## Friendship Luxe Development

## Traffic Impact Study

Prepared for:
Myers \& Company, Inc.
DRAFT
Prepared by:
KCI Technologies Inc.
2160 Satellite Boulevard, Suite 130
Duluth, GA 30097
www.kci.com
678.990.6200

September 2023
KCI Project \# 242307372

RISE TO THE
CHALLENGE

## Executive Summary

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the potential traffic impacts of the proposed Friendship Luxe mixeduse development. The site is in Hall County, Georgia along the north side of SR 347/Friendship Road, and east of Reunion Way. Based on the site concept plan (see Appendix B), the proposed development will contain up to 185 single-family attached residential apartments and approximately 4-acres of commercial/retail space. The development is expected to be fully built out by year 2027. The concept plan for the development illustrates the conditions in the study area, including the proposed residential units and the driveway location. Access to the site is proposed via one driveway through the existing intersection of SR 347 at Celebration Church Driveway. The new intersection is proposed to be a restricted crossing Uturn (RCUT).

For the purposes of the traffic study, the analysis included the expected completion (build-out) of the development by year 2027. This study performed an analysis of existing traffic conditions and future traffic conditions. The future conditions analysis was performed for the year 2027 No-Build and Build Conditions. The traffic impact study network consisted of two intersections: SR 347 at Napa Ridge Road/Reunion Way and SR 347 at Celebration Church Driveaway/Proposed Driveway \#1.

## Capacity Results

The existing intersections are currently operating with acceptable levels of service during the PM peak hour. During the AM peak hour, intersection one (1) operates with an acceptable level of service, while intersection two (2) operates with a slightly low level of service (LOS E). It is important to note that it is common for a side-street stop-control intersection to operate with a low level of service/high delay when the side-street is intersecting a high-volume roadway. The one (1) vehicle recorded turning left from the side-street had to wait for gaps in the high eastbound and westbound traffic, causing the poor level of service E.

By the 2027 Future No-Build Conditions, the intersections are expected to continue operating with acceptable levels of service during the PM peak hour. During the AM peak hour, intersection one (1) is expected to continue operating with an acceptable level of service, while intersection two (2) is expected to continue operating with a slightly low level of service.

By the 2027 Future Build Conditions, the intersections are expected to operate at acceptable levels of service during the AM and PM peak hours. Since the proposed driveway is proposed to become a Restricted Crossing U-turn intersection, the level of service greatly improves from a LOS E to a LOS B due to the restriction of left-turn movements out of the side-street driveways.

## Proposed Site Driveways

Based on estimated traffic volumes and the capacity analysis in the year 2027 Build year conditions, the following driveway geometry recommendations are provided:

- SR 347 at Celebration Church Driveway/Proposed Driveway \#1
- Construct driveway with one entry lane and one exit lane; restricted crossing U-turn intersection; with side-street yield-control
- Construct a westbound right-turn deceleration lane along SR 347
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## 1. Existing Conditions

### 1.1 Site Conditions

The proposed development is located on undeveloped property. Figure $\mathbf{1}$ provides a general location map.
Figure 2 is an aerial that shows the site location and the proposed site driveway (Figures included in Appendix A). Access to the property is proposed via one driveway through the existing median opening of SR 347/Friendship Road at Celebration Church Driveway. (The concept plan is included in Appendix B). Nearby land uses are either residential homes or undeveloped property.

### 1.2 Roadway Conditions

State Route 347 is a four-lane roadway with a 45 -mph posted speed limit within the study area. SR 347 is an east-west oriented roadway with mostly residential uses nearby and grassed shoulders in the nearby vicinity. GDOT classifies SR 347 as an urban minor arterial.

Reunion Way and Napa Ridge Road are two-lane roadways with a $25-\mathrm{mph}$ posted speed limit. GDOT classifies both Reunion way and Napa Ridge Road as local roads. Reunion Way and Napa Ridge Road are north-south oriented roadways, with residential uses, undeveloped land, and grass shoulders in the nearby vicinity.

Celebration Church Driveway is a two-lane roadway with a $15-\mathrm{mph}$ posted speed limit. GDOT classifies Celebration Church Driveway as a local road. Celebration Church Driveway is a north-south oriented roadway, with Celebration Church, undeveloped land, and grass shoulders in the nearby vicinity.

The intersection of SR 347 at Reunion Way/Napa Ridge Road is a restricted crossing U-turn (RCUT), sidestreet yield-controlled, and has the following lane configuration:

- Northbound Napa Ridge Road: one right-turn lane
- Southbound Reunion Way: one right-turn lane
- Eastbound SR 347: one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane
- Westbound SR 347: one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane

The intersection of SR 347 at Celebration Church Driveway is a T-intersection, side-street stop-controlled, and has the following lane configuration:

- Northbound Celebration Church Driveway: one shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane
- Eastbound SR 347: one U-turn-lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane.
- Westbound SR 347: one shared left-turn/U-turn-lane and two through lanes
(Figure $\mathbf{3}$ identifies existing traffic conditions and lane geometry).


### 1.3 Traffic Volumes

Traffic counts were performed when Hall County public schools were in session. The traffic data collected included two 4 -hour turning movement count at the study intersections. Raw traffic counts are included in Appendix C.

Historical traffic volume data available from the GDOT TADA source were utilized to develop the annual growth factor. Three locations are indicated in Appendix D. The three locations are:

- GDOT Count Station \#139-0491 located on SR 347, west of the development
- GDOT Count Station \#139-0437 located on Spout Springs Rd, north of the development
- GDOT Count Station \#139-0545 located on SR 211, east of the development


### 1.4 Crash Review

Crash history was performed at the intersection of SR 374 at Celebration Church Driveway, for use in the GDOT ICE Policy review, as appropriate. GDOT's Numetric database was used to analyze historical crash data at or near proposed site driveway along SR 374 and Celebration Church Driveway. Crash records for a 5-year period 2018-2022) are summarized in Table 1 below.

| Table 1: Site Frontage 5-Year Crash History (2018-2022) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Manner of Collision | PDO | Injury* $^{*}$ | Fatality* | Total Crashes* |
| Angle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Head On | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rear End | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Sideswipe - Same Direction | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Sideswipe - Opposite Direction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not a Collision with Motor Vehicle | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |

*Note: Number of crashes (not number of injured persons)

The records indicate there were a total of 2 crashes -1 property damage only (PDO) crash and 1 injuryrelated crash. The one (1) injury crash was a rear end collision.

