Memorandum

SRF No. 11648

To: Michael Maddox Fargo-Moorhead Metro COG<br>From: Leif Garnass, PE, PTOE, Principal<br>Brent Clark, PE, Senior Engineer<br>Date: April 3, 2020<br>Subject: US 10/75 Corridor Study - Year 2045 Conditions Technical Memorandum

## Introduction

This memorandum summarizes the year 2045 no build conditions, the alternatives developed and considered to inform the corridor visions and provides recommendations for the build conditions for the US 10/75 Corridor Study. Findings and recommendations presented in this memorandum are divided by the three study focus areas: 1) Downtown; 2) US 10 East; and 3) US 75 South. This was used to inform discussions with the Study Review Committee (SRC) regarding corridor concepts.

## Year 2045 No Build Conditions

MnDOT is planning to reconstruct the US 10/75 corridors in years 2025-2026. The no build assumes that the existing intersection geometrics, roadway cross-sections, and traffic controls will all remain consistent with current conditions, but the existing signal timing was assumed to be optimized at intersections currently signalized. Also, the jurisdictional transfer of US 10 from Center Avenue to Main Avenue between 8th Street and 11th Street, which is planned to occur prior to year 2045 conditions, was assumed in the no build conditions analysis. Year 2045 peak hour traffic volumes for the Downtown, US 10 East and US 75 South Focus Areas are illustrated in Figure 1, Figure 2, and Figure 3, respectively. The methodology for developing traffic volumes is documented in the Traffic Forecasts Technical Memorandum, dated May 2019.

A traffic operations analysis was conducted for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours at the study intersections to determine how future year 2045 traffic is expected to operate in the study area. PTV VISSIM (Version 11.00-02) was once again used to evaluate the intersections since it is an effective tool to analyze how pedestrian activity and train operations influence traffic operations. Results of the year 2045 no build analysis shown in Table 1 indicate that all study intersections are expected to operate at an acceptable overall LOS D or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour.
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Table 1. Year 2045 No Build Intersection Capacity Analysis

| Intersection | Level of Service (LOS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A.M. Peak Hour | P.M. Peak Hour |
| Downtown |  |  |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/4th Street | A | C |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/5th Street | B | B |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/6th Street | A | A |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/7th Street (1) | A/C | A/D |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/8th Street (US 75) | C | D |
| Main Avenue/11th Street | B | C |
| Center Avenue (US 10/US 75)/8th Street | C | C |
| Center Avenue (US 10/US 75)/11th Street | C | C |
| Center Avenue (US 10/US 75)/14th Street | C | B |
| US 10 East |  |  |
| Center Avenue (US 10/US 75)/21st Street/1st Avenue | C | D |
| Center Avenue (US 10)/US 75 | A | B |
| Center Avenue (US 10)/28th Street (1) | A/C | A/E |
| Center Avenue (US 10)/30th Street (1) | A/C | A/F |
| Center Avenue (US 10)/32nd Street | A | B |
| Center Avenue (US 10)/34th Street | B | C |
| US 75 South |  |  |
| 8th Street (US 75)/2nd Avenue ${ }^{(1)}$ | A/F | C/F |
| 8th Street (US 75)/4th Avenue ${ }^{(1)}$ | A/D | B/F |
| 8th Street (US 75)/7th Avenue | B | B |
| 8th Street (US 75)/10th Avenue ${ }^{(1)(2)}$ | A/C | A/C |
| 8th Street (US 75)/12th Avenue | C | D |
| 8th Street (US 75)/20th Avenue | A | B |

(1) Indicates an unsignalized intersection with side-street stop control, where the overall LOS is shown followed by the worst side-street approach LOS.
(2) A pedestrian signal is located at this intersection and was modeled to incorporate delay with this signal.

While the overall intersections are expected to operate acceptably, the following operational and queuing issues should be noted:

## Main Avenue (US 10)/4th Street

- Eastbound queues are expected to extend approximately 700 feet during the p.m. peak hour.


## Center Avenue (US 10/75)/11th Street

- The southbound approach is expected to operate in the LOS E/F range with maximum queues extending more than 400 feet during the p.m. peak hour. Deficiencies are due to a combination of train events and poor lane utilization for vehicles positioning themselves for the Main Avenue/11th Street intersection.


## Center Avenue (US 10/75)/21st Street / 1st Avenue

- The northbound right-turn movement is expected to operate in the LOS $\mathrm{D} / \mathrm{E}$ range with maximum queues extending 600 feet or greater during the p.m. peak hour.


## Center Avenue (US 10)/28th Street

- The northbound movement is expected to operate at a LOS E during the p.m. peak hour.


## Center Avenue (US 10)/30th Street

- Side-street movements are anticipated to operate at a LOS F during p.m. peak hour with delays of two (2) minutes or greater.


## 8th Street (US 75) at 2nd Avenue and 4th Avenue

- Side-street movements are anticipated to operate at the LOS E/F border during a.m. and p.m. peak hours.


## 8th Street (US 75)/12th Avenue

- Maximum mainline queues are anticipated to extend 600 feet or greater during the p.m. peak. The eastbound thru/right-turn lane and westbound left-turn lane maximum queues are expected to extend approximately 450 feet.

Detailed measures of effectiveness (MOEs) are included in Appendix A.

## Alternatives Considered

The alternatives developed for each focus area ranged from grade-separation of users (i.e., roadways, railroads, and pedestrian/bicycle accommodations) to adding and/or removing lanes of traffic to restricting access at low-volume intersections and mid-block driveways. Converting one-way streets to two-way traffic were considered along with changes to how intersections are controlled (i.e., roundabouts vs. traffic signals). Incorporating technology to reduce impacts caused be train activities was considered. Lastly, alternatives were developed to focus on improving the experience for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Alternatives were developed for the three focus areas (Downtown, US 10 East, and US 75 South Focus Areas) and were reviewed based on a variety of objectives, including potential safety impacts, traffic operational impacts, social/economic impacts and walkability/bikeability impacts. A description, as well as a summary of the potential benefits and challenges for each alternative are summarized in this section. Detailed MOEs for the proposed alternatives (where applicable) are included in Appendix B.

## Downtown Focus Area

The City of Moorhead is currently conducting a study to identify if/where a railroad grade-separation should be constructed in downtown Moorhead. Previous studies, including the 2013 Corridor Study and the 2014 Moorhead Downtown Grade Separation Study, identified 11th Street to be the optimal location for a grade-separated railroad crossings between 1st Avenue and Center Avenue (BNSF Prosper Subdivision) and between Center Avenue and Main Avenue (BNSF KO Subdivision).

The 2013 Corridor Study and subsequent 2014 Moorhead Downtown Grade Separation Study also recommended a jurisdictional transfer of US 10/75 from the existing jurisdiction along 8th Street (between Main Avenue and Center Avenue) and along Center Avenue (between 8th Street and 11th Street) to a future jurisdiction along Main Avenue (between 8th Street and 11th Street) and along 11th Street (between Main Avenue and Center Avenue). This transfer is expected to occur regardless of if/when 11th Street has grade-separated railroad crossings.

The ongoing grade-separation study is conducting detailed traffic analysis work for the downtown area to determine where the grade-separation is recommended and what additional improvements/mitigation will be included. While the US 10/75 Corridor study assumes that the grade-separation will occur along 11th Street based on study previous recommendations, the gradeseparation study is evaluating other locations as well, including 8th Street and 14th Street. The gradeseparation study will also recommend intersection and roadway cross-section improvements along 11th Street and to the key intersections between 8th Street (US 75) and 14th Street along Main Avenue.

