June 22, 2021

Mr. Chris Nelson
32-36 Iron Horse LLC
75 West Street
Simsbury, CT 06070

## RE: Traffic Impact Study <br> Barber Cove <br> Residential Development <br> 32 \& 36 Iron Horse Boulevard <br> Simsbury, Connecticut <br> SLR \#17216.00001

Dear Mr. Nelson:

At your request, we have undertaken this study to evaluate traffic impacts associated with the proposed residential development, Barber Cove, to be located at 32 \& 36 Iron Horse Boulevard in Simsbury, Connecticut. The proposed development is to be comprised of five multifamily residential buildings, totaling 175 units, as well as a club house building for residents. Site access is to be provided via two site driveways on Iron Horse Boulevard, one opposite Pent Road and one approximately 300 feet north. The work comprising the study consisted of several tasks including field reconnaissance, data collection, review of roadway and traffic conditions, estimation of site-development-generated traffic volumes, and assessment of future traffic operations near the site. Figure 1 shows the site location and surrounding roadway network.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

The proposed development is to be located on the east side of Iron Horse Boulevard. The site was formerly a contractors' lot. The key intersections that have been analyzed as part of this study are as follows:

1. Hopmeadow Street (Route 10/202) at Iron Horse Boulevard/Owens Brook Boulevard (signalized)
2. Iron Horse Boulevard at proposed north site driveway (unsignalized)
3. Hopmeadow Street at Pent Road (unsignalized)
4. Iron Horse Boulevard at Pent Road/main site driveway (unsignalized)
5. Iron Horse Boulevard at Drake Hill Road (unsignalized)

Hopmeadow Street (Route 10/202) runs approximately north/south with one travel lane in each direction and additional turning lanes at key intersections. The posted speed limit is 35 miles per hour ( mph ) near the site.

Iron Horse Boulevard runs approximately north/south parallel to Route 10/202 with one travel lane in each direction and a center median separating the northbound and southbound travel lanes. There are additional turning lanes at key intersections; the posted speed limit is 35 mph . There are bike lanes present along either side of Iron Horse Boulevard.
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Drake Hill Road runs east／west with one travel lane in each direction，connecting Riverside Road to Hopmeadow Street（Route 10／202）．The posted speed limit is 25 mph ．

There are also several east－west streets between Iron Horse Boulevard and Hopmeadow Street．Many of these are best characterized as through commercial driveways with sporadic one－way restrictions and access to commercial parking areas．For purposes of this study，we assumed that use of these roads，while possible，would be minimal．We instead assumed east－west traffic would largely use Pent Road and Drake Hill Road，the most likely roads for through traffic between the two main north－south arterials．

Lane use in this area of Simsbury is largely a mix of commercial and outdoor recreational space．The Simsbury Meadows outdoor performing arts center is located at 22 Iron Horse Boulevard， 0.2 miles south of the proposed site．The Farmington Canal Heritage Trail runs adjacent to the east side of Iron Horse Boulevard from Route 10／202 to Drake Hill Road，then continues along the south side of Drake Hill Road in both directions．Consequently，Iron Horse Boulevard is frequented by pedestrians and cyclists；there are several entry points to trailheads along Iron Horse Boulevard near the site．

## Crash Data Summary

Data on traffic crashes near the site for the recent 3－year period of March 1，2017，through February 29， 2020 （pre－COVID－19），was obtained via the Connecticut Crash Data Repository．This data is summarized in Table 1 by location，crash severity，and collision type．

TABLE 1
Crash Data Summary

|  | CRASH SEVERITY |  |  |  |  | TYPE OF COLLISION |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOCATION： |  |  | z 2 2 2 $\cdots$ $\frac{0}{2}$ 0 |  | $\frac{1}{⿺ ⿻}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 岂 } \\ & \frac{0}{4} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ㄷ } \\ & \text { M } \\ & \text { ó } \\ & \text { i } \\ & \text { 쓴 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5 } \\ & \frac{3}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & z \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \frac{1}{4} \\ & \underline{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{1}{\mathbf{1}}$ |
| Hopmeadow Street at Iron Horse Boulevard／Owens Brook Boulevard |  | 1 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 5 |  | 1 |  | 11 |
| Iron Horse Boulevard between Hopmeadow Street and Pent Road |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| Iron Horse Boulevard at Pent Road |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Hopmeadow Street at Pent Road |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Iron Horse Boulevard at Wilcox Street |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |
| Iron Horse Boulevard at Drake Hill Road |  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 6 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 2 | 3 | 18 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 23 |

Source：University of Connecticut Crash Data Repository from March 1， 2017 to February 29， 2020

A total of 23 crashes were reported within the study area during this period, 11 of which occurred at the intersection of Hopmeadow Street at Iron Horse Boulevard/Owens Brook Boulevard. Seventy-eight percent of all reported crashes resulted in property damage only. No crashes resulted in serious injury or fatality. The most common collision type was the rear-end collision, comprising $35 \%$ of reported crashes, followed by angle collisions at $30 \%$. There do not appear to be any unusual trends in the crash data.

Crash history following the COVID-19 outbreak was also separately investigated for the study area. Four crashes occurred within the study area, three of which occurred at the intersection of Hopmeadow Street at Iron Horse Boulevard/Owens Brook Boulevard. Two of the crashes were rear-end collisions and resulted in property damage only; the remaining crash was an angle-type collision resulting in possible injury. The last collision occurred at the intersection of Iron Horse Boulevard and an unnamed access road just north of 836 Hopmeadow Street when a box truck hit a signpost when turning right out of the shopping plaza driveway, resulting in property damage only. There were no unusual trends in the crash data for this period.

