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## Traffic Impact Analysis 12-23-05

## Study Objective

The objective of this traffic impact study is to determine if the US 16 / Moon Meadows / Sammis Trail intersection and proposed intersections can support the traffic generated by a proposed Wal*Mart Supercenter.

## Executive Summary

A traffic impact analysis was performed for a new mixed-use development near US Highway 16 and Sammis Trail in Rapid City, SD. This mixed-use development includes a Wal*Mart, a hotel, 4 retail lots, and 300 single-family detached housing lots. A level of service (LOS) analysis was preformed for the intersection of US 16 and Sammis Trail, as well as four additional intersections within the development. The analysis revealed that a signal is warranted at the intersection of US 16 / Sammis Road / Moon Meadows Drive with dual left-turn lanes for the westbound and southbound approaches, as well as a free right-turn lane for the westbound approach. An additional signal is warranted at the intersection of Sammis Trail at the Main Access Road, along with exclusive left and right-turn lanes on the eastbound approach (assuming full site development). A signal at Sammis Trail/Main Access Road does not meet signal warrant criteria opening day therefore should not be installed until it is warranted. All other intersections operate at LOS C or better.

Based on the criteria that all proposed intersections must be mitigated to operate at LOS C or better, the US 16 / Moon Meadows / Sammis Trail access and proposed internal intersections with mitigation as recommended will provide acceptable operations. A connection to Catron Boulevard is not needed based on the LOS criteria established for this study.

Driveway locations as indicated on the figures are the recommended locations determined from this traffic analysis. It is recommended that Sammis Trail have limited access since it is classified as an arterial for the City of Rapid City.

The intersection of Sammis Trail / Rearage Road operates at an acceptable LOS and does not warrant a traffic signal.

It is recommended that either a continuous left-turn lane or left-turn lanes within a median section be provided at each intersection on the Rearage Road. As development increases north of this area, the turn lanes will provide additional safety and capacity.

Several types of signal control options were evaluated with the recommended lane geometry to determine if queuing along Sammis Trail would have a negative impact at the US 16 / Sammis Trail intersection and Sammis Trail / Main access road. Both protected only and permitted/protected left-turn phasing, along
with actuated uncoordinated and actuated coordinated timing plans were evaluated using SimTRAFFIC simulation software. The simulation results revealed that protected phasing at US 16 / Moon Meadows / Sammis Trail allows for acceptable queues with no spill back into other intersections when actuated uncoordinated signals were used. Permitted/protected phasing was used at Sammis Trail / Main Access Road. SimTRAFFIC also verified the length of the recommended storage lanes were sufficient and that merging the southbound dual left-turn lanes on US 16 into a single left-turn lane at the Main Access Road into Wal*Mart would not negatively traffic operations; the analysis indicates that the spacing of 850 feet is sufficient. It is recommended the detector loops be placed according to the SDDOT recommended procedure or video detection be used to allow the signals to operate fully-actuated. During the construction of the Sammis Trail / Main Access Road intersection, signal conduit should be installed across the roadway in preparation for a future signal.

## Background

The proposed development will be located at the southwest corner of the Commerford Ranch Development Park near US 16, Moon Meadows Drive and Sammis Trail. The land uses included in the proposal are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Land Use Information

| Land Use Type | Size |
| :--- | :--- |
| Wal*Mart (Discount Superstore) | 203,000 sq.ft. |
| Lot 1 (Specialty Retail) | 30,000 sq.ft. |
| Lot 3 (High Turnover Restaurant) | 6,000 sq.ft. |
| Lot 4 (Specialty Retail) | 50,000 sq. ft. |
| Hotel | 150 rooms |
| Specialty Retail near Hotel | 20,000 sq. ft. |
| Single Family Detached Housing | 300 lots |

The site plan includes realignment of a portion of Sammis Trail west of US 16 to connect with Moon Meadows Drive at US 16. The Wal*Mart and Lots 1,3, \& 4 will be located north of Sammis Trail, while the hotel, specialty retail, and single family houses will be located south of Sammis Trail. The Wal*Mart and Lot 1 will have an access road (Main Access Road) located approximately 850-900 feet east of US 16. The access road will continue south across Sammis Trail to provide access to the hotel and retail, creating a four-legged intersection. Until the Hotel and retail area are developed, an interim connection from existing Sammis Trail will be required. The existing Sammis Trail shall connect to the proposed Sammis Trail at approximately a 90 degree angle. The location of the interim connection shall be a minimum of 200 feet north of the access road to Wal*Mart. This interim connection shall be removed as development begins on the south side of Sammis Trail.