The following summarizes the benefits and challenges of each of the alternatives considered for the Downtown Focus Area:

## Alternative 1: 11th Street Grade-Separation

Previous studies have identified 11th Street to be the likely location for grade-separated railroad crossings between 1st Avenue and Center Avenue (BNSF Prosper Subdivision) and between Center Avenue and Main Avenue (BNSF KO Subdivision). This will include roadway capacity improvements as well as a shared-use path along 11th Street between 1st Avenue and Main Avenue.

The ongoing Downtown Grade-Separation Study is conducting a detailed analysis of the benefits and challenges of providing a grade-separated crossing at 11th Street and will review additional locations before determining if the 11th Street is the preferred corridor. For the purposes of the US 10/75 Corridor Study, a high-level review of the benefits and challenges are summarized below.

## Description:

- Construct a grade-separated crossing along 11th Street between 1st Avenue and Main Avenue.


Detailed analysis results can be requested through the Downtown Grade-Separation Study team.

## Alternative 2: Three-Lane Cross-Sections along Center Avenue and 8th Street following Jurisdictional Transfer and Grade-Separation

With the future jurisdictional transfer, and if a grade-separated crossing along 11th Street between 1st Avenue and Main Avenue (Alternative 1) is constructed, traffic volumes will be reduced along 8th Street between Center Avenue and Main Avenue and along Center Avenue between 8th Street and 11th Street. This provides the opportunity to reduce the cross-section and remove a thru lane in both directions.

Alternative 2A: Three-Lane Cross-Section along Center Avenue between 8th Street and 11th Street
Center Avenue is expected to operate acceptably (see Appendix B) with a three-lane cross-section and is discussed below.

## Description:

- Restripe or modify the curb location to provide a three-lane section along Center Avenue between 8th Street and 11th Street.
- To transition from the five-lane to the three-lane and vice versa, it was assumed that two eastbound thru lanes would begin approximately 200 to 300 feet west of 11th Street and the northernmost westbound thru lane east of 11th Street would trap into a right-turn lane at the 11th Street intersection. If this alternative is selected, additional consideration is needed during design to determine the optimal configuration to transition between the three-lane and five-lane sections.
- If this alternative is selected, Center Avenue would be re-striped to be consistent with the changes to Center Avenue west of 8th Street that were completed by the City in 2019.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Opportunity to provide on-street parking, shared on-street bike lanes, and/or wider sidewalks <br> - Removes the multiple-lane threat for pedestrians <br> - Reduces the crossing distance for pedestrians and opportunities to provide pedestrian crossing enhancements at non-signalized intersections <br> - Intersections are expected to operate at an overall acceptable level of service <br> - Three-lane provides vehicular safety benefits compared to the five-lane facility <br> - Three-lane likely to reduce travel speeds through this segment (depending on lane widths) <br> - Consistent with the three-lane section on Center Avenue west of 8th Street | - While the intersections are expected to operate acceptably, the corridor will be more congested during peak hours compared to existing crosssection <br> - Center Avenue is a likely future transit route; additional consideration should be given to where transit stops should be located |

Alternative 2B: Three-Lane Cross-Section along 8th Street between Center Avenue and Main Avenue
An initial test determined that the existing roadway geometry along 8th Street between Center Avenue and Main Avenue is needed for both capacity and vehicle storage during train events (see Appendix B). The southbound queue at the Main Avenue/8th Street intersection will queue into the Center Avenue/8th Street intersection, impacting operations.

## Description:

- Restripe or modify the curb location to provide a three-lane section along 8th Street between Center Avenue and Main Avenue.
- If this alternative is selected, additional consideration is needed during design to determine the optimal configuration to transition between the three-lane and five-lane sections, potentially including a southbound left-turn lane, one thru lane, and one shared thru/right-turn lane.


## Benefits

- Opportunity to provide on-street parking, shared on-street bike lanes, and/or wider sidewalks
- Removes the multiple-lane threat for pedestrians
- Reduces the crossing distance for pedestrians and opportunities to provide pedestrian crossing enhancements at non-signalized intersections
- Three-lane provides vehicular safety benefits compared to the five-lane facility
- Three-lane likely to reduce travel speeds through this segment (depending on lane widths)

Challenges

- The corridor will be more congested during peak hours compared to existing cross-section and queues are expected between the Center Avenue and Main Avenue intersections
- During the p.m. peak, failing operations are expected

Alternative 2B is not recommended by the SRC due to the congestion expected with the close intersection spacing and their interaction with the at-grade railroad crossings. Further, 8th Street serves as a main connection between I-94 and 1st Avenue. 1st Avenue is the City's preferred traffic corridor through downtown.

## Alternative 3: Add Trail Connection between 11th Street and 21st Street/1st Avenue

The segment of Center Avenue (US 10/75) between 11 th Street and 21 st Street/1st Avenue is an existing gap in the pedestrian/bicycle network. It should be noted that in the US 10 East Focus Area, alternatives to provide a pedestrian connection between 21st Street/1st Avenue and 28th Street area are discussed (see Alternative 2 in the US 10 East Focus Area). Two alternatives were considered:

Alternative 3A: Add Trail on the North or South Side of 1st Avenue Between 11th Street and 21st Street/1st Avenue

Adding a trail along 1st Avenue was deemed feasible by the previous 1st Avenue Corridor Study. Installing an 8 -foot (minimum) wide shared-use path would result in removal of the existing sidewalk, stamped and colored boulevard ADA ramps, and relocation of streetlights. It would also be prudent to replace the curb and gutter to better control of grades and flexibility in the design.

## Description:

- Construct a shared use path along 1st Avenue between 11th Street and 21st Street/1st Avenue.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Addresses the existing gap in the pedestrian/ | •No pedestrian/bicycle facilities would be <br> provided along Center Avenue (US 10) between <br> bicycle network |
| Similar distance for pedestrians/bicyclists to <br> travel between 11th Street and 21st Street/1st | •Wayfinding signage may be needed to direct <br> Avenue if a trail were to be provided along Center <br> pedestrians/bicyclists to 1st Avenue |
| Avenue (US 10/75) |  |

Alternative 3B: Add Trail on the North or South Side of Center Avenue (US 10/75) between 11th Street and 21st Street/1st Avenue

## Description:

- Construct a shared-use path trail along the north or south side of Center Avenue (US 10/75) between 11th Street and 21st Street/1st Avenue.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\bullet$ Addresses the existing gap in the pedestrian/ | $\bullet$There are slope issues at the railroad bridge <br> piers that make it challenging to construct a trail <br> bicycle network |
| along Center Avenue (US 10/75); based on a |  |
| Similar distance for pedestrians/bicyclists to <br> travel between 11th Street and 21st Street/1st <br> Avenue if a trail were to be provided along 1st <br> Avenue | review it is not considered feasible to construct a <br> trial until the railroad bridge is reconstructed |
|  |  |

Alternative $3 B$ is not feasible and therefore is not recommended to be carried forward or considered further at this time. However, adding trail along Center Avenue (US 10) is a longterm vision for this corridor and should be considered when the railroad bridge is reconstructed and there is opportunity to relocate the bridge piers to accommodate a trail.

## Alternative 4: One-Way to Two-Way Conversion along 5th Street Between Main Avenue (US 10) and 2nd Avenue

The Main Avenue (US 10)/5th Street intersection is expected to operate acceptably under year 2045 conditions. 5th Street is currently one-way northbound. At the Main Avenue (US 10) intersection the northbound approach has two left-turn lanes, a thru lane and a right-turn lane. To the north of the intersection, 5th Street is a two-way roadway with one northbound and southbound thru lane.