## 2. Future Conditions

### 2.1 Future No-Build Traffic Volumes

Future No-Build traffic volumes were developed by reviewing the historical traffic volumes roadways within the vicinity of the project and historic population growth in the county. Three nearby GDOT count stations were evaluated to determine a growth rate. The annual historic compound growth rate at the GDOT count stations averaged to $1.6 \%$ per year. Hall County's population growth rate was most recently reported as 1.23\% per year in 2020. The Governor's Office of Planning and Budget developed population projections which indicates an estimated growth of $1.39 \%$ per year by 2027 in Hall County.

Considering this data, a $1.6 \%$ per year growth rate to account for background traffic volume growth was used in the traffic study. For the purposes of this study the proposed development is expected to be fully built out by 2027. A $1.6 \%$ per year growth rate was applied to the 2023 existing volumes to calculate year 2027 No-Build traffic volumes. The 2027 No-Build traffic volumes are indicated in the Intersection Volume Development tables included in the Appendix E.

### 2.2 Future Roadway Conditions

A review of Georgia DOT and Hall County planned and programmed transportation projects was performed. There are no planned/programmed roadway projects near the development site.

## 3. Proposed Development Traffic

Project traffic was calculated for the proposed development. Project traffic is defined as the vehicular trips expected to be generated by the development and distributed over the roadway network.

### 3.1 Trip Generation

The project driveway volumes were calculated based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, Eleventh Edition. The development proposes 185 Single-Family Attached residential units and 4 acres of commercial/retail space. The most applicable ITE land use (LU) codes are LU 215 (SingleFamily Attached Housing and LU 822 (Strip Retail Plaza). Due to the development's land use types, pass-by reductions were included. Table 2 below summarizes the trips expected daily, during the AM peak hour, and during the PM peak hour for the development.

| Table 2: Proposed Site Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use (ITE Code) | Units | Daily Trips |  | eak |  |  | Peak |  |
|  |  | Two-Way Total | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Single-Family Attached Housing (210) | $185$ <br> (Dwelling <br> Units) | 1,359 | 28 | 63 | 91 | 61 | 46 | 107 |
| Strip Retail Plaza (822) | 5,000 SF | 441 | 11 | 7 | 18 | 24 | 24 | 48 |
| Gross Trips (Driveway Volumes) |  | 1,800 | 39 | 70 | 109 | 85 | 70 | 155 |
| Total Pass-By Reductions |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -8 | -8 | -16 |
| Net New Trips (Total with reductions) |  | 1,800 | 39 | 70 | 109 | 77 | 62 | 139 |

Note: Trip Generation Rates based on ITE Trip Generation, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition

### 3.2 Trip Distribution and Assignment

An overall trip distribution and assignment of project trips was based on existing traffic patterns and a review of land uses and the street network in the area. This information was used to apply the project traffic volumes at the study intersections and development driveways.

The directional distribution for the proposed development is estimated to be:

- $55 \%$ to/from the east along SR 347
- $45 \%$ to/from the west along SR 347

Project trip distribution is further detailed in Figure 4 (Appendix A).

### 3.3 Future Build Traffic Volumes

The 2027 future Build traffic volumes were calculated by adding the proposed development (Friendship Luxe development) traffic volumes to the projected year 2027 No-Build traffic volumes. Figure 5 (Appendix A) illustrates the year 2027 Build traffic volumes.

## 4. Capacity Analysis

Capacity analysis was performed at the study intersections for the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Intersection Level of Service (LOS) was calculated based on the methodologies contained in the Highway Capacity Manual, $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition. The Synchro Studio software, which utilizes the HCM 6th Edition methodology, was utilized to perform the analyses.

Capacity is defined as the maximum number of vehicles that can pass over a particular road segment or through a particular intersection within a specified period under prevailing roadway, traffic, and control conditions. Level of service (LOS) is used to describe the operating characteristics of a road segment or intersection in relation to its capacity. LOS is defined as a qualitative measure that describes operational conditions and motorist's perceptions. The Highway Capacity Manual defines six levels of service, LOS A through LOS F. Level of service A indicates excellent operations with little delay to motorists, while level of service $F$ indicates extremely long delay.

Level of service for unsignalized intersections is calculated for the average control delay incurred for vehicles on the stop control approach, compared to the average control delay per vehicle for all approaches at a signalized intersection. Control delay for vehicles include initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. Table $\mathbf{3}$ below indicates the relationship between delay and LOS for signalized and unsignalized intersections, respectively. Level-of-service "E" is typically considered to be the limit of acceptable delay.

Several factors affect the controlled delay for unsignalized intersections, including the availability of gaps in the cross-street traffic, and acceptable gap time to make the movement from the stop position. For stopcontrol intersections, LOS E and F exist when there are insufficient gaps in traffic, resulting in long delays. Low level of service for stop-control approaches are not uncommon at major cross-streets.

| Table 3: Level of Service Criteria |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level of Service | Average Control Delay Per Vehicle (sec) |  |
|  | Signalized Intersection | Unsignalized Intersection |
| A | $\leq 10$ | $\leq 10$ |
| B | $>10$ and $\leq 20$ | $>10$ and $\leq 15$ |
| C | $>20$ and $\leq 35$ | $>15$ and $\leq 25$ |
| D | $>35$ and $\leq 55$ | $>25$ and $\leq 35$ |
| E | $>55$ and $\leq 80$ | $>35$ and $\leq 50$ |
| F | $>80$ | $>50$ |

### 4.1 Existing Conditions Capacity Analysis

Capacity analysis was performed for the year 2023 traffic volumes and the existing roadway conditions. The existing traffic conditions are illustrated in Figure 3. Table 4 summarizes the results of the capacity analysis.

| Table 4: Existing Year (2023) Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Intersection <br> Control | Approach | AM Peak Hour <br> LOS (Delay*) | PM Peak Hour <br> LOS (Delay*) |  |  |
| 1. SR 347 at Napa Ridge Rd/Reunion Way | Stop-Control | NB | B (13) | C (15) |  |  |
|  |  | SB | B (13) | B (13) |  |  |
| 2. SR 347 at Celebration Church Drwy | Stop-Control | NB | E (36) | B (13) |  |  |

*Average vehicle delay in seconds

The existing intersections are currently operating with acceptable levels of service during the PM peak hour. During the AM peak hour, intersection one (1) operates with an acceptable level of service, while intersection two (2) operates with a slightly low level of service. It is important to note that it is common for a side-street stop-control intersection to operate with a low level of service/high delay when the side-street is intersecting a high-volume roadway. The one (1) vehicle recorded turning left from the side-street had to wait for gaps in the high eastbound and westbound traffic, causing the poor level of service E .