The site plan includes a proposed Rearage Road to the north property line of the proposed Wal*Mart property where it will terminate and will run parallel to US 16. This road would provide access to Wal*Mart and lots along the eastern edge of the development. A driveway will be located approximately 400 feet north of the Rearage Road/Sammis Trail intersection to provide access to Lots $3 \& 4$. The exact driveway location shall meet City of Rapid City driveway spacing standards. One additional access road will also be constructed to provide direct access to the Rearage Road. The study area encompasses the US 16 / Moon Meadows Drive intersection, plus four additional intersections created by the development:

* US 16 / Moon Meadows Drive / Sammis Trail
* Sammis Trail / Main Access Road (proposed)
* Sammis Trail / Rearage Road (proposed)
* Rearage Trail / East Access Road (proposed)
* Rearage Road / Lot 3 \& 4 access (proposed)

An illustration of the proposed development and study area is shown in Figure 1.


## Methodology

The main objective of the study was to determine the traffic impacts of the proposed mixed-use development located near the intersection of US 16 and Moon Meadows Drive/Sammis Trail in Rapid City, South Dakota. A traffic operations analysis of the surrounding roadway system and proposed roadways was performed to predict the quality of traffic operations in the area.

* Existing AM and PM peak hour turning movement counts were collected at the intersection of US 16 and Moon Meadows Drive (Figure 2). The existing counts were adjusted to represent summer "seasonal" volumes factors supplied by the SDDOT.
* The proposed development trips were estimated using the methodology of ITE Trip Generation, $7^{\text {th }}$ Edition. The PM Peak Hour of Generator rate for the Wal*Mart store was adjusted based on recommendations in a SDDOT completed study "Verify Certain ITE Trip Generation Rate Applications in South Dakota".
* Some portion of the trips to the proposed development may be shared-use trips. An internal capture rate of $16 \%$ was agreed upon by City of Rapid City, the State of South Dakota, and HDR to be used in this study.
* The pre-development daily traffic volumes were used to determine the directional orientation of traffic. It was assumed the development would alter the directional orientation as shown in Figure 3.
* Capacity analyses were performed for the AM and PM peak hours. The following scenarios will be evaluated:


## $>$ Existing Conditions

$>2005$ Build Condition - Existing volumes added to the build volumes (proposed development trips).
$>2020$ Build Condition - Existing volumes increased at a rate of 2\% per year for 15 years added to the build volumes (proposed development trips).

* The impacts of the site-generated trips on the surrounding street network were determined using Synchro 6.1 and the methodologies summarized in the Highway Capacity Manual.
* Mitigation measures were identified to provide acceptable operations at the study area intersections.


FIGURE 3: Distribution of Trips at US 16 / Sammis Trail (Represents approximately the existing distribution)


## Trip Generation

ITE Trip Generation, $7^{\text {th }}$ Edition was used to determine the number of expected trips generated by the development during the AM and PM peak hour. Due to the numerous buildings on the proposed site, separate land uses were used in the trip generation calculation. The trip generation rate for the Wal*Mart Superstore was adjusted to 5.00 for the PM Peak Hour of Generator based on a study completed by the South Dakota Department of Transportation.

Based on the high density of retail land uses located in a relatively small area, an internal capture rate of $16 \%$ was determined to be a conservative approach for estimating trips for this development. The trips internally captured were routed on the proposed roadways with exception of trips that were allowed to travel between land uses using internal roadways or parking lots.

The site-generated trip summary using this methodology is shown in Table 2.