## Description:

- Modify the south leg from a one-way northbound to two-way operations.
- Convert the westernmost northbound left-turn lane to a southbound thru lane.
- Modifications to the existing parking lot in the commercial area in the southwest quadrant of the intersection may be required (currently striped with angle parking, one-way internal operations).
- Opportunity to close access(es) along Main Avenue if two-way operations provided.
- There will likely be a southbound thru lane alignment shift of approximately eight feet.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Intersection is expected to operate acceptably <br> - Converting 5th Street from one-way to two-way operations makes it easier to navigate downtown and to access business to/from 2nd Avenue <br> - Potential to close access along Main Avenue, improving compliance with access spacing guidelines <br> - Consistent with two-way operations at 4th Street | - Does not improve pedestrian crossing <br> - Converting the south leg from a one-way to twoway operations increases the intersection conflicts potentially increasing risk for crashes <br> - The southbound thru lane will be challenging to align through the intersection <br> - Parking lot in the southwest quadrant would likely require restriping and modification |

## Alternative 5: Modify Main Avenue (US 10) between River and 8th Street (US 75)

Main Avenue (US 10) between the River and 8th Street is current a four-lane undivided roadway with left-turn lanes at each of the public streets. To the east of 8th Street (US 75), Main Avenue transitions to a five-lane undivided roadway with center two-way left-turns. The Fargo Main Avenue Reconstruction project started construction in Spring 2019. The project is converting Main Avenue between 8th Street and 2nd Street to a three-lane roadway with on-street parking. While the Fargo Main Avenue traffic study did not estimate significant travel pattern/volume changes to the Main Avenue segment in Moorhead, if traffic volumes decrease as a result of the Fargo Main Avenue project a different cross-section should be considered along Main Avenue between the River and 11th Street.

The methodology for developing traffic volumes for this study is documented in the Traffic Forecasts Technical Memorandum, dated May 2019. The future expected traffic diversion will need to be determined during project development when new data can be collected following completion of the Main Avenue reconstruction project and other ongoing projects impacting traffic in downtown Moorhead. Without any assumed diversion the daily volume ranges from 18,500 (existing) to 24,900 (2045), which both are within the expected range of a three-lane roadway capacity ( 17,000 to 25,000
daily vehicles). The capacity depends on roadway characteristics, access spacing, and traffic patterns. From a peak hour perspective, overall poor operations (LOS E or worse) are expected during the afternoon peak at the signalized intersections of 4th Street, 5th Street, and 8th Street with the threelane concept. However, MnDOT's Performance-Based Practice Design notes a "design vehicular LOS of D or lower is suggested for urban streets as an appropriate balance between design-year peak-hour operation and off-peak safety." Thus, the SRC supports the trade-off between the less than ideal peak hour operations under worst-case volume conditions to promote walkability and bikeablility. Details are included in Appendix B.

In year 2022 (one-year after the completion of the Fargo Main Avenue Reconstruction project), traffic volumes in downtown Moorhead should be re-assessed to determine if traffic pattern changes have occurred that would suggest a different cross-section would work. Further, reevaluation of traffic at this time would allow for a new "base" set of data to be evaluated once traffic stabilizes following the completion of several ongoing constructions projects that impact traffic volumes in downtown.

Alternative 5A: Maintain 5-Lane Roadway on Main Avenue (US 10) between the River and 8th Street

## Description:

- Reconstruct as a five-lane with a center two-way left-turns.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Intersections and corridor are expected to | $\bullet$ Does not promote walkability/bikeability |
| operate acceptably |  |
| Two-way left-turn striping is consistent with the |  |
| access density and the striping west of 11th |  |
| Street |  |

Alternative 5B: Modify the Main Avenue (US 10) Cross-Section to a 3-Lane Roadway

## Description:

- Reconstruct Main Avenue (US 10) as a 3-lane roadway between the River and 8th Street to provide one thru lane in each direction, center two-way left-turns, and on-street parking.
- Widen sidewalks with reconstruction.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Promotes walkability/bikeability | - Poor traffic operations are expected with current projections <br> - Need to re-evaluate traffic once ongoing construction projects are complete and traffic stabilizes through downtown Moorhead |

## Alternative 6: Additional Improvements for Consideration

The following additional enhancements such as signage, pedestrian improvements, and streetscaping elements have also been discussed as potential improvement options for the downtown area.

## Alternative 6A: Add Dynamic Signage to Notify Vehicles of Approaching Trains

During the public and stakeholder engagement process, feedback was provided that the Downtown Focus Area is congested during train events. Providing additional signage notifying motorists when trains are approaching will help motorists to make decisions on travel routes to avoid getting stuck at an at-grade crossing when a train is traveling through downtown and the gate arms are down.

## Description:

- Add dynamic message signage to notify motorists of when trains are coming.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\bullet$ Notifies motorists of oncoming trains | $\bullet$Ability and technique to coordinate with the <br> railroad detection system |
| Reduces the likelihood of vehicles not getting <br> stuck at a railroad crossing |  |
| - Reduces driver frustration |  |

## Alternative 6B: Add Pedestrian Crossing Enhancements at Main Avenue (US 10)/7th Street

The 7th Street intersection along Main Avenue (US 10) is the only unsignalized intersection along the corridor between the River and 8th Street (US 75). It is a T-intersection (no north leg) and provides the opportunity to add a pedestrian refuge island on the west leg. However, there are few pedestrians that would likely want to cross at this intersection based on the current land uses and there are nearby alternative pedestrian crossing options at the signals at 6th Street and 8th Street. It should be noted that according to Minnesota's Crosswalk Law, vehicles must stop for crossing pedestrians at all intersections regardless if the intersection is marked or unmarked.

## Description:

- Construct a pedestrian refuge island on the west leg (with a 5-lane roadway) or provide a curb bump-out on the north side of Maine Avenue (with a 3-lane roadway).
- Consider marking the crosswalk and adding "Stop for Pedestrian" signage or a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB).

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pedestrians tend to select routes that are the | • Few pedestrians currently want to cross at this |
| shortest distance between two points - if a | intersection - the lack of pedestrian |
| pedestrian's origin/destination is along | enhancements encourages pedestrians to cross |
| 7th Street north or south of Main Avenue | at signalized intersections to the east and west |
| (US 10), pedestrians are likely to want to cross at  |  |
| 7th Street |  |

## Alternative 6C: Increase the Sidewalk Width along 8th Street Between 1st and Center Avenues

Public feedback from the public engagement process identified that this study should prioritize pedestrians and bicyclists. One of the improvements identified by the SRC was to explore the possibility of increasing the sidewalk width along 8th Street between 1st Avenue and Center Avenue. The current sidewalk width narrows just north of the Center Avenue intersection due to the NAPA driveway area. One of the alternatives being explored for the US 75 South Focus Area is adding a share-use trail on the east side of 8th Street (US 75) between Main Avenue (US 10/75) and 12th Avenue (see Alternative 3 in the US 75 South Focus Area), which extending the pedestrian/bicycle connection to the north to 1st Avenue becomes a critical connection.