## Existing Traffic Volumes

Traffic counts were conducted at the study intersections on Wednesday, March 31, 2021, during the morning and afternoon peak periods. The peak hours were found to be 7:45 a.m. to 8:45 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. for the weekday morning and afternoon, respectively. Figure $\mathbf{2}$ shows the existing peakhour traffic volumes.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and its overall effect on reducing current travel, the traffic volumes shown in Figure 2 were adjusted to better reflect typical traffic levels in the area. The adjusted volumes were approved by the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) Bureau of Policy and Planning and can be seen on Figure 3.

## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed Barber Cove residential development will comprise five multifamily apartment buildings totaling 175 units, as well as a clubhouse for residents. Surface parking will be available throughout the site adjacent to the apartment buildings; there will also be three small free-standing parking garages and garage parking within each apartment building.

Site access will be provided via two unsignalized driveways. The main site driveway will be in the same location as the existing site driveway, opposite Pent Road at Iron Horse Boulevard. The intersection will remain an all-way stop. An additional site driveway will be added approximately 330 feet north of the main site driveway and will be right-in, right-out only. No modification of the center island on Iron Horse Boulevard is proposed.

Sight lines were reviewed from both points of driver egress. At the main site driveway, drivers can see clearly to all other stop-controlled approaches. It is recommended that stop signs be added to the medians adjacent to the northbound and southbound approaches of Iron Horse Boulevard, particularly since these
approaches are multilane and vehicles stopped at the intersection in the through/right lanes could potentially block the existing stop signs for drivers in the left turn lanes.

For a right-turning driver egressing the north site driveway, the sight line looking left extends through to the all-way-stop-controlled intersection at the main site driveway, meeting the CTDOT guideline for the 35 mph speed limit on Iron Horse Boulevard. Furthermore, all northbound approaching vehicles will be coming from the all-way stop and are not expected to be traveling in excess of the speed limit.

It is also recommended that the Farmington Canal trail be level across the site driveways-similar to the entrance of the Simsbury Meadows performing arts center, south of the site-which will act as minor traffic calming whereby vehicles entering the site will slow down as they drive over what is effectively a speed table at the development entrances.

## SITE-GENERATED TRAFFIC

The amount of new peak-hour site traffic that is estimated to be generated by the proposed development was estimated using statistical data published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE ${ }^{1}$ ). ITE Land Use Code (LUC) \#221, Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) was used to estimate the site traffic volumes, which are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Site Development Traffic Estimates

| LAND USE | ITE <br> LAND <br> USE \# | NUMBER OF VEHICLE TRIPS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | WEEKDAY MORNING PEAK HOUR |  |  | WEEKDAY AFTERNOON PEAK HOUR |  |  |
|  |  | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL |
| Multifamily Housing, Mid-Rise (175 units) | 221 | 16 | 47 | 63 | 47 | 30 | 77 |

Trip Generation, 10th Edition. Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017
The geographic distribution of the net new site-generated traffic was estimated based on review of the roadway traffic patterns in the vicinity of the site and Journey-to-Work census data ${ }^{2}$. It is estimated that approximately $15 \%$ of new site traffic will be oriented to/from the north via Hopmeadow Street (Route 10/202); $50 \%$ to/from the south and east via Drake Hill Road; and $35 \%$ to/from the south and west via Hopmeadow Street (Route 10/202). The site traffic distribution can be seen on Figure 4 . Figure 5 shows the estimated site-generated traffic based on this route distribution for the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours.

As noted above, there are several minor roads that run perpendicular to Pent Road and connect Hopmeadow Street (Route 10/202) to Iron Horse Boulevard south of the site. It is expected that some
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drivers approaching the site from Route 10/202 will stay on Route $10 / 202$ for as long as possible before turning onto one of the minor connecting roads close to the site and continuing to Iron Horse Boulevard and the site. Similarly, some drivers exiting the site are expected to turn left onto Iron Horse Boulevard and take one of the minor connecting streets to Route 10/202 and continue toward their destination from there. For the purposes of this study, it was conservatively assumed that all future site traffic will be routed through the study intersections; drivers who would take one of the minor connecting roads are routed as though they are entering/exiting via Drake Hill Road and Pent Road.

## FUTURE TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Future roadway traffic volumes were estimated both with and without the proposed residential development in place to determine possible traffic impacts. This proposed development is anticipated to open in year 2023.

The background traffic scenario is reflective of future conditions before Barber Cove is built and was estimated by expanding the 2021 adjusted traffic volumes to the estimated opening year of 2023 using an annual growth rate of $0.9 \%$, per input from CTDOT. Correspondence with the Town of Simsbury and CTDOT finds that there are no approved upcoming developments that are expected to add notable traffic through the study area. The resultant 2023 estimated traffic volumes reflect conditions just before the proposed development would open and can be seen on Figure 6 as the background traffic volumes.

The combined traffic scenario is reflective of future conditions after the proposed development is built and opened and was estimated by adding the anticipated site traffic generated by the proposed residential development to the future background traffic. The resultant estimated 2023 future combined traffic volumes are also shown on Figure 7.

## Intersection Capacity Analysis

The future background and combined traffic scenarios were evaluated by means of capacity analysis techniques. These analyses were used to determine the quality of operations at the study intersections, and a comparison of background versus combined traffic operations allows for a determination of possible traffic impacts from the proposed development. The quality of operations is measured and expressed as a level of service (LOS). LOS is defined as a measure of inconvenience that motorists experience. The levels are expressed with letter designations of A through F. In most communities, LOS D or better during peak hours is considered acceptable. Table 3 summarizes the results of the capacity analysis.