Table 2

|  |  |  |  | AM Peak Hour of Generator |  |  |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour of Generator |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development | Number | Unit | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITE Land } \\ & \text { Use } \end{aligned}$ | \% Enter | \% Exit | ITE Trip Rate | Total Trip <br> Ends | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips | \% Enter | \% Exit | ITE Trip Rate | Total <br> Trip <br> Ends | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| Wal*Mart | 203000 | sq ft | 813 | 53\% | 47\% | 3.17 | 644 | 341 | 302 | 52\% | 48\% | 5.00 | 1015 | 528 | 487 |
| Lot 1 (Specialty Retail) | 30000 | sq ft | 814 | 48\% | 52\% | 6.84 | 205 | 98 | 107 | 56\% | 44\% | 5.02 | 151 | 84 | 66 |
| Lot 3 (High Turnover Restaurant) | 6000 | sq ft | 932 | 52\% | 48\% | 13.53 | 81 | 42 | 39 | 55\% | 45\% | 18.8 | 113 | 62 | 51 |
| Lot 4 (Specialty Retail) | 50000 | sq ft | 814 | 48\% | 52\% | 6.84 | 342 | 164 | 178 | 56\% | 44\% | 5.02 | 251 | 141 | 110 |
| Hotel | 150 | Rooms | 310 | 55\% | 45\% | 0.52 | 78 | 43 | 35 | 58\% | 42\% | 0.61 | 92 | 53 | 38 |
| Specialty Retail | 20000 | sq ft | 814 | 48\% | 52\% | 6.84 | 137 | 66 | 71 | 56\% | 44\% | 5.02 | 100 | 56 | 44 |
| Houses (SF Detached) | 300 | lots | 210 | 26\% | 74\% | 0.77 | 231 | 60 | 171 | 64\% | 36\% | 1.02 | 306 | 196 | 110 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1718 | 815 | 903 |  |  |  | 2027 | 1120 | 907 |
| Internal Trip Reduction - 16\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 275 | 130 | 145 |  |  |  | 324 | 179 | 145 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1443 | 684 | 759 |  |  |  | 1703 | 941 | 762 |

Note: The PM trip generation rate for Wal*Mart was determined by information provided in a Trip Generation Study conducted by the SDDOT called "Verify Certain ITE Trip Generation Rate Applications" in South Dakota.

## Trip Distribution

The orientation of site-generated traffic is the most complex and subjective step in the process of any traffic impact analysis. There are a variety of methods available to estimate the likely orientation of traffic; however, no method can guarantee 100 percent accuracy (people are free to visit this site from any location using whichever route they choose). Therefore, it is important to provide the most reasonable possible analysis in combination with a procedure that is reasonably conservative such that an appropriate "factor of safety" is inherent to the results. Trips were distributed along each of the roadway segments and intersections using the directional orientation from Figure 3 and the layout of the proposed site. It is important to note that several assumptions were made including:

* $95 \%$ of trips entering and exiting Wal*Mart and Lot 1 were assigned via the Main Access Road. The remaining 5\% were assigned to the Rearage Road based on the location of the Gas Station.
* All of the trips entering and exiting lot $3 \& 4$ occurred via the rearage road as no internal access to Wal*Mart exists.
* All of the trips entering and exiting the hotel and retail area south of Sammis Trail used the Main Access Road.
* All of the proposed trips entering and exiting the residential area used Sammis Trail to the east of the Rearage Road.

The site-generated trip distribution for the AM and PM peak hours are shown in Figures 4 and 5, respectively.
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## Post-Development Volume

The existing AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes from Figure 2 were combined with those from Figures 4 and 5, respectively, to determine the total volumes used in the level of service analysis. It is assumed due to the number of land uses estimated in this study that this area will take 5 to10 years to fully developed as only the Wal*Mart store is being proposed at this time. The LOS for each intersection is also documented and represents the unmitigated or baseline scenario. An assessment of the quality of traffic operations and mitigation measures are discussed in the next section. Figures 6 and 7 documents the anticipated post-development turning movements and LOS for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.



## Analysis Description

Observations of traffic volumes provide an understanding of the general nature of traffic, but are insufficient to indicate either the ability of the street network to carry additional traffic or the quality of service provided by the street system. For this reason the concept of Levels of Service (LOS) was developed to correlate numerical traffic operational data to subjective descriptions of traffic performance at intersections. Each lane of traffic has delay associated with it and therefore a correlating LOS. The weighted average delay for each of these lanes of traffic for a signalized intersection is the intersection LOS. LOS categories range from LOS A (best) to F (worst) as shown in Table 3.