Description:

- Widen the sidewalk on the east side of 8th Street between 1st Avenue and Center Avenue to a minimum of 8 feet.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Improves the pedestrian/bicycle facility and | $\bullet$Coordinate with the NAPA store parcel - <br> modifications to the parcel would be needed and <br> connectivity to the Downtown Focus Area and the <br> regional system |
| likely the block long driveway would need to be <br> removed or modified |  |
| The current sidewalk configuration is not ADA |  |
| compliant |  |

Alternative 6D: Utilize Dead-End Space for Parking, Streetscaping, Park Space, etc.
There are currently dead-end locations along the corridor where the railroad intersects the roadway and there are no at-grade railroad crossings (i.e., 6th Street between Center Avenue and Main Avenue and 9th Street and 10th Street between 1st Avenue and Center Avenue). In discussions with City staff, there may opportunity to better utilize this space such as for designated on-street parking, streetscaping elements, park space, etc. The City is currently conducting a Downtown Master Planning Study that will take a closer look at improvements such as these. Therefore, while this study will not recommend what (if any) specific use the dead-end spaces will serve, this study will recommend that the dead-end spaces should be studied further in the Downtown Master Planning Study.

## Description:

- The Downtown Master Planning Study project team should work with the public and local business community to identify the best use for the dead-end space

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\bullet$ Better utilization of the space | Coordinating with the community and competing <br> interests |

Alternative 6E: Add Streetscaping Elements and Reduce Roadway Width along Center Avenue (US 10/75) between 14th Street and 21st Street/1St Avenue to Reduce Travel Speeds

Public feedback from the public engagement process suggested that this study should explore opportunities to reduce the travel speeds along Center Avenue (US 10/75) between 14th Street and 21st Street/1st Avenue. Reducing travel speeds and adding streetscaping elements along corridor will create a more cohesive design connecting the Downtown and US 10 East Focus Areas.

## Description:

- Add streetscaping elements such as trees, park area, and/or trail (see Alternative 3B).
- Reduce roadway lane widths.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Potential to reduce travel speeds along Center | Reduces vehicular speeds along Center Avenue <br> (US 10/75) <br> Avenue (US 10/75) |
| - Potential to create active green space |  |

## Alternative 7: Restrict or Close Driveway Accesses in Downtown

The access density along Main Avenue and Center Avenue in the Downtown Focus Area exceeds the current access spacing requirements. Consolidating, restricting or eliminating access would improve safety and mobility along the corridors.

## Description:

- Specific access locations TBD.



## US 10 East Focus Area

During the public and stakeholder engagement process, comments were received to explore opportunities to modify the roadway cross-section and streetscaping elements to create a cohesive roadway that connects the Downtown and US 10 East Focus Areas. This included alternatives that would reduce travel speeds along Center Avenue (US 10/75) to be consistent with the existing speed limit in the Downtown Focus Area ( 30 mph ), as well as alternatives that evaluated an urban section with curb and gutter along Center Avenue (US 10). In addition, feedback was given to review alternatives to add pedestrian/bicycle facilities along Center Avenue (US 10) between 21st Street/1st Avenue and 28th Street to connect into the existing facilities. The following summarizes the benefits and challenges of each of the alternatives considered for the US 10 East Focus Area:

## Alternative 1: Center Avenue between the 21st Street/1st Avenue and 32nd Street

The center median of Center Avenue (US 10) east of the US 75 East Junction intersection was designed to be used as a truck weigh station but the weigh station closed, and its remnants are now used as a truck inspection site. This alternative explores the opportunity to reclaim that area and to design the US 10 corridor between the 21st Street/1st Avenue and 32nd Street intersections with a complete streets approach. Further, under year 2045 conditions, the side-street approaches at the 24th Street, 26th Street, 28th Street, and 30th Street are expected to have high average delays during the peak hours with the current two-stage crossing configuration. Two alternatives were considered, both assume the alignment of Center Avenue was shifted south to better tie-in the alignments east and west of the wide median:

Alternative 1A: Remove the Grass Ditch Median along Center Avenue between the 21st Street/1st Avenue and 32nd Street Intersections with Access Restrictions (28th Street is Full Access)

## Description:

- Remove the grass ditch median and replace it with a narrow concrete median with curb and gutter.
- Modifications to the 21 st Street/1st Avenue intersection are discussed in Alternative 3 and modifications to the US 75 East Junction intersection are discussed in Alternative 4.
- The following access modifications were assumed under this alternative:
- 24th Street - close access due to its proximity to the US 75 East Junction intersection
- 26th Street - restrict access to right-in/right-out to provide safety and operational benefits
- 28th Street - provide full access and signalize once traffic volumes warrant installation
- 30th Street - restrict access to three-quarter access to provide safety and operational benefits
- 32nd Street - maintain as a full access signalized intersection
- Optional - Provide a frontage road connection between 28th Street and 30th Street on the north side of Center Avenue to improve connectivity since northbound and southbound left-turn and thru movements are restricted at the 30th Street intersection under this alternative.

Benefits

- Roadway modifications and access restrictions are expected to provide safety and operational benefits
- Addresses safety/operational issues observed at the 30th Street intersection
- Improves compliance with access spacing guidelines
- A new pedestrian crossing can be provided at the 28th Street signalized intersection
- Roadway design expected to reduce travel speeds promoting an urban, multi-modal environment
- 28th Street provides the best north/south regional connectivity since it connects to 80th Avenue to the north
- 28th Street is located midway between US 75 East Junction and 32nd Street providing good traffic signal spacing
- 28th Street is located closer to 24th Street and 26th Street compared to 30th Street making it closer for vehicles to re-route to
- Vehicles can make a U-Turn along Center Avenue for locations where access is proposed to be restricted
- Urbanizing the corridor to lower speeds provides the opportunity for transit buses to stop in-lane with the potential to add a high-frequency transit route between Moorhead and Dilworth


## Challenges

- Construction costs
- Coordination with businesses on proposed access closure/restriction locations
- Traffic volumes on 30th Street are greater than traffic volumes on 28th Street
- Vehicles re-routing from 24th Street, 26th Street, and 30th Street (proposed access closures or restrictions) would need to make a U-Turn or use the frontage road system to access the signal at 28th Street thereby increasing vehicle miles traveled
- Closure of 24th Street access has transit impacts - need to coordinate with MATBUS to determine how transit would be re-routed or if an eastbound right-in is needed

Alternative 1B: Remove the Grass Ditch Median Along Center Avenue between the 21st Street/1st Avenue and 32nd Street Intersections with Access Restrictions (30th Street is Full Access)