TABLE 3
Capacity Analysis Summary

| MOVEMENTS | WEEKDAY MORNING PEAK HOUR |  | WEEKDAY AFTERNOON PEAK HOUR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BACKGROUND | COMBINED | BACKGROUND | COMBINED |
| Signalized |  |  |  |  |
| Hopmeadow Street (Route 10 \& 202) at Iron Horse Boulevard/Owens Brook Boulevard |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound Left/Through | E | E | E | E |
| Eastbound Right | A | A | A | A |
| Westbound Left/Through | D | D | E | E |
| Westbound Right | A | A | B | B |
| Northbound Left | A | A | A | A |
| Northbound Through/Right | A | A | A | A |
| Southbound Left | A | A | A | A |
| Southbound Through/Right | A | A | A | A |
| OVERALL | A | A | A | B |
| Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |
| Hopmeadow Street (Route 10 \& 202) at Pent Road |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Left/Right | C | C | D | D |
| Iron Horse Boulevard at north site driveway |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound Right | -- | A | -- | A |
| Iron Horse Boulevard at Pent Road/south site driveway |  |  |  |  |
| Northbound Left | A | A | A | A |
| Northbound Through/Right | A | A | A | A |
| Eastbound Left/Right | A | A | A | A |
| Westbound Left/Right | A | A | A | A |
| Southbound Left | A | A | A | A |
| Southbound Through/Right | A | A | A | A |
| Iron Horse Boulevard at Drake Hill Road |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound Left/Through | A | A | A | A |
| Southbound Left | B | B | B | B |
| Southbound Right | A | A | B | B |

As can be seen, traffic conditions are expected to remain largely the same with the proposed residential development in place. No individual movements experience a decrease in LOS due to the addition of the proposed development traffic. It is noted that the overall LOS for the intersection of Hopmeadow Street at Iron Horse Boulevard/Owens Brook Boulevard experiences a decrease from LOS A to B. However, this movement is noted to already be at the tipping point threshold with LOS B under background conditions and the intersection delay only increases by 0.4 seconds.
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Also, note that poor LOS during peak hours for the minor street approaches at the signalized intersection of Hopmeadow Street (Route 10/202) will occur with or without new traffic from the proposed development. The eastbound left/through movement during both peak hours, for example, will remain LOS E between background and combined conditions with no additional delay caused by the proposed development. The minor street delays are a function of the way the signal is programmed to give most of the signal time to the northbound and southbound artery to serve the higher vehicle volumes along Route $10 / 202$. These findings indicate that the proposed residential development will not cause significant traffic impact to area roadways. No traffic mitigation is necessary as part of this development.

## CONCLUSION

This study was conducted to assess the traffic impact of the proposed residential development of Barber Cove to be located at $32 \& 36$ Iron Horse Boulevard in Simsbury. To determine a profile of existing conditions, detailed field reconnaissance and data assembly efforts were undertaken. The traffic that will be generated by the proposed development was estimated based on industry statistical data, and intersection capacity analyses were performed comparing existing and future conditions at the two site driveways and nearby offsite intersections. Analysis of the new traffic that is estimated to be added from this proposed development finds that it will be accommodated with little to no perceptible impact. No movements experience a decrease in LOS due to the addition of the proposed development.

It is recommended that stop signs be added to the medians adjacent to the northbound and southbound approaches of Iron Horse Boulevard, since these approaches are multilane and vehicles stopped at the intersection in the through/right lanes could potentially block the existing stop signs for drivers in the left turn lanes. Additionally, the developer should consider keeping the Farmington Canal trail level across the site driveways, which will elevate the point of eye for egressing drivers, allowing them to see further down Iron Horse Boulevard, and will act as minor traffic calming whereby vehicles entering the site will slow down as they turn into the site driveways.

We hope this report is useful to you and the Town of Simsbury. If you have any questions or need anything further, please do not hesitate to contact either of the undersigned.

Sincerely,

## SLR International Corporation



David G. Sullivan, PE
U.S. Manager of Traffic \& Transportation Planning

Enclosures
17216.00001.jn1021.Itr
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FIGURE 2
BASELINE TRAFFIC VOLUMES


FIGURE 3
ADJUSTED TRAFFIC VOLUMES


FIGURE 4
SITE TRAFFIC DISTRIBUTION


FIGURE 5
SITE-GENERATED TRAFFIC VOLUMES
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FIGURE 7
COMBINED TRAFFIC VOLUMES

## APPENDIX

## LEVEL OF SERVICE

FOR
SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS (MOTORIZED VEHICLE MODE)

Level of service for signalized intersections is defined in terms of control delay, which is a measure of driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption, and increased travel time. The delay experienced by a motorist is made up of a number of factors that relate to control, geometrics, traffic, and incidents. Total delay is the difference between the travel time actually experienced and the reference travel time that would result during base conditions: in the absence of traffic control, geometric delay, any incidents, and any other vehicles. Specifically, LOS criteria for traffic signals are stated in terms of the average control delay per vehicle, typically for a $15-\mathrm{min}$ analysis period. Delay is a complex measure and depends on a number of variables, including the quality of progression, the cycle length, the green ratio, and the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio for the lane group. The criteria are given below.

| LEVEL-OF SERVICE CRITERIA FOR SIGNALIZED <br> INTERSECTIONS <br> MOTORIZED VEHICLE MODE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS By Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c} \leq 1.0$ | $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1.0$ |  |
| A | F | $\leq 10$ |
| B | F | $>10$ AND $\leq 20$ |
| C | F | $>20$ AND $\leq 35$ |
| D | F | $>35$ AND $\leq 55$ |
| E | F | $>55$ AND $\leq 80$ |
| F | F | $>80$ |

${ }^{1}$ For approach-based and intersection-wide assessments, LOS is defined solely by control delay.

Specific descriptions of each LOS for signalized intersections are provided below:

Level of Service A describes operations with a control delay of $10 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{veh}$ and $20 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{veh}$ and a volume-to-capacity ratio no greater than 1.0. This level is typically assigned when the volume-to-capacity ratio is low and either progression is exceptionally favorable or the cycle length is very short. If LOS A is the result of favorable progression, most vehicles arrive during the green indication and travel through the intersection without stopping.

Level of Service B describes operations with control delay between 10 and $20 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{veh}$ and a volume-to-capacity ratio no greater than 1.0. This level is typically assigned when the volume-to-capacity ratio is low and either progression is highly favorable or the cycle length is short. More vehicles stop than with LOS A.