### 4.2 Future No-Build Conditions Capacity Analysis

Capacity analysis was performed for the year 2027 Future Conditions and includes the No-Build traffic and the existing roadway conditions. Table 5 summarizes the results of the capacity analysis for the Future NoBuild Conditions.

| Table 5: Future Year (2027) Level of Service (No-Build) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Intersection <br> Control | Approach | AM Peak Hour <br> LOS (Delay*) | PM Peak Hour <br> LOS (Delay*) |  |
| 1. SR 347 at Napa Ridge Rd/Reunion Way | Stop-Control | NB | B (13) | C (16) |  |
|  |  | SB | B (13) | B (14) |  |
|  | Stop-Control | NB | E (41) | B (14) |  |

*Average vehicle delay in seconds

By the 2027 Future No-Build Conditions, the intersections are expected to continue operating with acceptable levels of service during the PM peak hour. During the AM peak hour, intersection one (1) is expected to continue operating with an acceptable level of service, while intersection two (2) is expected to continue operating with a slightly low level of service.

### 4.3 Future Build Conditions Capacity Analysis

Capacity analysis was performed for the year 2027 Future Build Conditions and includes the No-Build traffic volumes plus the Friendship Luxe development volumes. The Build traffic conditions and volumes are illustrated in Figure 5. Table 6 summarizes the results of the capacity analysis.

| Table 6: Future Year (2027) Level of Service (Build) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Intersection <br> Control | Approach | AM Peak Hour <br> LOS (Delay*) | PM Peak Hour <br> LOS (Delay*) |  |
| 1. SR 347 at Napa Ridge Rd/Reunion Way | Stop-Control | NB | B (13) | C (17) |  |
|  | SB | B (14) | B (14) |  |  |
| 2. SR 347 at Celebration Church <br> Drwy/Proposed Drwy \#1 | RCUT/Yield- <br> Control | NB | B (13) | B (13) |  |

*Average vehicle delay in seconds

By the 2027 Future Build Conditions, the intersections are expected to operate at acceptable levels of service during the AM and PM peak hours. Since the proposed driveway is proposed to become a Restricted Crossing U-turn intersection, the level of service greatly improves from a LOS E to a LOS B due to the restriction of left-turn movements out of the side-street driveways.

## 5. Recommendations

Recommendations for access for the proposed Friendship Luxe development are based on existing conditions, the proposed development use, and expected traffic volumes. The appropriate traffic control at driveways was analyzed. Recommendations included reviewing Hall County and Georgia DOT requirements, knowledge of general transportation standards, and engineering judgment.

Access to the site is proposed via one driveway through the existing median opening of SR 347/Friendship Road at Celebration Church Driveway. The new intersection is proposed to be a restricted crossing U-turn (RCUT). The proposed lane configuration is expected to be sufficient to accommodate the development traffic volumes. The required intersection sight distance will need to be verified at the proposed driveway location as part of the driveway design.

### 5.1 Recommended Driveway Geometry

Based on estimated traffic volumes and the capacity analysis in the year 2027 Build year conditions, the following driveway geometry recommendations are provided:

- SR 347 at Celebration Church Driveway/Proposed Driveway \#1
- Construct driveway with one entry lane and one exit lane; restricted crossing U-turn intersection; with side-street yield-control
- Construct a westbound right-turn deceleration lane along SR 347

The Georgia DOT Driveway and Encroachment Control Manual was reviewed for the proposed driveway along State Route 347. The GDOT driveway manual, Section 4I, Auxiliary Turn Lanes, provides minimum volumes requiring right-turn or left-turn deceleration lanes. The year 2027 Build traffic volumes were compared to the Georgia DOT driveway requirements for deceleration lanes along SR 347.

## Right-Turn Deceleration Lane Criteria

Based on the 45-mph speed limit, two-lane roadway, and more than 10,000 ADT (Average Daily Traffic) on SR 347, Table 4-6 indicates a dedicated right-turn lane is required if there are at least 75 vehicles turning right into the site within a day. The estimated daily westbound right-turn volume entering the development is 405 vehicles per day at the proposed site driveway.

Calculation: 1,800 daily trips / $2=900$ entering trips * 0.45 (percentage of vehicles turning right at Driveway) $=405$ vehicles

### 5.2 GDOT ICE Report

The GDOT Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) policy was reviewed at the proposed site driveway along SR 347. The GDOT ICE Report is included in Appendix $G$ and can be submitted to Georgia DOT when the driveway encroachment permit is requested from Georgia DOT.

The purpose of the ICE process is to consider traffic control alternatives at intersections, analyze the options, and select the alternative that reflects the overall best value and balances the need to address operations, safety, project cost and environmental impacts. At proposed development driveways, this process included the traffic and crash history conditions and completing the Stage 1 screening form. For Proposed Driveway \#1, the most appropriate traffic control is a restricted crossing U-turn (RCUT).
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Figures




Figure


Not to Scale

| $\overline{\overline{\bar{K}}=}$ | Traffic Impact Study <br> Friendship Luxe Development <br> Hall County, Georgia | Future Build <br> (Year 2027) <br> Conditions | Figure <br> 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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## Appendix C

## Traffic Count Data



Site 1
Napa Ridge Rd
Reunion Way
GA-347 Friendship Rd (West)
GA-347 Friendship Rd (East)

| Date | Weather |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tuesday, August 15, 2023 | Mostly Cloudy <br> $80^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Lat/Long | Click here for Map |

(1)