## Description:

- Remove the grass ditch median and replace it with a narrow concrete median with curb and gutter.
- Modifications to the 21st Street/1st Avenue intersection are discussed in Alternative 3 and modifications to the US 75 East Junction intersection are discussed in Alternative 4.
- The following access modifications were assumed under this alternative:
- 24th Street - close access due to its proximity to the US 75 East Junction intersection
- 26th Street - restrict access to right-in/right-out to provide safety and operational benefits
- 28th Street - restrict access to three-quarter access to provide safety and operational benefits
- 30th Street - provide a full access and signalize once traffic volumes warrant installation
- 32nd Street - restrict access to three-quarter access to improve traffic signal spacing
- Optional - Provide a frontage road connection between 28th Street and 30th Street on the north side of Center Avenue to improve connectivity since southbound/northbound left-turn and thru movements are restricted at the 28th Street intersection under this alternative.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Roadway modifications and access restrictions are expected to provide safety and operational benefits | - Construction costs <br> - Coordination with businesses on proposed access closure/restriction locations |
| - Addresses safety/operational issues observed at the 30th Street intersection | - Pedestrian crossings on Center Avenue would be removed at 32nd Street |
| - Improves compliance with access spacing guidelines | - Removes an existing signal at 32 nd Street coordination with the Easten Shopping Center |
| - A new pedestrian crossing can be provided at the 30th Street intersection | would be needed and potential modifications to their parking lot to encourage vehicles to exit |
| - Roadway design expected to reduce travel speeds promoting an urban, multi-modal environment | onto 30th Street or 34th where signals would be provided <br> - Removes existing signal at 32nd Street where |
| - 30th Street is located midway between US 75 East Junction and 34th Street providing good traffic signal spacing | transit buses use the intersection <br> - 30th Street does not provide the same regional connectivity as 28th Street provides since 30th |
| - Vehicles can make a U-Turn along Center Avenue for locations where access is proposed to be restricted | Street dead-ends approximately one-half mile to the north of Center Avenue <br> - Vehicles re-routing from 24th Street, 26th Street, |
| - Traffic volumes on 30th Street are greater than traffic volumes on 28th Street | and 28th Street (proposed access closure or restrictions) would need to make a U-Turn or use |
| - Urbanizing the corridor to lower speeds provides the opportunity for transit buses to stop in-lane with the potential to add a high-frequency transit | the frontage road system to access the signal at 30th Street thereby increasing vehicle miles traveled |
| route between Moorhead and Dilworth | - Closure of 24 th Street access has transit impacts - need to coordinate with MATBUS to determine how transit would be re-routed or if an eastbound right-in is needed |

## Alternative 2: Add Trail on Center Avenue between 21st Street/1st Avenue and 28th Street

The segment of Center Avenue between 21st Street/1st Avenue and 28th Street is an existing gap in the pedestrian/bicycle network. It should be noted that in the Downtown Focus Area, alternatives to provide a pedestrian connection between 11th Street and 21st Street/1st Avenue were discussed (see Alternative 3 in the Downtown Focus Area). Based on that review, a trail along 1st Avenue (Alternative 3A) was identified to be the recommended alternative. Combining Alternative 3A in the Downtown Focus Area with Alternative 2 in the US 10 East Focus Area, pedestrian/bicycle connections would address the existing gap. Based on discussions with the SRC, this study reviewed options to provide trail on both the north and south sides of Center Avenue between 21st Street/ 1st Avenue and 28th Street.

## Description:

- Construct a shared-use path along both the north and the south sides of Center Avenue between 21st Street/1st Avenue and 28th Street.
- This alternative assumes that Alternative 1A or 1B for the US 10 East Focus Area is selected, providing additional right-of-way space to the north and assumes that the US 75 East Junction intersection can be redesigned to accommodate pedestrians on the north leg (further discussed in Alternative 4).

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Addresses the existing gap in the pedestrian/ bicycle network <br> - Provides accommodations on both the north and south sides of Center Avenue | - Requires the greatest amount of space for trail facilities; however, no right-of-way acquisition is anticipated to be needed |

## Alternative 3: Center Avenue (US 10/75)/21st Street/1st Avenue Intersection

Under year 2045 conditions, this intersection is expected to operate near capacity with the existing intersection configuration. Feedback provided from the SRC as well as from public and stakeholder engagement efforts suggested that this study should explore opportunities to modify the intersection configuration to remove split signal timing phasing for the northbound/southbound approaches, improve pedestrian crossing safety, provide pedestrian/bicycle facilities to the east and west along the corridor, remove/reduce the existing median, and to create an urban section/intersection to reduce travel speeds through the intersection and further to the east. It is important to note that the design of this intersection is impacted by other alternatives being considered:

- In the Downtown Focus Area, alternatives to provide a pedestrian connection between 11th Street and 21st Street/1st Avenue were discussed (see Alternative 3 in the Downtown Focus Area). Based on the review, a trail along 1st Avenue (Alternative 3A) was recommended.
- For purposes of evaluating this intersection, new trail was assumed to be constructed on the north and south sides of Center Avenue that would connect into the existing trail at 28th Street (Alternative 2).
- Due to close intersection spacing with the Center Avenue (US 10)/US 75 East Junction intersection, the proposed improvements at this intersection need to work in coordination with the improvements at the US 75 East Junction intersection (Alternative 4).

Three alternatives were considered:

Alternative 3A: Modify Intersection Configuration but keep Split Phasing

## Description:

- Remove the grass ditch median and construct a narrow pavement median. Reduce the lane widths and provide curb and gutter sections along Center Avenue (US 10/75) to the east and west of the intersection (See Alternative 1).
- Modify the signal phasing to provide a northbound right-turn and westbound left-turn overlap.
- Remove the northbound channelized right-turn or consider installing flashing yellow right-turn arrows to accommodate the northbound right-turn and westbound left-turn overlap signal phase.
- Reduce the intersection skew.
- Provide a pedestrian refuge island on the west leg (if no underpass is built).
- Intersection would be modified, but the lane geometry and split signal timing phasing would remain the same as existing conditions.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Overall operations during the peak hours are expected to improve <br> - Reduces delay/queues for the northbound rightturn movement during the p.m. peak hour <br> - Intersection design expected to reduce travel speeds promoting an urban, multi-modal environment <br> - Skewed intersection reduced thereby improving safety <br> - Pedestrian crossing distance reduced on the west leg (if no underpass is built) <br> - Maintains ability for eastbound transit buses on 1st Avenue to easily access the left-turn movement at the intersection | - Reduces travel speeds impacting mobility <br> - Likely would need to eliminate the pedestrian crossing on the east leg unless modifications can be made to provide a two-stage crossing <br> - Split signal phasing during the non-peak periods reduces intersection efficiency <br> - The intersection to the north may need to be closed or restricted |

## Alternative 3B: Modify Intersection Configuration with Protected/Permitted Left-turn Phasing

## Description:

- Remove the grass ditch median and construct a narrow pavement median. Reduce the lane widths and provide curb and gutter sections along Center Avenue (US 10/75) to the east and west of the intersection (See Alternative 1).
- Remove the northbound channelized right-turn or consider installing flashing yellow right-turn arrows to accommodate the northbound right-turn and westbound left-turn overlap signal phase.
- Modify the signal phasing to provide a northbound right-turn and westbound left-turn overlap.
- Reduce the intersection skew.
- Provide a pedestrian refuge island on the west leg (if no underpass is built).
- To ensure that northbound and southbound left-turns do not overlap, the pedestrian crossing on the east approach would need to be set back approximately 70 feet from the intersection creating a potential pedestrian crossing safety concern for northbound and westbound right-turns.
- Intersection would be modified, and split signal phasing would be removed, but the lane geometry would remain the same as existing conditions.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Removing the split phasing increases the intersection efficiency during non-peak hours <br> - Intersection design expected to reduce travel speeds promoting an urban, multi-modal environment <br> - Skewed intersection reduced thereby improving safety <br> - Pedestrian crossing distance reduced on the west leg | - Reduces travel speeds impacting mobility <br> - Vehicle compliance concerns for the westbound approach as vehicles may not stop at the designated stop bar location <br> - Pedestrian crossing safety concerns on the north leg due to potential conflicts with westbound right-turning vehicles <br> - Likely would need to eliminate the pedestrian crossing on the east leg <br> - The intersection to the north may need to be closed or restricted |

This alternative is only recommended if a grade-separation for pedestrians is built. To remove overlapping turns the stop bar back on the east leg would need to be set back a distance to which negatively impacts the pedestrian crossing.