## TABLE 3: Level of Service Description

| Level of Service | SIGNALIZED <br> Intersection Control Delay (sec) | UNSIGNALIZED <br> Intersection Control Delay (sec) | Intersection LOS Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | $\leq 10.0$ | $\leq 10.0$ | Free flow, insignificant delays. |
| B | 10.1-20.0 | 10.1-15.0 | Stable operation, minimal delays. |
| C | 20.1-35.0 | 15.1-25.0 | Stable operation, acceptable delays. |
| D | 35.1-55.0 | 25.1-35.0 | Restricted flow, regular delays. |
| E | 55.1-80.0 | 35.1-50.0 | Maximum capacity, extended delays. Volumes at or near capacity. Long queues form upstream from intersection. |
| F | > 80.0 | > 50.0 | Forced flow, excessive delays. Represents jammed conditions. Intersection operates below capacity with low volumes. Queues may block upstream intersections. |

Source: Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, 2000
The intersection capacity analyses were completed using Synchro 6.1 software. Synchro replicates the analysis procedures defined in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual. This manual provides procedures for the analysis of both signalized and unsignalized intersections. It should be noted that stop-controlled intersections are analyzed by identifying the amount of delay at each approach that conflict with other intersection movements (i.e. all movements except the free flow through lanes), thus approach level of service is reported for unsignalized intersections.

LOS C has generally been established as the standard for planning of transportation facilities for peak hour traffic conditions. For this study, LOS "C" for the overall intersection was used as the minimum standard.

A review of the analyses for each volume scenario is provided in the following sections, with summaries of the LOS analyses. Summary LOS output reports of the analysis are included in the appendix and may be referenced to review signal timings and phasing as presented in this study.
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## Unmitigated Conditions Analysis

Capacity analysis was performed using the existing AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes adjusted where necessary to represent peak summer volumes on the existing and proposed roadway network. In general, the surrounding roadways on the eastern edge of the site are characterized by low levels of traffic with acceptable levels of service based on the lane geometry shown in Figures 6 and 7. The US 16 / Sammis Trail / Moon Meadows and Sammis Trail / Main Access Road intersections are characterized by near or over capacity conditions. In this study, it was assumed that the intersection of Sammis Trail / Main Access Road and Sammis Trail / Rearage Road were operated as all-way stop controlled, while the remaining intersections were two-way stop controlled (with US 16 and Rearage Road uncontrolled). A summary of the intersection LOS for the existing conditions is documented in Table 4.

## TABLE 4: Unmitigated Condition Intersection Level-of-Service

| Intersection | Traffic <br> Control | AM Peak <br> Hour LOS | Avg Delay <br> per Vehicle <br> (sec) | PM Peak <br> Hour LOS | Avg Delay <br> per Vehicle <br> (sec) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. 16 / Sammis Trail | Two-Way | F | NA $^{2}$ | F | $\mathrm{NA}^{2}$ |
| Sammis Trail / Main access <br> road | Four-Way <br> Stop | $\mathrm{D}^{1}$ | 32.2 | $\mathrm{~F}^{3}$ | 64.1 |
| Sammis Trail / Rearage Road | All-Way <br> Stop | A | 8.2 | A | 8.6 |
| Rearage Road / Lot 3 \& 4 | Two-Way | A | 9.9 | A | 10.0 |
| Rearage Road / East Access | Two-Way | A | 8.5 | A | 8.5 |

Source: HDR Engineering, Inc. using Synchro 6.1 (HCM Methodology)
Note: 1. Worst Approach at LOS F (54.3 sec/veh), overall intersection at LOS D or $32.2 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$
Note: 2. Overcapacity conditions
Note: 3. Worst Approach at LOS F (108.2 sec/veh), overall intersection at LOS F or $64.1 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$
The LOS reported for four-way intersections represents overall intersection delay, whereas the delay for unsignalized two-way stop controlled intersections are reported as the "worst approach." This is to account for the potential of vehicles waiting on the minor approaches for unreasonable amounts of time where mainline through vehicles have no delay. Two-way stop controlled intersections having minor approaches operating at LOS D, E, or F do not necessarily require mitigation; however additional minor street approach lanes and investigation of signal warrants may be appropriate.

