 41 | 28.5 | 51.9\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 10:00:00 | AM | 28.0 | 312 | 367 | 39 | 28.4 | 40.1\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 11:00:00 | AM | 27.0 | 326 | 384 | 36 | 27.9 | 25.3\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 12:00:00 | PM | 26.0 | 357 | 420 | 40 | 27.9 | 19.8\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 01:00:00 | pM | 26.0 | 366 | 430 | 33 | 27.4 | 18.8\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 02:00:00 | pM | 28.0 | 374 | 440 | 45 | 28.6 | 28.9\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 03:00:00 | PM | 26.0 | 367 | 432 | 49 | 28.6 | 18.3\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 04:00:00 | PM | 27.0 | 213 | 251 | 37 | 28.1 | 29.1\% |
| 85 th percentile speeds, counts and total counts by day: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date/Time | Ending |  | 85th pctl (MPH) | 85th pctl cnts | Total Cnts | Max Speed | Avg Speeder | \% Speeders |
| 7/14/2022 | 12:00:00 | AM | 29.0 | 1588 | 1868 | 45 | 28.5 | 40.0\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 12:00:00 | AM | 27.0 | 5391 | 6342 | 48 | 28.3 | 28.0\% |
| 7/15/2022 | 03:59:59 | PM | 28.0 | 3042 | 3579 | 49 | 28.5 | 33.5\% |

## TRAFFIC ANALYSIS REPORT

For Project: Babcock 3rd and Grand
Projects Notes/Address:
Location/Name: Merged
Report Generated: 1/19/2023 10:03:30 AM
Speed Intervals = 1 MPH
Time Intervals = Instant
Traffic Report From 7/11/2022 01:00:00 PM through 7/13/2022 01:59:59 PM

85th Percentile Speed $=30.0 \mathrm{MPH}$
85th Percentile Vehicles $=7,806$ counts
Max Speed $=48.0 \mathrm{MPH}$ on 7/12/2022 7:00:58 PM
Total Vehicles $=9,183$ counts
AADT: 4497.8
Volumes - weekly vehicle counts

|  | Time |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average Daily |  |
| AM Peak | $11: 00$ to $12: 00$ |
| PM Peak | $12: 00$ to $01: 00$ |

Speed
Speed Limit: 25 MPH
85th Percentile Speed: 30.0 MPH
50th Percentile Speed: 26.0 MPH
10 MPH Pace Interval: 21.0 MPH to 31.0 MPH
Average Speed: 25.5 MPH

|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Count over limit | 1231 | 2467 | 1167 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| \% over limit | 54.5 | 52.8 | 51.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Avg Speeder | 28.7 | 28.7 | 29.0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Class Counts

|  | Number | $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VEH_SM | 589 | 6.4 |
| VEH_MED | 8313 | 90.5 |
| VEH_LG | 281 | 3.1 |
| [ VEH_SM = motorcycle, VEH_MED $=$ sedan, VEH_LG = truck ] |  |  |

[ VEH_SM = motorcycle, VEH_MED = sedan, VEH_LG = truck ]

Date/Time Ending
7/11/2022 02:00:00 PM 7/11/2022 03:00:00 PM 7/11/2022 04:00:00 PM 7/11/2022 05:00:00 PM 7/11/2022 06:00:00 PM 7/11/2022 07:00:00 PM 7/11/2022 08:00:00 PM 7/11/2022 09:00:00 PM 7/11/2022 10:00:00 PM 7/11/2022 11:00:00 PM 7/12/2022 12:00:00 AM 7/12/2022 01:00:00 AM 7/12/2022 02:00:00 AM 7/12/2022 03:00:00 AM 7/12/2022 04:00:00 AM 7/12/2022 05:00:00 AM 7/12/2022 06:00:00 AM 7/12/2022 07:00:00 AM 7/12/2022 08:00:00 AM 7/12/2022 09:00:00 AM 7/12/2022 10:00:00 AM 7/12/2022 11:00:00 AM 7/12/2022 12:00:00 PM 7/12/2022 01:00:00 PM 7/12/2022 02:00:00 PM 7/12/2022 03:00:00 PM 7/12/2022 04:00:00 PM 7/12/2022 05:00:00 PM 7/12/2022 06:00:00 PM 7/12/2022 07:00:00 PM 7/12/2022 08:00:00 PM 7/12/2022 09:00:00 PM 7/12/2022 10:00:00 PM 7/12/2022 11:00:00 PM 7/13/2022 12:00:00 AM 7/13/2022 01:00:00 AM 7/13/2022 02:00:00 AM 7/13/2022 03:00:00 AM 7/13/2022 04:00:00 AM 7/13/2022 05:00:00 AM 7/13/2022 06:00:00 AM 7/13/2022 07:00:00 AM 7/13/2022 08:00:00 AM 7/13/2022 09:00:00 AM 7/13/2022 10:00:00 AM 7/13/2022 11:00:00 AM 7/13/2022 12:00:00 PM 7/13/2022 01:00:00 PM 7/13/2022 02:00:00 PM

85th pctl (MPH) 85th pctl counts

## 278

267 283

## 5 Day 3,061

 368 4237 Day
3,061
368
423

| Total Cnts | Max Speed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2257 | 47 |
| 4675 | 48 |
| 2251 | 46 |

Avg Speeder
28.7
28.7
29.0

[^1]


[^0]:    \% Speeders
    $54.0 \%$
    49.6\%

[^1]:    \% Speeders
    $54.5 \%$
    52.8\%
    51.8\%