Alternative 3C: Construct a Multi-Lane Roundabout

## Description:

- Construct a multi-lane roundabout.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\bullet$ Reduces delay during non-peak hours | $\bullet$Failing operations (LOS F (>2 min.)) during peak <br> hours |
| $\bullet$ Reduces travel speeds through the intersection |  |
|  | Potential operational issues during events at the <br> High School |
|  | Poor pedestrian accommodations <br> • Increases in the frequency of crashes expected |
|  | The intersection to the north may need to be <br> closed or restricted |
|  |  |

Alternative 3C is not feasible based on expected future intersection capacity needs; therefore, this alternative was not recommended to be carried forward or considered further.

## Alternative 4: Center Avenue (US 10)/US 75 East Junction

Under year 2045 conditions, this intersection is expected to operate acceptably with the existing intersection configuration. Feedback provided from the SRC as well as from public and stakeholder engagement suggested that this study should explore opportunities to simplify the traffic control, improve pedestrian crossing safety, and to reduce travel speeds through the intersection. It should be noted the design of this intersection is impacted by other alternatives being considered:

- A new trail was assumed to be constructed on the north and south sides of Center Avenue that would connect into the existing trail at 28th Street (Alternative 2).
- Due to its close intersection spacing with the Center Avenue (US 10/75)/21st Street/1st Avenue intersection, the proposed improvements at this intersection need to work in coordination with the improvements at the 21st Street/1st Avenue intersection (Alternative 3).

Three alternatives were considered:

Alternative 4A: Modify Intersection Configuration with Typical Signal Phasing
Description:

- Remove the grass ditch median and construct a narrow pavement median. Reduce the lane widths and provide curb and gutter sections to the east and west.
- Construct dual eastbound left-turn lanes with protected only signal phasing.
- Provide pedestrian crossings on all legs and a pedestrian refuge island on the east leg along Center Avenue.
- Replace the current traffic signal phasing with a typical signal phasing configuration.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Simplifies intersection <br> - Acceptable overall operations during the peak hours <br> - Intersection design expected to reduce travel speeds promoting an urban, multi-modal environment <br> - Pedestrian crossing will likely be feasible on all legs | - Reduces travel speeds impacting mobility <br> - Eastbound traffic must stop, which it currently is a free movement <br> - Overall operations expected to have higher delay than a Continuous Green-T intersection |

## Alternative 4B: Construct an Urban Continuous Green-T Intersection

## Description:

- Remove the grass ditch median and construct a narrow pavement median. Reduce the lane widths and provide curb and gutter sections to the east and west.
- Construct a single eastbound left-turn lane with flashing-yellow-arrow phasing.
- Provide an acceleration lane for southbound left-turning traffic onto eastbound Center Avenue, which is the typical configuration for a Continuous Green-T intersection.
- No pedestrian crossings are permitted across Center Avenue with this intersection configuration since the eastbound traffic does not have to stop.
- Provide a pedestrian crossing on the north leg.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Simplifies intersection from current configuration <br> - Acceptable overall operations during the peak hours <br> - Provides the lowest overall delay/queues compared to the other alternatives <br> - Eastbound traffic does not stop | - Higher speeds through the intersection since the eastbound traffic does not stop <br> - Eliminates potential for a pedestrian crossing on the east and west legs |

Alternative 4C: Construct a Multi-Lane Roundabout

## Description:

- Construct a multi-lane roundabout.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\bullet$ Acceptable overall operations during the peak | $\bullet$Potential operational issues during events at the <br> High School |
| hours | Increases in the frequency of crashes expected |
| - Reduces delay during non-peak hours | Reduces travel speeds through the intersection |
|  | Large roundabout footprint needed to <br> accommodate high volume of heavy vehicles |

Recommendations and additional details for the Center Avenue (US 10)/US 75 East Junction are documented in the Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE), report dated April 2020. This includes discussion an option to consider for the commercial vehicle inspection site being impacted.

## Alternative 5: Center Avenue (US 10)/34th Street Intersection

The Center Avenue (US 10)/34th Street intersection was identified to have an existing crash rate above the critical crash rate. Based on a review of the crash trends, the driveways to the north and the South Frontage Road to the south of the intersection are likely significant contributors to the high frequency of crashes due to the proximity of these accesses/intersections to the Center Avenue (US 10) intersection. Two alternatives were considered:

Alternative 5A: Relocate/Restrict Access to the North and Restrict South Frontage Road to Right-In/Right-Out

## Description:

- Restrict the south driveway into the Tesoro gas station to right-in/right-out; relocate the north driveway into the Tesoro gas station and the main Tractor Supply Co. driveway to the north to be directly across from one another while maintaining full access.
- Restrict the South Frontage road access to right-in/right-out.
- Extend the westbound left-turn lane storage to a minimum of 500 feet.
- Eastbound/westbound left-turns are recommended to be protected only during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Maintains full access to the Tractor Supply Co. <br> - Provides one full access and one right-in/rightout access to Tesoro (currently two full accesses) <br> - Reduces conflicts at the intersections/driveways located closest to the Center Avenue (US 10) intersection <br> - Westbound left-turn lane storage can accommodate the expected queues during the peak hours <br> - The protected left-turn phasing is expected to improve safety at the intersection | - Coordination is needed with the businesses with relocation and/or restriction of accesses <br> - Restricting the South Frontage Road to right-in/right-out will likely re-route vehicles to the existing traffic signal at the 32nd Street intersection or to 34th Street to make a U-Turn <br> - Transit route \#6 currently makes a southbound left-turn at the South Frontage Road and would need to use an alternative route |

Alternative 5B: Relocate/Restrict Access to the North and Restrict South Frontage Road 3/4 Access

## Description:

- Restrict the south driveway into the Tesoro gas station to right-in/right-out; relocate the north driveway into the Tesoro gas station and the main Tractor Supply Co. driveway to the north to be directly across from one another while maintaining full access.
- Restrict the South Frontage road access to a three-quarter access intersection.
- Extend the westbound left-turn lane storage to a minimum of 500 feet.
- Eastbound/westbound left-turns are recommended to be protected only during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Maintains full access to the Tractor Supply Co. | • Coordination is needed with the businesses with |
| - Provides one full access and one right-in/right- | relocation and/or restriction of accesses |
| out access to Tesoro (currently two full accesses) | • Restricting the South Frontage Road to right- |
| - Reduces conflicts at the intersections/driveways | int-out will likely re-route vehicles to the |
| existing traffic signal at the 32nd Street |  |
| located closest to the Center Avenue (US 10) | intersection or to 34th Street to make a U-Turn <br> intersection |
| - Westbound left-turn lane storage can | Conflict between northbound left-turns at the |

accommodate the expected queues during the peak hours

- The protected left-turn phasing is expected to improve safety at the intersection
- Maintains current transit route \#6 which makes a southbound left-turn at the South Frontage Road

Center Avenue (US 10) and South Frontage Road still exists

- Operational concerns for if/when the queues from the southbound left-turn onto the South Frontage Road impact the Center Avenue (US 10 intersection)
- Operational concerns for if/when the queues from the northbound left-turn onto Center Avenue (US 10) impact the South Frontage Road

Alternative 5B was not recommended by the SRC based on safety and operational concerns with the three-quarter access onto the South Frontage Road and therefore, was not recommended to be carried forward or considered further.