## Mitigation

There are two main areas that will likely require mitigation as a result of the development:

* US Highway 16 / Moon Meadows / Sammis Trail
* Sammis Trail / Wal*Mart Main access road


## U.S. Highway 16 / Sammis Trail

As documented in Figure 6 and 7, the intersection of US 16 / Sammis Trail is expected to operate at deficient levels after the site is developed. To mitigate this condition, installation of an 8 -phase traffic signal with protected left-turn phasing for the northbound and southbound directions and protected leftturns for the eastbound and westbound approaches is the most appropriate measure. A Synchro analysis revealed that this measure improved the level of service to LOS B. Due to the large volume of leftturning traffic from southbound US 16 to Sammis Trail, installation of an additional left-turn lane along southbound US 16 has significant potential to reduce delay. The southbound left-turn lanes shall be designed to allow the left-turns to run protected only without the requirement of split phasing due to lane geometrics. The large volume of left-turning traffic from Sammis Trail onto southbound US 16 also warrants an additional left-turn lane. The westbound left-turn lanes shall be designed to allow the leftturns to run protected only without the requirement of split phasing due to lane geometrics. Finally, the volume of right-turning traffic from Sammis Trail onto northbound US 16 should be given a separate lane to make free right-turns. The free right-turn lane should be long enough (preferably at least 600 feet) to allow traffic to merge onto US 16.

## Sammis Trail / Main Access Road

As documented in Figure 6 and 7, the intersection of Sammis Trail / Main Access Road is expected to operate at deficient levels after the site is developed. To mitigate this condition, the intersection shall be signalized and the proposed lane geometry shall consist of an exclusive left-turn lane along the eastbound approach from Sammis Trail and a right-turn lane to improve intersection operations, especially in reducing queue lengths. Installation of a 5-phase traffic signal (with permitted-protected left turns for eastbound left-turning traffic) improved PM peak hour operations from LOS F to LOS B.

## Summary of Capacity Improvements

Summaries of the mitigated LOS and turning movements are documented in Figures 8 and 9, and Table 5 for the AM and PM peak hours. The following improvements were made:

* Installation of an 8-phase traffic signal at US Highway 16 / Sammis Trail.
* Installation of an additional southbound left-turn lane along US Highway 16 at Sammis Trail.
* Installation of a free-right turn lane along westbound Sammis Trail at US Highway 16.
* Installation of an additional left-turn lane along westbound Sammis Trail at US Highway 16.
* Installation of a 600 foot free-right turn acceleration lane along northbound US Highway 16.
* Installation of a 5-phase traffic signal at Sammis Trail / Main Access Road.
* Installation of a left-turn lane along eastbound Sammis Trail at the Main Access Road.
* Installation of a right-turn lane along eastbound Sammis Trail at the Main access road.



TABLE 5: Mitigated Intersection Level-of-Service

| Intersection | Traffic <br> Control | AM Peak <br> Hour LOS | Avg Delay <br> per Vehicle <br> (sec) | PM Peak <br> Hour LOS | Avg Delay <br> per Vehicle <br> $(\mathrm{sec})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 16 / Sammis Trail / Moon <br> Meadows | Signal | B | 15.6 | B | 19.0 |
| Sammis Trail / Wal*Mart Main <br> access road | Signal | B | 17.3 | B | 12.3 |
| Sammis Trail / Rearage Road | All-Way <br> Stop | A | 8.2 | A | 8.6 |
| Rearage Road / Lot 3 \& 4 | Two-Way | A | 9.9 | A | 10.0 |
| Rearage Road / East Access | Two-Way | A | 8.5 | A | 8.5 |

Source: HDR Engineering, Inc. using Synchro 6.1 (HCM Methodology)

## Future Build (2020) Conditions Analysis

Based on growth trends in the study area, future build (2020) volumes were developed by growing the existing traffic volumes by 2.0 percent per year for 15 years and adding them to the trips generated by the proposed mixed-use development. The growth rate was based on historical count information gathered by the SDDOT. The 2020 build traffic volumes and LOS (AM) are shown in Figure 10. The 2020 build traffic volumes and LOS (PM) are shown in Figure 11.

The capacity analysis was performed using future build (2020) AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes to determine if the geometric improvements recommended would serve this area in the future. It was determined through an operational analysis that the study intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS in 2020 with no further geometric improvements. A summary of the intersection LOS for the existing conditions is documented in Table 6.