0700-0900 (Weekday 2h Session) (08-15-2023)
All vehicles

|  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Int <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Napa Ridge Rd |  | Reunion Way |  | GA-347 Friendship Rd (West) |  |  |  |  | GA-347 Friendship Rd (East) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Right } \\ 1.1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | App Total | ght | App | Left ${ }^{\text {L }}$ GA-3 |  | Right | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { U-Turn } \\ 1.6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | App <br> Total | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Left } \\ 1.7 \end{gathered}$ | Thru | Right | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { U-Turn } \\ 1.10 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { App } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 0700-0715 | 10 | 10 | 45 | 45 | 8 | 144 | 3 | 0 | 155 | 14 | 168 | 3 | 0 | 185 | 395 |
| 0715-0730 | 11 | 11 | 26 | 26 | 8 | 169 | 2 | 0 | 179 | 13 | 164 | 3 | 0 | 180 | 396 |
| 0730-0745 | 6 | 6 | 39 | 39 | 7 | 201 | 4 | 0 | 212 | 8 | 221 | 3 | 0 | 232 | 489 |
| 0745-0800 | 10 | 10 | 33 | 33 | 18 | 230 | 1 | 0 | 249 | 13 | 197 | 10 | 0 | 220 | 512 |
| Hourly Total | 37 | 37 | 143 | 143 | 41 | 744 | 10 | 0 | 795 | 48 | 750 | 19 | 0 | 817 | 1792 |
| 0800-0815 | 15 | 15 | 37 | 37 | 9 | 242 | 4 | 0 | 255 | 12 | 181 | 14 | 0 | 207 | 514 |
| 0815-0830 | 19 | 19 | 35 | 35 | 9 | 210 | 3 | 0 | 222 | 9 | 183 | 17 | 1 | 210 | 486 |
| 0830-0845 | 22 | 22 | 34 | 34 | 8 | 220 | 6 | 0 | 234 | 17 | 187 | 11 | 0 | 215 | 505 |
| 0845-0900 | 16 | 16 | 21 | 21 | 7 | 197 | 0 | 1 | 205 | 15 | 194 | 11 | 0 | 220 | 462 |
| Hourly Total | 72 | 72 | 127 | 127 | 33 | 869 | 13 | 1 | 916 | 53 | 745 | 53 | 1 | 852 | 1967 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand Total | 109 | 109 | 270 | 270 | 74 | 1613 | 23 | 1 | 1711 | 101 | 1495 | 72 | 1 | 1669 | 3759 |
| Approach \% | 100.00 | - | 100.00 | - | 4.32 | 94.27 | 1.34 | 0.06 | - | 6.05 | 89.57 | 4.31 | 0.06 | - |  |
| Intersection \% | 2.90 | 2.90 | 7.18 | 7.18 | 1.97 | 42.91 | 0.61 | 0.03 | 45.52 | 2.69 | 39.77 | 1.92 | 0.03 | 44.40 |  |
| Heavy Vehicle \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| PHF | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.61 | 0.93 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.94 | 0.75 | 0.95 | 0.76 | 0.25 | 0.97 | 0.98 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1600-1800 (Weekday 2h Session) (08-15-2023)
All vehicles

|  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Int } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Napa Ridge Rd |  | Reunion Way |  | GA-347 Friendship Rd (West) |  |  |  |  | GA-347 Friendship Rd (East) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Right } \\ 1.1 \end{gathered}$ | App <br> Total | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Right } \\ 1.2 \end{gathered}$ | App |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Right } \\ 1.5 \end{gathered}$ | U-Turn 1.6 | App <br> Total | Left |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Right } \\ 1.9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { U-Turn } \\ 1.10 \end{gathered}$ | App Total |  |
| 1600-1615 | 23 | 23 | 30 | 30 | 16 | 216 | 7 | 0 | 239 | 23 | 229 | 7 | 1 | 260 | 552 |
| 1615-1630 | 28 | 28 | 33 | 33 | 18 | 234 | 7 | 0 | 259 | 16 | 208 | 13 | 0 | 237 | 557 |
| 1630-1645 | 25 | 25 | 22 | 22 | 29 | 256 | 5 | 0 | 290 | 14 | 212 | 26 | 0 | 252 | 589 |
| 1645-1700 | 31 | 31 | 27 | 27 | 23 | 251 | 7 | 0 | 281 | 29 | 203 | 12 | 0 | 244 | 583 |
| Hourly Total | 107 | 107 | 112 | 112 | 86 | 957 | 26 | 0 | 1069 | 82 | 852 | 58 | 1 | 993 | 2281 |
| 1700-1715 | 44 | 44 | 23 | 23 | 17 | 260 | 5 | 0 | 282 | 22 | 217 | 10 | 0 | 249 | 598 |
| 1715-1730 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 24 | 22 | 251 | 0 | 0 | 273 | 27 | 215 | 16 | 0 | 258 | 576 |
| 1730-1745 | 38 | 38 | 23 | 23 | 32 | 255 | 2 | 0 | 289 | 23 | 242 | 17 | 0 | 282 | 632 |
| 1745-1800 | 50 | 50 | 21 | 21 | 25 | 199 | 3 | 0 | 227 | 25 | 173 | 13 | 0 | 211 | 509 |
| Hourly Total | 153 | 153 | 91 | 91 | 96 | 965 | 10 | 0 | 1071 | 97 | 847 | 56 | 0 | 1000 | 2315 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand Total | 260 | 260 | 203 | 203 | 182 | 1922 | 36 | 0 | 2140 | 179 | 1699 | 114 | 1 | 1993 | 4596 |
| Approach \% | 100.00 | - | 100.00 | - | 8.50 | 89.81 | 1.68 | 0.00 | - | 8.98 | 85.25 | 5.72 | 0.05 | - |  |
| Intersection \% | 5.66 | 5.66 | 4.42 | 4.42 | 3.96 | 41.82 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 46.56 | 3.89 | 36.97 | 2.48 | 0.02 | 43.36 |  |
| Heavy Vehicle \% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | - | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| PHF | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.73 | 0.98 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 0.87 | 0.91 | 0.81 | 0.00 | 0.92 | 0.95 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Tuesday, August 15, 2023 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Period | $0700-0900$ |
| Peak Hour | $0745-0845$ |



| Tuesday, August 15, 2023 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Period | $1600-1800$ |
| Peak Hour | $1645-1745$ |