## Alternative 6: Center Avenue (US 10/75) Grade Separated Pedestrian/Bicyclist Crossing Between 21st Street/1st Avenue and US 75 East Junction

Consideration was given to the need for a pedestrian/bicycle grade-separated crossing (i.e., bridge or underpass) across Center Avenue (US 10) between the 21st Street/1st Avenue and the US 75 East Junction intersections. In the Downtown Focus Area, alternatives to provide a pedestrian connection between 11th Street and 21st Street/1st Avenue were discussed (see Alternative 3 in the Downtown Focus Area). Based on the review, a trail along 1st Avenue (see Alternative 3A) was identified to be the recommended alternative. Further, Alternative 2 in the US 10 East Focus Area reviewed alternatives to provide a trail on the north and south side of Center Avenue between 21st Street/1st Avenue and 28th Street. The pedestrian/bicycle grade-separated crossing alternative would connect the trail at 1 st Avenue with the trail on the south side of Center Avenue.

Pedestrian crossings may need to be removed on the east approach of the 21 st Street/1st Avenue intersection (Alternative 3A and 3B) and potentially both the east and west approaches of the US 75 East Junction intersections (Alternative 4B). This grade-separated crossing would improve connectivity and provide a safe and conflict-free crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists. Two alternatives were considered:

## Alternative 6A: Construct a Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge

## Description:

- Construct a pedestrian/bicycle bridge across Center Avenue.
- If this alternative is selected for further consideration, additional study will be needed to determine how the structured ramps to the grade-separated crossing would be designed and how the structure would connect to the existing/proposed trail system, etc.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| - No conflicts for pedestrians and bicycles crossing | • Construction costs |
|  | Sightline concerns for where the bridge piers <br> would be located to make sure that adequate <br> sight distance is provided for vehicles and to not <br> introduce safety issues |
|  | Bridges tend to have longer structured <br> approaches requiring pedestrians/bicyclists to <br> walk/bike further out of their way to cross, <br> potentially reducing the likelihood that they will <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> use the crossing vs. crossing at-grade <br> Bridge may block visibility of businesses |

Alternative 6B: Construct a Pedestrian/Bicycle Underpass

## Description:

- Construct a pedestrian/bicycle underpass across Center Avenue.
- If this alternative is selected for further consideration, additional study will be needed to determine the design of the tunnel and how they connect to the existing/proposed trail system, etc.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :---: | :---: |
| - No conflicts for pedestrians and bicycles crossing <br> - No sightline issues | - Construction costs <br> - Need to confirm that there are no water table issues with constructing an underpass <br> - Public generally has safety and lighting concerns with underpasses |

## US 75 South Focus Area

During the public and stakeholder engagement process, comments were received to explore opportunities to provide pedestrian/bicycle facilities along 8th Street (US 75). It was also noted that the 8th Street (US 75)/12th Avenue intersection has high pedestrian crossing volumes (verified with the data collection efforts), which can make it challenging for vehicles to make left- or right-turns. Further, safety and operational issues were identified at the 8th Street (US 75)/2nd Avenue intersection under existing and year 2045 conditions. The following summarizes the benefits and challenges of each of the alternatives considered for the US 75 South Focus Area:

## Alternative 1: 8th Street (US 75) Between Main Avenue (US 10) and 4th Avenue Segment Test

Under year 2045 conditions, the side-street approaches along 8th Street (US 75) intersections at the 2nd Avenue, 3rd Avenue, and 4th Avenue intersections are expected to have operational issues (average delays of more than three minutes during the p.m. peak hour). In addition, the 2nd Avenue intersection was identified to have an existing crash rate above the critical crash rate.

## Description:

- Construct a raised median along the center of 8th Street (US 75) to restrict the 2nd Avenue intersection to only allow the northbound left-turn movement.
- Install a traffic signal at the 4th Avenue intersection. A cursory review of year 2045 traffic volumes indicates that with the access restrictions at 2nd Avenue and 3rd Avenue that the traffic signal is expected to be warranted.
- The center raised median provides the opportunity for a two-stage pedestrian crossing with a pedestrian refuge island at 2nd Avenue and 3rd Avenue across 8th Street (US 75).
- Consider marking the crosswalk and adding "Stop for Pedestrian" signage or a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) at the 2nd Avenue and 3rd Avenue intersections.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Access restrictions expected to improve safety | •Coordinate with business along this segment of <br> and traffic operations |
| 8th Street (US 75) to discuss proposed access <br> Opportunities to enhance the pedestrian <br> crossings at unsignalized intersections (2nd and any impacts to delivery truck <br> circulation |  |
| Avenue and 3rd Avenue) |  |
| New signalized intersection at 4th Avenue will <br> provide an additional signalized crossing along <br> the corridor; the signal can also help transition <br> the lane alignment shifts |  |
| Access restrictions have no impacts to transit |  |

## Alternative 2: 8th Street (US 75) Lane Alignment Shifts at 4th Avenue and 5th Avenue

There are existing lane alignment shift issues along 8th Street (US 75) at 4th Avenue and 5th Avenue which cause driver confusion. During winter months, when the pavement markings are difficult to see with the snow/ice on the pavement, vehicles paths do not follow the through lane markings.

## Description:

- Modify the roadway configuration to reduce or eliminate the existing skew for northbound and southbound vehicles traveling through the 4th Avenue and 5th Avenue intersections.
- To reduce the skew, the existing on-street parking along 8th Street (US 75) was removed.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| • Reducing the existing lane alignment shifts which | • Would likely require removing the on-street |
| will reduce driver confusion traveling along the |  |
| corridor | parking <br> Due to the required right-of-way acquisition, utility <br> impact, and mature tree impacts it will be <br> challenging to remove the alignment shift <br> completely |

## Alternative 3: Add Trail on 8th Street (US 75) Between Main Avenue (US 10) and 12th Avenue

During the public engagement process, feedback was provided indicating the importance of providing a shared-use trail along 8th Street (US 75) between Main Avenue (US 10) and 12th Avenue. Currently, there is sidewalk on both the east and the west sides of 8th Street (US 75) in this segment, but there are no shared-used trails or existing on-street bike lanes to accommodate bicyclists. It should be noted that there is an existing trail on the east side of 8th Street (US 75) south of 12th Avenue.

The 12th Avenue Corridor Study recommended a shared-use trail on the south side of 12th Avenue between 5th Street and 20th Street, connecting into the existing trail at 20th Street. If trail cannot be accommodated along 8th Street (US 75) between Main Avenue (US 10) and 12th Avenue, then a trail should be considered along adjacent or nearby north/south corridors that connect to/from 12th Avenue. Two alternatives were considered:

Alternative 3A: Construct Trail on the East Side of 8th Street (US 75) between Main Avenue (US 10) and 12th Avenue

## Description:

- Construct a trail on the east side of 8th Street (US 75) between Main Avenue (US 10) and 12th Avenue.
- Construction of trail requires removal of existing mature trees within the right-of-way, relocation of existing utilities, and has right-of-way impacts.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Addresses the gap for bicyclists | In several areas there would not be space to <br> provide a boulevard between the road and the <br> shared-use trail |
|  | In several areas the purchase of permanent <br> easements of right-of-way would be needed and <br> would result in re-grading almost all residential <br> front yards |
|  | Requires removal of mature trees <br> Requires relocation of existing utilities |

Alternative $3 A$ is not feasible based impacts to right-of-way, mature trees, and utilities; therefore, it was not recommended to be carried forward or considered further.