TABLE 6: Future Build (2020) Intersection Level-of-Service

|  | Traffic <br> Control | AM Peak <br> Hour LOS | Avg Delay <br> per Vehicle <br> (sec) | PM Peak <br> Hour LOS | Avg Delay <br> per Vehicle <br> $(\mathrm{sec})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 16 / Sammis Trail / Moon <br> Meadows | Signal | B | 19.6 | C | 23.1 |
| Sammis Trail / Wal*Mart Main <br> access road | Signal | B | 17.4 | B | 12.3 |
| Sammis Trail / Rearage Road | All-Way <br> Stop | A | 8.2 | A | 8.6 |
| Rearage Road / Lot 3 \& 4 | Two-Way | A | 9.9 | A | 10.0 |
| Rearage Road / East Access | Two-Way | A | 8.5 | A | 8.5 |

Source: HDR Engineering, Inc. using Synchro 6.1 (HCM Methodology)



## APPENDIX

1.) Current Site Plan
2.) Synchro Print-outs


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
6: Sammis Trail \& Wal*Mart Main Access Road

|  | 4 |  | \% | 7 | $4$ | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 | $\pm$ | $\ddagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Volume (vph) | 351 | 247 | 91 | 5 | 346 | 20 | 89 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 327 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 382 | 268 | 99 | 5 | 376 | 22 | 97 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 355 |
| Direction, Lane \# EB 1 WB 1 NB 1 SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 749 | 403 | 111 | 373 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 382 | 5 | 97 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 99 | 22 | 5 | 355 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | -0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 6.5 | 6.9 | 8.1 | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, $x$ | 1.35 | 0.78 | 0.25 | 0.68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 564 | 493 | 395 | 537 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 54.3 | 14.9 | 11.8 | 12.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 54.3 | 14.9 | 11.8 | 12.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F | B | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 32.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Level of Service |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Util | ization |  | 02.4\% |  | ICU Leve | of Servir | vice |  | G |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## 18: Sammis Trail \& Rearage Road

|  | $\rangle$ |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% |  |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop | Stop |  | Stop |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 194 | 64 | 157 | 17 | 2 | 214 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 211 | 70 | 171 | 18 | 2 | 233 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 280 | 189 | 235 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 211 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 18 | 233 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.2 | 0.0 | -0.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.38 | 0.24 | 0.29 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 712 | 586 | 778 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.5 | 8.0 | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.5 | 8.0 | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 8.2 |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Level of Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 48.8\% |  | ICU Leve | of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
21: Lot 3 \& 4 \& Rearage Road


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
25: East Access Road \& Rearage Road


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
6: Sammis Trail \& Wal*Mart Main Access Road

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | 4 |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Volume (vph) | 488 | 364 | 92 | 3 | 255 | 20 | 69 | 7 | 4 | 25 | 7 | 442 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 530 | 396 | 100 | 3 | 277 | 22 | 75 | 8 | 4 | 27 | 8 | 480 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 1026 | 302 | 87 | 515 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 530 | 3 | 75 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 100 | 22 | 4 | 480 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | -0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 6.5 | 6.2 | 8.0 | 6.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, $x$ | 1.85 | 0.52 | 0.19 | 0.88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 562 | 495 | 406 | 580 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 108.2 | 10.9 | 11.5 | 16.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 108.2 | 10.9 | 11.5 | 16.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F | B | B | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 64.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Level of Service |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 14.9\% |  | ICU Leve | of Se |  |  | H |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## 18: Sammis Trail \& Rearage Road

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\longleftarrow$ | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\dagger$ |  | \% |  |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop | Stop |  | Stop |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 216 | 177 | 103 | 12 | 15 | 175 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 235 | 192 | 112 | 13 | 16 | 190 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 427 | 125 | 207 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 235 | 0 | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 13 | 190 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | -0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, $x$ | 0.55 | 0.16 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 746 | 570 | 726 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.1 | 7.9 | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 9.1 | 7.9 | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 8.6 |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Level of Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 48.1\% |  | ICU Leve | of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
21: Lots 3 \& 4 \& Rearage Road


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
25: East Access Road \& Rearage Road


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
6: Sammis Trail \& Wal*Mart Main Access Road