Classified Turn Movement Count || All vehicles

Hall County, GA
Site 2
Celebration Church Driveway
GA-347 Friendship Rd (West)
GA-347 Friendship Rd (East)

| Date | Weather |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tuesday, August 15, 2023 | Mostly Cloudy |
|  | $80^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Lat/Long | Click here for Map |

(1)

0700-0900 (Weekday 2h Session) (08-15-2023)
All vehicles



1600-1800 (Weekday 2h Session) (08-15-2023)
All vehicles

|  | Northbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Celebration Church Driveway |  |  |  |
| TIME | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Left } \\ 2.1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Right } \\ 2.2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { U-Turn } \\ 2.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | App <br> Total |
| 1600-1615 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1615-1630 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1630-1645 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 1645-1700 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 1700-1715 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1715-1730 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1730-1745 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1745-1800 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Grand Total | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| Approach \% | 40.00 | 60.00 | 0.00 | - |
| Intersection \% | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.12 |
| Heavy Vehicle \% | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| PHF | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.25 |



## Appendix D

## GDOT Traffic Data





## Location Map of GDOT Count Stations



0000139_0491-139-0491
Description: SR347/Friendship Rd W of Spout Spg Rd County: Hall
Route number: 00000347
LRS section: 1391034700
Functional class: 4U - Minor Arterial (Utban)
Coordinates: 34.116186, -83.906852


| 20 Count listory |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | Month | Count type | Duration | Count |
| 2023 | July | Volume | 48 hours | 19,309 |
| 2020 | October | Volume | 48 hours | 17.519 |
| 2018 | May | Class | 48 hours | 16,829 |
| 2016 | August | Class | 35 hours | 21,343 |
| 2014 | April | Volume | 48 hours | 8,419 |
| 2012 | January | Volume | 48 hours | 7,404 |
| 2010 | January | Class | 48 hours | 6,573 |

0000139_0437-139-0437
County: Hall
Route number: 00128700
LRS section: 1392128700
Functional class: 4 U - Minor Arterial (Urban)
Coordinates: 34.1213073847158, -83.876837841541



## Appendix E

## Intersection Volume Development

Traffic Impact Study
Friendship Luxe Development
Intersection Traffic Volumes

Intersection: \#1-SR 347/Friendship Rd at Reunion Way/Napa Ridge Rd

| A.M. PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition | Napa Ridge Rd Northbound |  |  | Reunion Way <br> Southbound |  |  | SR 347 Friendship Rd <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | SR 347 Friendship Rd <br> Westbound |  |  |  |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R | U-turn | L | T | R | U-turn | L | T | R |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing Volumes (2023) | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 44 | 902 | 14 | 1 | 51 | 748 | 52 |
| Annual Growth Rate | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% |
| No-Build Condition (2027) | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 0 | 47 | 961 | 15 | 1 | 54 | 797 | 55 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Trips: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Distribution IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Distribution OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45\% |  | 55\% |  |
| Residential Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 35 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Distribution IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Distribution OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45\% |  | 55\% |  |
| Development Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass-By Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Project Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 39 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buildout Total (2027) | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 0 | 47 | 982 | 15 | 32 | 54 | 836 | 55 |

P.M. PEAK HOUR

| Condition | Napa Ridge Rd <br> Northbound |  |  | Reunion Way Southbound |  |  | SR 347 Friendship Rd Eastbound |  |  |  | SR 347 Friendship Rd Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R | U-turn | L | T | R | U-turn | L | T | R |
| Existing Volumes (2023) | 0 | 0 | 134 |  |  | 97 | 0 | 94 | 1,017 | 14 | 0 | 101 | 877 | 55 |
| Annual Growth Rate | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% |
| No-Build Condition (2027) | 0 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 100 | 1,084 | 15 | 0 | 108 | 934 | 59 |
| Project Trips: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Distribution IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Distribution OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45\% |  | 55\% |  |
| Residential Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 25 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Distribution IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Distribution OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45\% |  | 55\% |  |
| Development Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass-By Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -8 |  |  |  | -8 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Project Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 26 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buildout Total (2027) | 0 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 100 | 1,119 | 15 | 28 | 108 | 960 | 59 |

Traffic Impact Study
Friendship Luxe Development
Intersection Traffic Volumes

Intersection: \#2 - SR 347/Friendship Rd at Celebration Church Drwy/Proposed Drwy \#1

| A.M. PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition | Celebration Church Dwy <br> Northbound |  |  | Proposed Drwy \#1 Southbound |  |  | SR 347/Friendship Rd Eastbound |  |  |  | SR 347/Friendship Rd Westbound |  |  |  |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R | U-turn | L | T | R | U-turn | L | T | R |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing Volumes (2023) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 961 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 847 | 0 |
| Annual Growth Rate | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% |
| No-Build Condition (2027) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1,024 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 903 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Trips: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Distribution IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55\% |  |  |  |  |  | 45\% |
| Trip Distribution OUT |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |  |  | 45\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 15 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Distribution IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55\% |  |  |  |  |  | 45\% |
| Trip Distribution OUT |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |  |  | 45\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass-By Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Project Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 21 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buildout Total (2027) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 5 | 21 | 1,055 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 903 | 18 |

P.M. PEAK HOUR

| Condition | Celebration Church Dwy <br> Northbound |  |  | Proposed Drwy \#1 <br> Southbound |  |  | SR 347/Friendship Rd <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | SR 347/Friendship Rd <br> Westbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R | U-turn | L | T | R | U-turn | L | T | R |
| Existing Volumes (2023) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1,142 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1,022 | 0 |
| Annual Growth Rate | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% |
| No-Build Condition (2027) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 1,217 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1,089 | 0 |
| Project Trips: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Distribution IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55\% |  |  |  |  |  | 45\% |
| Trip Distribution OUT |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |  |  | 45\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 34 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Trip Distribution IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55\% |  |  |  |  |  | 45\% |
| Trip Distribution OUT |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |  |  | 45\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Pass-By Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -8 |  |  |  | -8 |  |
| Total Project Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 43 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -8 | 34 |
| Buildout Total (2027) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 12 | 43 | 1,237 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1,081 | 34 |