Level of Service C describes operations with control delay between 20 and $35 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{veh}$ and a volume-to-capacity ratio no greater than 1.0. This level is typically assigned when progression is favorable or the cycle length is moderate. Individual cycle failures (i.e., one or more queued vehicles are not able to depart as a result of insufficient capacity during the cycle) may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant, although many vehicles still pass through the intersection without stopping.

Level of Service D describes operations with control delay between 35 and $55 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{veh}$ and a volume-to-capacity ratio no greater than 1.0. This level is typically assigned when the volume-to-capacity ratio is high and either progression is ineffective or the cycle length is long. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable.

Level of Service E describes operations with control delay between 55 and $80 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{veh}$ and a volume-to-capacity ratio no greater than 1.0 . This level is typically assigned when the volume-to-capacity ratio is high, progression is unfavorable, and the cycle length is long. Individual cycle failures are frequent.

Level of Service F describes operations with control delay exceeding $80 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{veh}$ or a volume-tocapacity ratio greater than 1.0. This level is typically assigned when the volume-to-capacity ratio is very high, progression is very poor, and the cycle length is long. Most cycles fail to clear the queue.

Reference: Highway Capacity Manual 6, Transportation Research Board, 2016.

## ALL-WAY STOP-CONTROL (AWSC)

The criteria for AWSC intersections have different threshold values than do those for signalized intersections primarily because drivers expect different levels of performance from distinct types of transportation facilities. The expectation is that a signalized intersection is designed to carry higher traffic volumes than an AWSC intersection. Thus a higher level of control delay is acceptable at a signalized intersection for the same LOS. The level-of-service criteria are given below.

| LEVEL-OF SERVICE CRITERIA FOR AWSC INTERSECTIONS |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| LOS $^{\mathbf{1}}$ | CONTROL DELAY (s/veh) |
| A | $\leq 10$ |
| B | $>10$ AND $\leq 15$ |
| C | $>15$ AND $\leq 25$ |
| D | $>25$ AND $\leq 35$ |
| E | $>35$ AND $\leq 50$ |
| F | $>50$ |

${ }^{1}$ For approaches and intersection-wide assessment, LOS is defined solely by control delay.
Note: LOS F is assigned to a movement if the volume-to-capacity ratio exceeds 1.0 , regardless of the control delay.

Reference: Highway Capacity Manual Version 6.0, Transportation Research Board, 2016.

## LEVEL OF SERVICE

FOR TWO-WAY

## STOP SIGN CONTROLLED INTERSECTIONS

The level of service for a TWSC (two-way stop controlled) intersection is determined by the computed or measured control delay and is defined for each minor movement. Level of service is not defined for the intersection as a whole. Control delay includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. LOS criteria are given in the Table. LOS criteria are given below:

| LEVEL-OF SERVICE CRITERIA FOR AWSC INTERSECTIONS |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| LOS $^{1}$ | CONTROL DELAY (s/veh) |
| A | $\leq 10$ |
| B | $>10$ AND $\leq 15$ |
| C | $>15 \mathrm{AND} \leq 25$ |
| D | $>25 \mathrm{AND} \leq \mathbf{3 5}$ |
| E | $>35 \mathrm{AND} \leq 50$ |
| F | $>50$ |

Note: LOS criteria apply to each lane on a given approach and to each approach on the minor street. LOS is not calculated for major-street approaches or for the intersection as a whole.
LOS F is assigned to a movement if the volume-to-capacity ratio exceeds 1.0 , regardless of the control delay

Reference: Highway Capacity Manual Version 6.0, Transportation Research Board, 2016.

|  | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | $\varnothing 3$ |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 44 | 14 | 67 | 3 | 8 | 37 | 41 | 484 | 16 | 46 | 527 | 39 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 44 | 14 | 67 | 3 | 8 | 37 | 41 | 484 | 16 | 46 | 527 | 39 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Storage Length (ft) | 80 |  | 80 | 0 |  | 150 | 350 |  | 0 | 230 |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 200 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Fit |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.995 |  |  | 0.990 |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.963 |  |  | 0.988 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1794 | 1583 | 0 | 1840 | 1583 | 1770 | 1853 | 0 | 1770 | 1844 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.770 |  |  | 0.904 |  | 0.386 |  |  | 0.426 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1434 | 1583 | 0 | 1684 | 1583 | 719 | 1853 | 0 | 794 | 1844 | 0 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 106 |  |  | 106 |  | 2 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 394 |  |  | 765 |  |  | 695 |  |  | 386 |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 14.9 |  |  | 13.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| 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 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 48 | 15 | 74 | 3 | 9 | 41 | 45 | 532 | 18 | 51 | 579 | 43 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 63 | 74 | 0 | 12 | 41 | 45 | 550 | 0 | 51 | 622 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 3 |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 4 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 |  | 5.0 | 15.0 |  | 1.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 9.0 | 21.7 |  | 9.0 | 21.7 |  | 30.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 15.0 | 56.0 |  | 15.0 | 56.0 |  | 30.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 12.5\% | 46.7\% |  | 12.5\% | 46.7\% |  | 25\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 11.0 | 49.3 |  | 11.0 | 49.3 |  | 26.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 4.3 |  | 3.0 | 4.3 |  | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.4 |  | 1.0 | 2.4 |  | 0.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 6.3 | 6.3 |  | 6.3 | 6.3 | 4.0 | 6.7 |  | 4.0 | 6.7 |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.5 |  | 2.0 | 3.5 |  | 0.2 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | C-Min |  | None | C-Min |  | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 9.8 | 9.8 |  | 9.8 | 9.8 | 99.2 | 93.5 |  | 99.1 | 93.5 |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.08 | 0.08 |  | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.83 | 0.78 |  | 0.83 | 0.78 |  |  |
| V/c Ratio |  | 0.54 | 0.33 |  | 0.09 | 0.18 | 0.07 | 0.38 |  | 0.07 | 0.43 |  |  |
| Control Delay |  | 68.9 | 7.4 |  | 50.3 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 6.8 |  | 2.4 | 7.4 |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay |  | 68.9 | 7.4 |  | 50.3 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 6.8 |  | 2.4 | 7.4 |  |  |
| LOS |  | E | A |  | D | A | A | A |  | A | A |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 35.7 |  |  | 12.7 |  |  | 6.5 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |
| Stops (vph) |  | 53 | 5 |  | 11 | 0 | 7 | 164 |  | 9 | 197 |  |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 4 |  |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  | 95 | 23 |  | 18 | 15 | 19 | 310 |  | 15 | 273 |  |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  | 19 | 4 |  | 3 | 3 | 4 | 60 |  | 3 | 53 |  |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  | 22 | 5 |  | 4 | 4 | 5 | 72 |  | 4 | 63 |  |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  | 0 | 20 |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 48 | 0 |  | 9 | 0 | 4 | 138 |  | 5 | 167 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 93 | 22 |  | 28 | 0 | 13 | 234 |  | 14 | 279 |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 314 |  |  | 685 |  |  | 615 |  |  | 306 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  | 80 |  |  | 150 | 350 |  |  | 230 |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 155 | 266 |  | 182 | 266 | 709 | 1444 |  | 766 | 1438 |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |

1: Route 10 \& 202 \& Owens Brook/Iron Horse Blvd


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | $\varnothing 3$ |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ＊ | 个 |  |  |
| Trafic Volume（vph） | 44 | 14 | 67 | 3 | 8 | 42 | 41 | 486 | 16 | 48 | 527 | 39 |  |
| Future Volume（vph） | 44 | 14 | 67 | 3 | 8 | 42 | 41 | 486 | 16 | 48 | 527 | 39 |  |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Storage Length（ft） | 80 |  | 80 | 0 |  | 150 | 350 |  | 0 | 230 |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Taper Length（ft） | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 200 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Fit |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.995 |  |  | 0.990 |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.963 |  |  | 0.988 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 0 | 1794 | 1583 | 0 | 1840 | 1583 | 1770 | 1853 | 0 | 1770 | 1844 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.770 |  |  | 0.904 |  | 0.386 |  |  | 0.425 |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 0 | 1434 | 1583 | 0 | 1684 | 1583 | 719 | 1853 | 0 | 792 | 1844 | 0 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 106 |  |  | 106 |  | 2 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Link Speed（mph） |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  |
| Link Distance（ft） |  | 394 |  |  | 417 |  |  | 695 |  |  | 386 |  |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 7.7 |  |  | 8.1 |  |  | 13.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| 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 |  |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 48 | 15 | 74 | 3 | 9 | 46 | 45 | 534 | 18 | 53 | 579 | 43 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 63 | 74 | 0 | 12 | 46 | 45 | 552 | 0 | 53 | 622 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | Perm | pm＋pt | NA |  | pm＋pt | NA |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | ， |  | 3 |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 4 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial（s） | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 |  | 5.0 | 15.0 |  | 1.0 |
| Minimum Split（s） | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 9.0 | 21.7 |  | 9.0 | 21.7 |  | 30.0 |
| Total Split（s） | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 15.0 | 56.0 |  | 15.0 | 56.0 |  | 30.0 |
| Total Split（\％） | 15．8\％ | 15．8\％ | 15．8\％ | 15．8\％ | 15．8\％ | 15．8\％ | 12．5\％ | 46．7\％ |  | 12．5\％ | 46．7\％ |  | 25\％ |
| Maximum Green（s） | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 11.0 | 49.3 |  | 11.0 | 49.3 |  | 26.0 |
| Yellow Time（s） | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 4.3 |  | 3.0 | 4.3 |  | 4.0 |
| All－Red Time（s） | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.4 |  | 1.0 | 2.4 |  | 0.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time（s） |  | 6.3 | 6.3 |  | 6.3 | 6.3 | 4.0 | 6.7 |  | 4.0 | 6.7 |  |  |
| Lead／Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.5 |  | 2.0 | 3.5 |  | 0.2 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | C－Min |  | None | C－Min |  | None |
| Walk Time（s） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk（s） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Act Effct Green（s） |  | 9.8 | 9.8 |  | 9.8 | 9.8 | 99.1 | 93.5 |  | 99.2 | 93.5 |  |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.08 | 0.08 |  | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.83 | 0.78 |  | 0.83 | 0.78 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.54 | 0.33 |  | 0.09 | 0.20 | 0.07 | 0.38 |  | 0.08 | 0.43 |  |  |
| Control Delay |  | 68.9 | 7.4 |  | 50.3 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 6.9 |  | 2.4 | 7.4 |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay |  | 68.9 | 7.4 |  | 50.3 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 6.9 |  | 2.4 | 7.4 |  |  |
| LOS |  | E | A |  | D | A | A | A |  | A | A |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 35.7 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 6.5 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |
| Stops（vph） |  | 53 | 5 |  | 11 | 0 | 7 | 166 |  | 9 | 197 |  |  |
| Fuel Used（gal） |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 4 |  |  |
| CO Emissions（g／hr） |  | 95 | 23 |  | 16 | 10 | 19 | 312 |  | 16 | 273 |  |  |
| NOx Emissions（g／hr） |  | 19 | 4 |  | 3 | 2 | 4 | 61 |  |  | 53 |  |  |
| VOC Emissions（g／hr） |  | 22 | 5 |  | 4 | 2 | 5 | 72 |  | 4 | 63 |  |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles（\＃） |  | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  | 0 | 20 |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th（ft） |  | 48 | 0 |  | 9 | 0 | 4 | 140 |  | 5 | 167 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th（ft） |  | 93 | 22 |  | 28 | 0 | 13 | 237 |  | 15 | 279 |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist（t） |  | 314 |  |  | 337 |  |  | 615 |  |  | 306 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length（ t ） |  |  | 80 |  |  | 150 | 350 |  |  | 230 |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity（vph） |  | 155 | 266 |  | 182 | 266 | 709 | 1444 |  | 765 | 1438 |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |