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 |  | $\ddagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | 7\％ | 4 | 「＇ | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 | 「＇ | 17 | 性 | 「 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Total Lost time（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1676 | 1709 |  | 3252 | 1765 | 1500 | 1676 | 3353 | 1500 | 3252 | 3353 | 1500 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1676 | 1709 |  | 3252 | 1765 | 1500 | 1676 | 3353 | 1500 | 3252 | 3353 | 1500 |
| Volume（vph） | 103 | 55 | 15 | 228 | 61 | 473 | 1 | 509 | 206 | 428 | 378 | 20 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 112 | 60 | 16 | 248 | 66 | 514 | 1 | 553 | 224 | 465 | 411 | 22 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 112 | 61 | 0 | 248 | 66 | 514 | 1 | 553 | 26 | 465 | 411 | 11 |
| Turn Type | Prot |  |  | Prot |  | Free | Prot |  | Over | Prot |  | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  | Free |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 5.8 | 4.5 |  | 6.3 | 5.0 | 53.4 | 0.7 | 12.7 | 6.3 | 13.9 | 25.9 | 25.9 |
| Effective Green，g（s） | 5.8 | 4.5 |  | 6.3 | 5.0 | 53.4 | 0.7 | 12.7 | 6.3 | 13.9 | 25.9 | 25.9 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.11 | 0.08 |  | 0.12 | 0.09 | 1.00 | 0.01 | 0.24 | 0.12 | 0.26 | 0.49 | 0.49 |
| Clearance Time（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 182 | 144 |  | 384 | 165 | 1500 | 22 | 797 | 177 | 846 | 1626 | 728 |
| v／s Ratio Prot | 0.07 | 0.04 |  | 0.08 | 0.04 |  | 0.00 | c0．16 | c0．15 | c0．14 | 0.12 |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  | 0.34 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.01 |
| v／c Ratio | 0.62 | 0.43 |  | 0.65 | 0.40 | 0.34 | 0.05 | 0.69 | 0.15 | 0.55 | 0.25 | 0.01 |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 22.7 | 23.2 |  | 22.5 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 26.0 | 18.6 | 21.1 | 17.0 | 8.1 | 7.1 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 6.1 | 2.0 |  | 3.7 | 1.6 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Delay（s） | 28.8 | 25.2 |  | 26.2 | 24.4 | 0.6 | 26.9 | 21.2 | 21.5 | 17.8 | 8.2 | 7.1 |
| Level of Service | C | C |  | C | C | A | C | C | C | B | A | A |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 27.4 |  |  | 10.2 |  |  | 21.3 |  |  | 13.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 15.6 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | rvice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay <br> HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 53.4 |  | Sum of los | st time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 51．3\％ |  | CU Leve | of Se | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 8 Analysis

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## 18: Sammis Trail \& Rearage Road

|  | $\rangle$ |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | M |  |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop | Stop |  | Stop |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 194 | 64 | 157 | 17 | 2 | 214 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 211 | 70 | 171 | 18 | 2 | 233 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 280 | 189 | 235 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 211 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 18 | 233 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.2 | 0.0 | -0.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.38 | 0.24 | 0.29 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 712 | 586 | 778 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.5 | 8.0 | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.5 | 8.0 | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DelayHCM Level of Service |  |  | 8.2 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 48.8\% |  | ICU Leve | of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## 21: Lots 3 \& 4 \& Rearage Road



HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
25: East Access Road \& Rearage Road


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
6: Sammis Trail \& Wal*Mart Main Access Road