## Appendix F

## Capacity Analysis Reports

## Existing Conditions - Year 2023

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ＊ | 中4 | 「＇ |  | \％ | 中4 | 「 |  |  | 「＇ |  |  | F＇ |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 44 | 902 | 14 | 1 | 51 | 748 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 139 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 44 | 902 | 14 | 1 | 51 | 748 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 139 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | － | － | Yield | － | － | － | Yield | － | － | None | － | － | None |
| Storage Length | 530 | － | － | － | 415 | － | 285 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | － | 0 | － | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | － | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 45 | 920 | 14 | 1 | 52 | 763 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 142 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBU | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\square$ |  | 44 | T |  | * | 中4 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 5 | 0 | 961 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 847 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 5 | 0 | 961 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 847 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | - | None | - | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 300 | - | 180 | - | 384 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 5 | 0 | 991 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 873 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |



| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.1 | 0.1 | 36.3 |
| HCM LOS |  | E |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBU | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 116 | 388 | - | - | 560 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.009 | 0.013 | - | - | 0.02 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 36.3 | 14.4 | - | - | 11.6 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | E | B | - | - | B | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0.1 | - |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBU | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\square$ |  | 44 | 「 |  | * | 中4 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 10 | 0 | 1142 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1022 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 10 | 0 | 1142 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1022 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | - | None | - | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 300 | - | 180 | - | 384 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 10 | 0 | 1190 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1065 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


HCM LOS B

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBU | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 447 | 291 | - | -281 | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.002 | 0.036 | - | -0.015 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 13.1 | 17.8 | - | - | 18 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | - | - | C | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | 0.1 | - | - | 0 | - |

Future No-Build Conditions - Year 2027

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \# | 44 | T |  | * | 44 | Tr |  |  | 「 |  |  | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 47 | 961 | 15 | 1 | 54 | 797 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 148 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 47 | 961 | 15 | 1 | 54 | 797 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 148 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | Yield | - | - | - | Yield | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | 530 | - | - | - | 415 | - | 285 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 48 | 981 | 15 | 1 | 55 | 813 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 151 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Minor1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 813 | 0 | 0 | 981 | 981 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 491 | - | - | 407 |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.22 | - | - | 6.52 | 4.22 | - | - | - | - | 6.94 | - | - | 6.94 |  |  |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.26 | - | - | 2.56 | 2.26 | - | - | - | - | 3.32 | - | - | 3.32 |  |  |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 784 | - | - | 330 | 676 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 523 | 0 | 0 | 593 |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - |  |  |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 784 | - | - | 660 | 660 | - | - | - | - | 523 | - | - | 593 |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  | Stage 2



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBU | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \# |  | 中4 | 7 |  | \# | 中4 |  |  | * |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 5 | 0 | 1024 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 903 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 5 | 0 | 1024 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 903 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | - | None | - | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 300 | - | 180 | - | 384 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 5 | 0 | 1056 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 931 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |



| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.1 | 0.2 | 41.4 |
| HCM LOS |  | E |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBU | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 100 | 356 | - | - | 529 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.01 | 0.014 | - | -0.023 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 41.4 | 15.3 | - | - | 12 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | E | C | - | - | B | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0.1 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ＊ | 44 | 7 | ＊ | 中4 | F |  |  | 「 |  |  | 「 |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 100 | 1084 | 15 | 108 | 934 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 100 | 1084 | 15 | 108 | 934 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | － | － | Yield | － | － | Yield | － | － | None | － | － | None |
| Storage Length | 530 | － | － | 415 | － | 285 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 105 | 1141 | 16 | 114 | 983 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 108 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBU | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ¢ |  | 44 | $t$ |  | \# | 44 |  |  | \& |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 12 | 0 | 1217 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1089 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 12 | 0 | 1217 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1089 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | - | None | - | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 300 | - | 180 | - | 384 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 0 | 1268 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |  | Minor1 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1134 | - | 0 | 0 | 1268 | 1268 | 0 | 0 | 1869 | 2436 | 634 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1294 | 1294 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 575 | 1142 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.52 | - | - | - | 6.52 | 4.22 | - | - | 6.84 | 6.54 | 6.94 |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.84 | 5.54 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.84 | 5.54 | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.56 | - | - | - | 2.56 | 2.26 | - | - | 3.52 | 4.02 | 3.32 |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 263 | 0 | - | - | 215 | 523 | - | 0 | 64 | 31 | 422 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 221 | 231 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 526 | 273 | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 263 | - | - | - | 251 | 251 | - | - | 60 | 0 | 422 |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 60 | 0 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 210 | 0 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 518 | 0 | - |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.2 | 0.1 | 13.6 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | B |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBU | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 422 | 263 | - | - | 251 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.002 | 0.048 | - | -0.017 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 13.6 | 19.4 | - | - | 19.6 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | - | - | C | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | 0.1 | - | - | 0.1 | - |

## Future Build Conditions - Year 2027

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \＃ | 44 | 「 |  | \＃ | 44 | 「 |  |  | 「 |  |  | 「 |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 47 | 982 | 15 | 32 | 54 | 836 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 148 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 47 | 982 | 15 | 32 | 54 | 836 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 148 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | － | － | Yield | － | － | － | Yield | － | － | None | － | － | None |
| Storage Length | 530 | － | － | － | 415 | － | 285 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | － | 0 | － | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | － | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 48 | 1002 | 15 | 33 | 55 | 853 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 151 |

 Stage 2

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay，s | 0.5 | 1.3 | 13.1 | 13.5 |
| HCM LOS |  | B | B |  |


| Minor Lane／Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity（veh／h） | 515 | 757 | - | - | 437 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V／C Ratio | 0.139 | 0.063 | - | -0.201 | - | -0.262 |  |
| HCM Control Delay（s） | 13.1 | 10.1 | - | - | 15.3 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | B | - | - | C | - | - |
| HCM 95th \％tile Q（veh） | 0.5 | 0.2 | - | - | 0.7 | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement E | EBU | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\stackrel{\text { \％}}{ }$ | 个4 | 「 |  | \％ | 个 $\uparrow$ | F |  |  | 「 |  |  | 「 |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 5 | 21 | 1055 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 903 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 5 | 21 | 1055 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 903 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | － | － | － | None | － | － | － | None | － | － | None | － | － | None |
| Storage Length | － | 300 | － | 180 | － | 384 | － | 150 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | \＃ | － | 0 | － | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | － | 0 | － | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 5 | 22 | 1088 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 931 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 72 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 中4 | 7 |  | ＊ | 44 | 「 |  |  | 「 |  |  | 「 |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 100 | 1119 | 15 | 28 | 108 | 960 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 100 | 1119 | 15 | 28 | 108 | 960 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | － | － | Yield | － | － | － | Yield | － | － | None | － | － | None |
| Storage Length | 530 | － | － | － | 415 | － | 285 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | － | 0 | － | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | － | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 105 | 1178 | 16 | 29 | 114 | 1011 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 108 |