1: Route 10 \& 202 \& Owens Brook/Iron Horse Blvd



## General Information

| Analyst | FMF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | SLR |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2021$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | AM |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | Background AM Peak Hour |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hopmeadow at Pent |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Simsbury |
| East/West Street | Pent Road |
| North/South Street | Hopmeadow Street |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |

Lanes


Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  | T |  |  |  | T |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 15 |  |  | 560 |  |  |  | 651 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 6.43 |  | 6.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.53 |  | 3.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | FMF | Intersection | Hopmeadow at Pent |
| Agency/Co. | SLR | Jurisdiction | Simsbury |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2021$ | East/West Street | Pent Road |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Hopmeadow Street |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Combined, AM Peak Hour |  |  |

## Lanes



## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  | T |  |  |  | T |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |  | 17 |  | 17 |  |  | 560 |  |  |  | 651 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 6.43 |  | 6.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.53 |  | 3.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


General Information

| Analyst | FMF |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | SLR |  |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2021$ |  |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |  |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |  |


| Time Analyzed | AM |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Description | Ba |

Lanes


Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 5 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 42 | 1 | 7 | 67 | 2 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | TR |  | L | TR |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 21 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 18 | 54 |  | 9 | 86 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  |

## Departure Headway and Service Time

| Initial Departure Headway, hd (s) | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 | 3.20 |  | 3.20 | 3.20 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial Degree of Utilization, x | 0.019 |  |  | 0.004 |  |  | 0.016 | 0.048 |  | 0.008 | 0.077 |  |
| Final Departure Headway, hd (s) | 3.96 |  |  | 4.34 |  |  | 5.16 | 4.64 |  | 5.14 | 4.62 |  |
| Final Degree of Utilization, $x$ | 0.023 |  |  | 0.006 |  |  | 0.025 | 0.069 |  | 0.012 | 0.111 |  |
| Move-Up Time, m (s) | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.3 | 2.3 |  | 2.3 | 2.3 |  |
| Service Time, ts (s) | 1.96 |  |  | 2.34 |  |  | 2.86 | 2.34 |  | 2.84 | 2.32 |  |

Capacity, Delay and Level of Service


General Information

| Analyst | FMF |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | SLR |  |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2021$ |  |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |  |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |  |
| Tim Anser |  |  |

Time Analyzed

| Project Description | Combined AM Peak Hour |
| :--- | :--- |

Lanes


Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 5 | 0 | 12 | 31 | 14 | 3 | 14 | 50 | 7 | 9 | 67 | 2 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | TR |  | L | TR |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 21 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 18 | 71 |  | 11 | 86 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Departure Headway and Service Time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initial Departure Headway, hd (s) | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 | 3.20 |  | 3.20 | 3.20 |  |
| Initial Degree of Utilization, x | 0.019 |  |  | 0.053 |  |  | 0.016 | 0.063 |  | 0.010 | 0.077 |  |
| Final Departure Headway, hd (s) | 4.07 |  |  | 4.48 |  |  | 5.30 | 4.72 |  | 5.30 | 4.78 |  |
| Final Degree of Utilization, x | 0.024 |  |  | 0.075 |  |  | 0.026 | 0.093 |  | 0.017 | 0.114 |  |
| Move-Up Time, m (s) | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.3 | 2.3 |  | 2.3 | 2.3 |  |
| Service Time, ts (s) | 2.07 |  |  | 2.48 |  |  | 3.00 | 2.42 |  | 3.00 | 2.48 |  |

Capacity, Delay and Level of Service



## HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | FMF | Intersection | Iron Horse at Drake Hill |
| Agency/Co. | SLR | Jurisdiction | Simsbury |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2021$ | East/West Street | Drake Hill Road |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Iron Horse Boulevard |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Combined AM Peak Hour |  |  |

## Lanes



## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 28 | 93 |  |  |  | 134 | 66 |  |  |  |  |  | 88 |  | 28 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \\| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 4.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.43 |  | 6.23 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 2.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.53 |  | 3.33 |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | FMF | Intersection | Iron Horse at North dwy |
| Agency/Co. | SLR | Jurisdiction | Simsbury |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2021$ | East/West Street | North site driveway |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Iron Horse Boulevard |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Combined AM Peak Hour |  |  |