|  | 4 |  | 7 | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | 7\％ | 4 | F | ${ }^{7}$ | 中4 | 「 | ${ }^{7 *}$ | 中4 | 「 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Total Lost time（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1676 | 1744 |  | 3252 | 1765 | 1500 | 1676 | 3353 | 1500 | 3252 | 3353 | 1500 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1676 | 1744 |  | 3252 | 1765 | 1500 | 1676 | 3353 | 1500 | 3252 | 3353 | 1500 |
| Volume（vph） | 20 | 75 | 6 | 229 | 61 | 477 | 9 | 535 | 283 | 585 | 886 | 75 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 22 | 82 | 7 | 249 | 66 | 518 | 10 | 582 | 308 | 636 | 963 | 82 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 22 | 85 | 0 | 249 | 66 | 518 | 10 | 582 | 114 | 636 | 963 | 34 |
| Turn Type | Prot |  |  | Prot |  | Free | Prot |  | pt＋ov | Prot |  | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 23 | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  | Free |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 1.3 | 8.4 |  | 7.5 | 14.6 | 64.8 | 6.3 | 16.4 | 23.9 | 16.5 | 26.6 | 26.6 |
| Effective Green，g（s） | 1.3 | 8.4 |  | 7.5 | 14.6 | 64.8 | 6.3 | 16.4 | 23.9 | 16.5 | 26.6 | 26.6 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.02 | 0.13 |  | 0.12 | 0.23 | 1.00 | 0.10 | 0.25 | 0.37 | 0.25 | 0.41 | 0.41 |
| Clearance Time（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 34 | 226 |  | 376 | 398 | 1500 | 163 | 849 | 553 | 828 | 1376 | 616 |
| v／s Ratio Prot | 0.01 | 0.05 |  | c0．08 | 0.04 |  | 0.01 | c0．17 | 0.21 | 0.20 | c0．29 |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05 |
| v／c Ratio | 0.65 | 0.37 |  | 0.66 | 0.17 | 0.35 | 0.06 | 0.69 | 0.21 | 0.77 | 0.70 | 0.05 |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 31.5 | 25.8 |  | 27.4 | 20.2 | 0.0 | 26.6 | 21.9 | 14.0 | 22.4 | 15.8 | 11.5 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 35.3 | 1.0 |  | 4.3 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 0.2 | 4.3 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
| Delay（s） | 66.8 | 26.8 |  | 31.8 | 20.4 | 0.6 | 26.7 | 24.2 | 14.2 | 26.7 | 17.4 | 11.6 |
| Level of Service | E | C |  | C | C | A | C | C | B | C | B | B |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 34.8 |  |  | 11.5 |  |  | 20.8 |  |  | 20.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 19.0 |  | HCM Le | vel of Ser | ervice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 64.8 |  | Sum of l | st time |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 56．8\％ |  | CU Lev | of Ser | vice |  | B |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 9 Analysis

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## 18: Sammis Trail \& Rearage Road

|  | 4 | - | $\leftarrow$ | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% |  |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop | Stop |  | Stop |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 216 | 177 | 103 | 12 | 15 | 175 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 235 | 192 | 112 | 13 | 16 | 190 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 427 | 125 | 207 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 235 | 0 | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 13 | 190 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | -0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, $x$ | 0.55 | 0.16 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 746 | 570 | 726 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.1 | 7.9 | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 9.1 | 7.9 | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 8.6 |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Level of Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 48.1\% |  | ICU Leve | of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
21: Lots 3 \& 4 \& Rearage Road


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
25: East Access Road \& Rearage Road


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
6: Sammis Trail \& Wal*Mart Main Access Road



Figure 10 Analysis

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## 18: Sammis Trail \& Rearage Road

|  |  |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% |  |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop | Stop |  | Stop |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 194 | 64 | 157 | 17 | 2 | 214 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 211 | 70 | 171 | 18 | 2 | 233 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 280 | 189 | 235 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 211 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 18 | 233 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.2 | 0.0 | -0.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, $x$ | 0.38 | 0.24 | 0.29 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 712 | 586 | 778 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.5 | 8.0 | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.5 | 8.0 | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 8.2 |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Level of Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 48.8\% |  | CU Leve | of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## 21: Lots 3 \& 4 \& Rearage Road



HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
25: East Access Road \& Rearage Road


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
6: Sammis Trail \& Wal*Mart Main Access Road


Figure 11 Analysis


Figure 11 Analysis

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## 18: Sammis Trail \& Rearage Road

|  | 4 | - | $\leftarrow$ | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% |  |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop | Stop |  | Stop |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 216 | 177 | 103 | 12 | 15 | 175 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 235 | 192 | 112 | 13 | 16 | 190 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 427 | 125 | 207 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 235 | 0 | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 13 | 190 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | -0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, $x$ | 0.55 | 0.16 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 746 | 570 | 726 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.1 | 7.9 | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 9.1 | 7.9 | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 8.6 |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Level of Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 48.1\% |  | ICU Leve | of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
21: Lots 3 \& 4 \& Rearage Road


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
25: East Access Road \& Rearage Road