 Stage 2

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay，s | 0.9 | 2.4 | 16.9 | 13.9 |
| HCM LOS |  | C | B |  |


| Minor Lane／Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity（veh／h） | 452 | 658 | - | - | 381 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V／C Ratio | 0.333 | 0.16 | - | -0.376 | - | -0.212 |  |
| HCM Control Delay（s） | 16.9 | 11.5 | - | - | 20 | - | -13.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | - | - | C | - | - |
| HCM 95th \％tile Q（veh） | 1.4 | 0.6 | - | - | 1.7 | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBU | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBU | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \％ | 中4 | 「 |  | ＊ | 中4 | 「 |  |  | 「 |  |  | F |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 12 | 43 | 1237 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1081 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 12 | 43 | 1237 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1081 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | － | － | － | None | － | － | － | None | － | － | None | － | － | None |
| Storage Length | － | 300 | － | 180 | － | 384 | － | 150 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | \＃ | － | 0 | － | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | － | 0 | － | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 45 | 1289 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1126 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 65 |



## GDOT Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE)



| Existing Data Year： | 2023 |
| ---: | :--- |
| Project Opening Year： | 2027 |
| Project Design Year： | 2027 |
| Annual Growth Rate： | $1.6 \%$ |
| K Factor： | $0 \%$ |
|  |  |

＊ K Factor $=$ Proportion of average annual daily traffic occurring in the highest one hour of the day

LEGEND：
$000=$ AM Peak Approach Volume
（000）＝PM Peak Approach Volume
［000］＝ADT Volume（Estimate）


2023 EXISTING YEAR VOLUMES
APPROACH SPLITS：
SR 347：\＃\＃\＃\＃
Proposed Drwy 1：\＃\＃\＃\＃

PEAK HR \％TRUCKS：

| EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |


EB SR 347

2027 DESIGN YEAR VOLUMES


|  |  |  | \＃DIV／0！ |  |  |  | WB SR 347 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | （0） | （62） | （0） | （0） |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Peds $\downarrow$ | $\stackrel{4}{4}$ | $\sqrt{1}$ | $\stackrel{y}{4}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { Peds }}$ | 0 | （0） |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# } \\ & \stackrel{\text { O}}{\vdots} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | （55） | 26 | ，方 | 2027 Intersection Daily Entering Volume（est）： \＃DIV／0！ |  |  | T | 18 | （34） |  |
|  | \＃\＃\＃\＃ | 1，055 | $\Rightarrow$ |  |  |  | 『 | 903 | （1081） |  |
|  | （0） | 6 | $\stackrel{7}{\square}$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | 12 | （4） |  |
|  | （0） | 0 | $\xrightarrow{\text { Peds }}$ | W | 个 | 内 | Peds | F22000000.00.002 |  |  |
| EB SR 347 |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | （0） | （0） | （1） | （0） |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \＃DIV／0！ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Introduction：In 2005，SAFETEA－LU established the Highway Safety Improvement Program（HSIP）and mandated that each state prepare a Strategic Highway Safety Plan（SHSP）to prioritize safety funding investments．Intersections quickly became a common component of most states＇SHSP emphasis areas and HSIP project lists，including Georgia＇s SHSP．Intersection Control Evaluation（ICE）policies and procedures represent a traceable and transparent procedure to streamline the evaluation of intersection control alternatives，and further leverage safety advancements for intersection improvements beyond just the safety program．Approximately one－third of all traffic fatalities and roughly seventy five percent of all traffic crashes in Georgia occur at or adjacent to intersections．Accordingly，the Georgia SHSP includes an emphasis on enhancing intersection safety to advance the Toward Zero Deaths vision embraced by the Georgia Governor＇s Office of Highway Safety（GOHS）．This ICE tool was developed to support the ICE policy，developed and adopted to help ensure that intersection investments across the entire Georgia highway system are selected，prioritized and implemented with defensible benefits for safety towards those ends．
Tool Goal：The goal of this ICE tool is to provide a simplified and consistent way of importing traffic，safety，cost，environmental impact and stakeholder posture data to assess and quantify intersection control improvement benefits．The tool supports the ICE policy and procedures to provide traceability，transparency，consistency and accountability when identifying and selecting an intersection control solution that both meets project purpose and reflects overall best value in terms of specific performance－based criteria．
Requirements：An ICE is required for any intersection improvement（e．g．new or modified intersection，widening／reconstruction or corridor project，or work accomplished through a driveway or encroachment permit that affects an intersection）where：1）the intersection includes at least one roadway designated as a State Route（State Highway System）or as part of the National Highway System；or 2）the intersection will be designed or constructed using State or Federal funding．In certain circumstances where an ICE would otherwise be required，the requirement may be waived based on appropriate evidence presented with a written request．（See the＂Waiver＂tab to review criteria that may make a project waiver eligible and for instructions to submit a waiver request to the Department）．An ICE is not required when the proposed work does not include any changes to the intersection design，involves only routine traffic signal timing and equipment maintenance，or for driveway permits where the driveway is not a new leg to an already existing intersection on either 1）a divided，multi－lane highway with a closed median and only right－in／right－out access or 2 ）an undivided roadway where the development is not required to construct left and／or right turn lanes（as per the Driveway Manual and District Traffic Engineer）．
Two－Stage A complete ICE process consists of two（2）distinct stages，and it is expected that the respective level of effort for completing both stages of ICE will correspond to the Process：magnitude and complexity of the intersection．Prior to starting an ICE，the District Traffic Engineer and／or State Traffic Engineer should be consulted for advice on an appropriate level of effort．The Stage 1 and Stage 2 ICE forms are designed minimize required data inputs using drop－down menu choices and limiting text entry．All fields shaded grey include drop down menu choices and all fields shaded blue require data entry．All other cells in the worksheet are locked．
Stage 1：Stage 1 should be conducted early in the project development process and is intended to inform which alternatives are worthy of further evaluation in Stage 2 ．Stage 1 serves Screening as a screening effort meant to eliminate non－competitive options and identify which alternatives merit further considerations based on their practical feasibility．Users should Decision use good engineering judgement in responding to the seven policy questions by selecting＂Yes＂or＂No＂in the drop－down boxes．Alternatives should not be summarily Record eliminated without due consideration，and reasons for eliminating or advancing an alternative should be documented in the＂Screening Decision Justification＂column．
Stage 2：Stage 2 involves a more detailed and familiar evaluation of the alternatives identified in Stage 1 in order to support the selection of a preferred alternative that may be advanced
Alternative to detailed design．Stage 2 data entry may require the use of external analysis tools to determine costs，operations and／or safety data that，combined with environmental and
Selection stakeholder posture data，form the basis of the ICE evaluation．A separate＂CostEst＂worksheet tab helps users develop pre－planning－level cost estimates for each Stage 2
Decision alternative evaluated，and a separate Users Guide has been prepared to give guidance on Stage 1 and Stage 2 data entry．Once all data is entered，each alternative is scored
Record and ranked，with the results reported at the bottom of the Stage 2 worksheet to inform on the best of the intersection controls evaluated for project recommendation．
Documentation：A complete ICE document consists of the combination of the outputs from either a completed and signed waiver form or both Stage 1 and Stage 2 worksheets（along with supporting costing and／or environmental documentation），to be included in the approved project Concept Report（or equivalent）or as a stand－alone document．