## Lanes



## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | TR |  |  | T |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  | 50 | 8 |  |  | 78 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | Ø3 |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | F |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 29 | 15 | 44 | 4 | 26 | 76 | 66 | 657 | 5 | 40 | 544 | 37 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 29 | 15 | 44 | 4 | 26 | 76 | 66 | 657 | 5 | 40 | 544 | 37 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Storage Length (ft) | 80 |  | 80 | 0 |  | 150 | 350 |  | 0 | 230 |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 200 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.990 |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.968 |  |  | 0.994 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1803 | 1583 | 0 | 1852 | 1583 | 1770 | 1861 | 0 | 1770 | 1844 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.781 |  |  | 0.948 |  | 0.370 |  |  | 0.327 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1455 | 1583 | 0 | 1766 | 1583 | 689 | 1861 | 0 | 609 | 1844 | 0 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 106 |  |  | 106 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 394 |  |  | 744 |  |  | 695 |  |  | 386 |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 14.5 |  |  | 13.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| 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 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 33 | 17 | 49 | 4 | 29 | 85 | 74 | 738 | 6 | 45 | 611 | 42 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 50 | 49 | 0 | 33 | 85 | 74 | 744 | 0 | 45 | 653 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 3 |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 4 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 |  | 5.0 | 15.0 |  | 1.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 9.0 | 21.7 |  | 9.0 | 21.7 |  | 30.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 15.0 | 56.0 |  | 15.0 | 56.0 |  | 30.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 12.5\% | 46.7\% |  | 12.5\% | 46.7\% |  | 25\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 11.0 | 49.3 |  | 11.0 | 49.3 |  | 26.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 4.3 |  | 3.0 | 4.3 |  | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.4 |  | 1.0 | 2.4 |  | 0.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 6.3 | 6.3 |  | 6.3 | 6.3 | 4.0 | 6.7 |  | 4.0 | 6.7 |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.5 |  | 2.0 | 3.5 |  | 0.2 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | C-Min |  | None | C-Min |  | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 8.8 | 8.8 |  | 8.8 | 8.8 | 100.5 | 94.6 |  | 99.8 | 94.2 |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.07 | 0.07 |  | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.84 | 0.79 |  | 0.83 | 0.78 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.47 | 0.23 |  | 0.26 | 0.40 | 0.12 | 0.51 |  | 0.08 | 0.45 |  |  |
| Control Delay |  | 66.8 | 2.5 |  | 56.2 | 11.3 | 2.3 | 7.9 |  | 2.3 | 7.3 |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay |  | 66.8 | 2.5 |  | 56.2 | 11.3 | 2.3 | 7.9 |  | 2.3 | 7.3 |  |  |
| LOS |  | E | A |  | E | B | A | A |  | A | A |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 35.0 |  |  | 23.8 |  |  | 7.4 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |
| Stops (vph) |  | 41 | 0 |  | 27 | 8 | 10 | 246 |  | 7 | 201 |  |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 4 |  |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  | 72 | 10 |  | 48 | 45 | 31 | 436 |  | 13 | 279 |  |  |
| NOX Emissions (g/hr) |  | 14 | 2 |  | 9 | 9 | 6 | 85 |  | 2 | 54 |  |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  | 17 | 2 |  | 11 | 10 | 7 | 101 |  | 3 | 65 |  |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 23 |  | 0 | 21 |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 38 | 0 |  | 25 | 0 | 7 | 211 |  | 4 | 174 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 76 | 0 |  | 56 | 32 | 17 | 341 |  | 12 | 286 |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 314 |  |  | 664 |  |  | 615 |  |  | 306 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  | 80 |  |  | 150 | 350 |  |  | 230 |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 153 | 262 |  | 186 | 262 | 692 | 1467 |  | 631 | 1448 |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |

1: Route 10 \& 202 \& Owens Brook/Iron Horse Blvd


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | $\varnothing 3$ |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | F |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 29 | 15 | 44 | 4 | 26 | 79 | 66 | 659 | 5 | 47 | 544 | 37 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 29 | 15 | 44 | 4 | 26 | 79 | 66 | 659 | 5 | 47 | 544 | 37 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Storage Length (ft) | 80 |  | 80 | 0 |  | 150 | 350 |  | 0 | 230 |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 200 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.990 |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.968 |  |  | 0.994 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1803 | 1583 | 0 | 1852 | 1583 | 1770 | 1861 | 0 | 1770 | 1844 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.781 |  |  | 0.952 |  | 0.367 |  |  | 0.322 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1455 | 1583 | 0 | 1773 | 1583 | 684 | 1861 | 0 | 600 | 1844 | 0 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 106 |  |  | 106 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 394 |  |  | 766 |  |  | 695 |  |  | 386 |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 7.7 |  |  | 14.9 |  |  | 13.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| 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 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 33 | 17 | 49 | 4 | 29 | 89 | 74 | 740 | 6 | 53 | 611 | 42 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 50 | 49 | 0 | 33 | 89 | 74 | 746 | 0 | 53 | 653 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 3 |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 4 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 |  | 5.0 | 15.0 |  | 1.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 9.0 | 21.7 |  | 9.0 | 21.7 |  | 30.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 15.0 | 56.0 |  | 15.0 | 56.0 |  | 30.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 12.5\% | 46.7\% |  | 12.5\% | 46.7\% |  | 25\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 11.0 | 49.3 |  | 11.0 | 49.3 |  | 26.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 4.3 |  | 3.0 | 4.3 |  | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.4 |  | 1.0 | 2.4 |  | 0.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 6.3 | 6.3 |  | 6.3 | 6.3 | 4.0 | 6.7 |  | 4.0 | 6.7 |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.5 |  | 2.0 | 3.5 |  | 0.2 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | C-Min |  | None | C-Min |  | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 8.8 | 8.8 |  | 8.8 | 8.8 | 98.0 | 90.7 |  | 97.4 | 90.4 |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.07 | 0.07 |  | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.82 | 0.76 |  | 0.81 | 0.75 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.47 | 0.23 |  | 0.25 | 0.42 | 0.12 | 0.53 |  | 0.10 | 0.47 |  |  |
| Control Delay |  | 66.8 | 2.5 |  | 56.1 | 12.5 | 2.3 | 8.4 |  | 2.3 | 7.7 |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay |  | 66.8 | 2.5 |  | 56.1 | 12.5 | 2.3 | 8.4 |  | 2.3 | 7.7 |  |  |
| LOS |  | E | A |  | E | B | A | A |  | A | A |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 35.0 |  |  | 24.3 |  |  | 7.9 |  |  | 7.3 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |
| Stops (vph) |  | 41 | 0 |  | 27 | 10 | 10 | 266 |  | 8 | 215 |  |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 4 |  |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  | 72 | 10 |  | 49 | 50 | 31 | 452 |  | 15 | 290 |  |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  | 14 | 2 |  | 9 | 10 | 6 | 88 |  | 3 | 56 |  |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  | 17 | 2 |  | 11 | 12 | 7 | 105 |  | 3 | 67 |  |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 28 |  | 0 | 24 |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 38 | 0 |  | 25 | 0 | 7 | 212 |  | 5 | 174 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 76 | 0 |  | 56 | 36 | 17 | 344 |  | 13 | 285 |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 314 |  |  | 686 |  |  | 615 |  |  | 306 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( ft ) |  |  | 80 |  |  | 150 | 350 |  |  | 230 |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 153 | 262 |  | 187 | 262 | 674 | 1407 |  | 611 | 1390 |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |

1: Route 10 \& 202 \& Owens Brook/Iron Horse Blvd



## General Information

| Analyst | FMF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | SLR |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2021$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | Background PM Peak Hour |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hopmeadow at Pent |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Simsbury |
| East/West Street | Pent Road |
| North/South Street | Hopmeadow Street |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |

Lanes


Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  | T |  |  |  | T |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |  | 13 |  | 6 |  |  | 699 |  |  |  | 595 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 6.43 |  | 6.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.53 |  | 3.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Analyst | FMF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | SLR |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2021$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Time Analyzed | PM |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South |
| Project Description | Combined PM Peak Hour |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Hopmeadow at Pent |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Simsbury |
| East/West Street | Pent Road |
| North/South Street | Hopmeadow Street |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |

Lanes


Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  | T |  |  |  | T |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |  | 8 |  |  | 699 |  |  |  | 595 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 6.43 |  | 6.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.53 |  | 3.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



General Information

| Analyst | FMF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | SLR |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2021$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Time Analyzed | PM |
| Project Description | Background PM Peak Hour |

Site Information

| Intersection | Iron Horse at Pent/dwy |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Simsbury |
| East/West Street | Pent Road/South site dwy |
| North/South Street | Iron Horse Boulevard |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.70 |

Lanes


Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 5 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 101 | 0 | 3 | 57 | 0 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | TR |  | L | TR |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 29 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 7 | 144 |  | 4 | 81 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Departure Headway and Service Time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initial Departure Headway, hd (s) | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 | 3.20 |  | 3.20 | 3.20 |  |
| Initial Degree of Utilization, x | 0.025 |  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.006 | 0.128 |  | 0.004 | 0.072 |  |
| Final Departure Headway, hd (s) | 4.07 |  |  | 4.51 |  |  | 5.16 | 4.66 |  | 5.20 | 4.70 |  |
| Final Degree of Utilization, $x$ | 0.032 |  |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.010 | 0.187 |  | 0.006 | 0.106 |  |
| Move-Up Time, m (s) | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.3 | 2.3 |  | 2.3 | 2.3 |  |
| Service Time, ts (s) | 2.07 |  |  | 2.51 |  |  | 2.86 | 2.36 |  | 2.90 | 2.40 |  |

Capacity, Delay and Level of Service


General Information

| Analyst | FMF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | SLR |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2021$ |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |
| Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Time Analyzed | PM |
| Project Description | Combined PM Peak Hour |

Site Information

| Intersection | Iron Horse at Pent/dwy |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Simsbury |
| East/West Street | Pent Road/South site dwy |
| North/South Street | Iron Horse Boulevard |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.70 |

Lanes


Vehicle Volume and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume | 5 | 0 | 15 | 18 | 9 | 1 | 5 | 124 | 17 | 10 | 57 | 0 |
| \% Thrus in Shared Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L1 | L2 | L3 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | TR |  | L | TR |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 29 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 7 | 201 |  | 14 | 81 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Departure Headway and Service Time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initial Departure Headway, hd (s) | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 |  |  | 3.20 | 3.20 |  | 3.20 | 3.20 |  |
| Initial Degree of Utilization, x | 0.025 |  |  | 0.036 |  |  | 0.006 | 0.179 |  | 0.013 | 0.072 |  |
| Final Departure Headway, hd (s) | 4.28 |  |  | 4.77 |  |  | 5.28 | 4.69 |  | 5.36 | 4.86 |  |
| Final Degree of Utilization, x | 0.034 |  |  | 0.053 |  |  | 0.010 | 0.263 |  | 0.021 | 0.110 |  |
| Move-Up Time, m (s) | 2.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.3 | 2.3 |  | 2.3 | 2.3 |  |
| Service Time, ts (s) | 2.28 |  |  | 2.77 |  |  | 2.98 | 2.39 |  | 3.06 | 2.56 |  |

Capacity, Delay and Level of Service


## HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | FMF | Intersection | Iron Horse at Drake Hill |
| Agency/Co. | SLR | Jurisdiction | Simsbury |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2021$ | East/West Street | Drake Hill Road |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Iron Horse Boulevard |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Background PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 38 | 135 |  |  |  | 182 | 68 |  |  |  |  |  | 51 |  | 52 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \\| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 4.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.43 |  | 6.23 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 2.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.53 |  | 3.33 |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61 |  | 63 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 1254 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 498 |  | 776 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.12 |  | 0.08 |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4 |  | 0.3 |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.3 |  | 10.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B |  | B |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.6 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |

## HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | FMF | Intersection | Iron Horse at Drake Hill |
| Agency/Co. | SLR | Jurisdiction | Simsbury |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2021$ | East/West Street | Drake Hill Road |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Iron Horse Boulevard |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Combined PM Peak Hour |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  | L |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 54 | 135 |  |  |  | 182 | 92 |  |  |  |  |  | 66 |  | 55 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \\| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 4.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.43 |  | 6.23 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 2.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.53 |  | 3.33 |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | FMF | Intersection | Iron Horse at North dwy |
| Agency/Co. | SLR | Jurisdiction | Simsbury |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2021$ | East/West Street | North site driveway |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Iron Horse Boulevard |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | Combined PM Peak Hour |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach <br> Movement | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | TR |  |  | T |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 107 | 23 |  |  | 67 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \\| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017
    ${ }^{2}$ Commuting Flows (Journey To Work) - U.S. Census Bureau -
    https://www.census.gov/topics/employment/commuting/guidance/flows.html