| GDOT PI\# | N/A |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project Location: | SR 347 @ Proposed Drwy 1 |
| Existing Control: | New Intersection or Other |
| Prepared by: | KCl Technologies, Inc. |
| Date: | $8 / 24 / 2023$ |

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each policy question for each control type to identify which alternatives should be evaluated in the Stage 2 Decision Record; enter justification in the rightmost column
Intersection Alternative (see "Intersections" tab for
detailed description of intersection/interchange type)


Conventional (Minor Stop)

| Conventional (All-Way Stop) |
| :--- |
| Mini Roundabout |

Note: Up to 5 alternatives may be selected and evaluated; Use this ICE Stage 1 to screen 5 or fewer alternatives to evaluate in Stage 2

## Waiver Request - Level 2 / 3

In certain circumstances where an ICE would otherwise be required, an ICE may be waived based on appropriate evidence presented with a written request. Scenarios in which an ICE waiver request may be considered include:

1. Proposed improvements do not substantially alter the character of the intersection, and are considered minor in nature, such as extending existing turn lane(s) or modifying signal phasing at an existing traffic signal
2. The intersection consists of a public roadway intersecting a divided, multilane roadway where the access will be limited to a closed median with only right-in/right-out access that will operate acceptably; or

3 The intersection is along an undivided, two-lane roadway that will not be widened and meets the following criteria:

- Low risk in terms of exposure (total intersection entering volume less than 1,000 vehicles /day)
- Latest 5 years of crash history is not indicative of a crash problem (no discernible crash patterns coupled with low crash frequency and severity)
- Layout has no unusual or undesirable geometric features (such as restricted sight distance)
- The proposed changes are not expected to adversely affect safety

If only one alternative is determined to be feasible from the ICE Stage 1 , then a waiver may be submitted in lieu of completing ICE Stage 2. The waiver must clearly explain why there is no other feasible alternative. A Waiver Form should also be submitted to document an agreed upon decision to select a preferred alternative other than the highest scoring alternative in Stage 2.

ICE waiver forms with supporting documentation should be submitted for approval to the Office of Traffic Operations or District Engineer (depending on Waiver level). Questions regarding the waiver process should be routed to the State Traffic Engineer.

```
Project Information: Location: SR 347 @ Proposed Drwy 1
                        County: Hall
            GDOT District: 1-Gainesville
                            Area Type: Suburb/Transition
        Existing Intersection Control: New Intersection or Other
```

Traffic and Operations Data: ${ }^{1,2}$

| Intersection meets signal/AWS warrants? Traffic Analysis Type: | None |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Intersection Delay |  |
| Existing Major Street Avg Daily Traffic (ADT): | 17,100 |  |
| Existing Minor Street Avg Daily Traffic (ADT): | 100 |  |
| Analysis Period: | AM Peak | PM Peak |
| 2027 Opening Yr Peak Hour Intersection Delay: | 13.5 sec | 12.6 sec |
| 2027 Opening Yr Peak Hour Intersection V/C: | 0.13 | 0.09 |
| 2027 Design Yr Peak Hour Intersection Delay: | 13.5 sec | 12.6 sec |
| 2027 Design Yr Peak Hour Intersection V/C: | 0.13 | 0.09 |

GDOT PI \# (or N/A): N/A
Requested By: Developer
Prepared By: KCI Technologies, Inc.
Date: 8/24/2023
Waiver Request Type: Driveway Permit

| Crash Data (Required): ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { Years: }}{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crash Data: Enter most recent 5 years of crash data | Crash Severity |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | K* | $\mathrm{A}^{*}$ | B* | C* | 0 |  |
| Angle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Head-On | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Rear End | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 50\% |
| Sideswipe - same | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50\% |
| Sideswipe - opposite | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Not Collision w/Motor Veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| TOTALS: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

* Number of crashes resulting in injuries / fatalities, not number of persons

| Description of Work / Justification for Waiver (Required): | New proposed RCUT driveway \#1 for the Friendship Luxe development; right-turn deceleration lane are proposed along SR 347; yield-control |
| :---: | :---: |
| Proposed Intersection Control: | RCUT (stop control) |

REQUESTED BY: Charles Bailey, PE Date: 8/24/2023

Title: $\qquad$

## APPROVED BY:

$\qquad$ Date:

Name:
District Engineer or (Approved Delegate)

[^0]
[^0]:    1 Analysis data input on this worksheet is for proposed control \& configuration on form, not the No-Build data shown on the top of Stage 2
    ${ }^{2}$ ADT's required if available (from data collected or nearest GDOT count station site); Capacity data optional unless needed to justify basis of the waiver request.
    ${ }^{3}$ Crash data (required for all existing intersections) must be entered here independent from Stage 2 worksheet inputs (not linked)