Alternative 3B: Identify an Alternative Corridor for a North/South Pedestrian/Bicycle Connection

## Description:

- 4th Street/5th Street or 11th Street are alternative corridors for consideration. Further discussion is needed with City staff to determine an appropriate location.
- Wayfinding signage would be provided along 12th Avenue to direct pedestrians/bicyclists to the alternative route.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\bullet$ Feasibility of constructing a shared-use trail or | $\bullet$Wayfinding/signage would need to be provided <br> along 12th Avenue to direct pedestrians/ <br> on-street bike Ianes on an alternative corridor is <br> more likely |
| bicycs |  |

## Alternative 4: 8th Street (US 75)/12th Avenue Intersection

As previously noted, this intersection is also being evaluated as part of the 12th Avenue Corridor Study. Under year 2045 conditions, this intersection is expected to operate acceptably, but is nearing capacity. Queues along 8th Street (US 75) are anticipated to extend 600 feet or greater during the p.m. peak and the eastbound thru/right-turn lane and westbound left-turn lane queues are expected to extend approximately 450 feet. Due to the existing pedestrian skyway bridge and the lack of available right-of-way space, adding additional turn lanes was considered not feasible. Further, due to the high pedestrian crossing volumes at this intersection when school is in session at Concordia College, there are high number of vehicle-pedestrian conflicts for vehicles wanting to make a left- or right-turn conflicting with pedestrians in the crosswalk thereby reducing the intersection efficiency. Under year 2045 no build conditions, the existing signal timing was modified to provide additional green time for the eastbound and westbound approaches to give vehicles more green time after the walk phase has ended. This helped to reduce the eastbound and westbound queues by reducing the number of cycle failures. Two alternatives were considered:

## Alternative 4A: Install LPI and Blank Out Signage

## Description:

- Install Leading Pedestrian Interval (LPI) to allow pedestrians to start crossing before vehicles are given a green light to proceed through the intersection. Note that with LPI, protected left-turns need to be lagging. LPI can be installed at intersection with flashing yellow arrows (FYA).
- Install "No Right Turn on Red" blank out signs at the intersection. During the peak periods during the school year, it is recommended that vehicles continue to be directed to not make a right-turn on red for pedestrian safety considerations. However, when school is not in session or outside of peak hours when pedestrian crossing volume is lower, vehicles would be permitted to make rightturns on red. This could potentially reduce driver frustration through this intersection.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :---: | :---: |
| - LPI is a Federal Highway Administration (FHA) proven safety countermeasure that: Increases the visibility of crossing pedestrians <br> - Reduces the conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles <br> - Increases the likelihood of a vehicle yielding to pedestrians <br> - Provides enhanced safety for pedestrians who may be slower to start into the intersection <br> - LPI is expected to have minimal impact to the overall traffic operations at the intersection <br> - Installing no right-turn on red blank out signs is expected to reduce driver frustration and intersection operations during non-peaks | - This would be the first intersection in the City with LPI and blank out signage - coordination and troubleshooting may be needed to determine the optimal signal timing and the hours of day/time of season for the blank out signage |

Alternative 4B: Modify Eastbound Lane Geometry, Install LPI and Blank Out Signage

## Description:

- Modify the eastbound approach from a left-turn lane and shared thru/right-turn lane configuration to a shared left-turn/thru lane and right-turn lane configuration. Requires modifications to the curb to better align the eastbound/westbound through lanes and removes the eastbound left-turn protected signal phase.
- Install LPI at the intersection.
- Install "No Right Turn on Red" blank out signs at the intersection.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Lane geometry provides a small benefit on | $\bullet$Potential safety concerns with the inside left-lane <br> offsets with the eastbound left-turn/thru lane <br> intersection operations and reduces the |
| and right-turn lane configuration |  |
| eastbound queue approximately 75 feet | LPI is a Federal Highway Administration (FHA) | • Cost to modify the curb line

proven safety countermeasure that:

- Increases the visibility of crossing pedestrians
- Reduces the conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles
- Increases the likelihood of a vehicle yielding to pedestrians
- Provides enhanced safety for pedestrians who may be slower to start into the intersection
- LPI is expected to have minimal impact to the overall traffic operations at the intersection
- Installing no right-turn on red blank out signs is expected to reduce driver frustration and intersection operations during non-peaks
- Protected eastbound left-turn phasing would be removed
- This would be the first intersection in the City with LPI and blank out signage - coordination and troubleshooting may be needed to determine the optimal signal timing and the hours of day/time of season for the blank out signage


## Alternative 5: 8th Street (US 75)/20th Avenue Intersection

Under year 2045 conditions, the 8th Street (US 75)/20th Avenue intersection is expected to operate acceptably during the peak hours. No intersection crash issues were identified under existing conditions. The 20th Avenue corridor is a planned future bikeway; however, currently the bike facility type is unknown. There are existing frontage roads parallel to the east and to the west of 8th Street (US 75) between 20th Avenue and 24th Avenue. Access to the frontage road is located close to the 20th Avenue intersection, approximately 50 feet east and west of the intersection. Two alternatives were considered:

Alternative 5A: Existing Signal with Closing Both the East and West Frontage Roads at 20th Avenue

## Description:

- Close access for both frontage roads to the east and west of 8th Street (US 75) along 20th Avenue.
- Residents and visitors of the properties along the frontage roads would still be able to access the properties via 22nd Avenue.

| Benefits |
| :--- |
| - Closing the frontage road intersections at 20th |
| Avenue is expected to reduce conflicts near the |
| 8th Street (US 75) intersection and improve |
| intersection safety for vehicles and |
| pedestrian/bicyclists |
| - Residents and visitors of the properties along the |
| frontage road can still access via 22nd Avenue |

Challenges

- Coordination is needed with the property owners along the frontage road to get feedback on the proposed access closures

Alternative 5B: Construct a Multi-Lane Roundabout
Description:

- Construct a multi-lane roundabout.
- Frontage roads would likely need to be closed to accommodate roundabout footprint.

| Benefits | Challenges |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Acceptable overall operations during the peak hours <br> - Reduces delay during non-peak hours <br> - Reduces travel speeds through the intersection <br> - Closing the frontage road intersections at 20th Avenue is expected to reduce conflicts near the 8th Street (US 75) intersection and improve intersection safety for vehicles and pedestrian/bicyclists <br> - Residents and visitors of the properties along the frontage road can still access via 22nd Avenue | - Construction costs <br> - Would likely require right-of-way acquision <br> - Poor pedestrian/bicycle crossing accommodations compared to a signal <br> - Increases in the frequency of crashes expected <br> - Large roundabout footprint needed to accommodate high volume of heavy vehicles <br> - Coordination is needed with the property owners along the frontage road to get feedback on the proposed access closures |

Recommendations and additional details for the 8th Street (US 75)/21st Avenue intersection are documented in the Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE), report dated April 2020.

Appendix A
Year 2045 No Build MOEs

MOE Results


| Main Ave/5th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Movement } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | Overall Delay (sec/veh) | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 332 | 35 | 187 | 28 | C | 26.8 | C | 14.7 | B |
|  | Thru | 93 | 14 | 112 | 34.7 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 52 | 1 | 40 | 5.8 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 8 | 2 | 58 | 34.7 | C | 22.3 | C |  |  |
|  | Right | 51 | 2 | 59 | 20.4 | C |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 13 | 1 | 15 | 23.8 | C | 6.0 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 467 | 8 | 114 | 5.5 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Thru | 849 | 35 | 251 | 12.2 | B | 12.3 | B |  |  |
|  | Right | 13 | 37 | 259 | 17.4 | B |  |  |  |  |


| Main Ave/6th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ (\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}) \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 14 | 4 | 44 | 31 | C | 22.1 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 8 | 3 | 43 | 26.1 | C |  |  | 4.8 | A |
|  | Right | 11 | 4 | 45 | 7.8 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 26 | 5 | 54 | 31.7 | C | 24.9 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 7 | 5 | 50 | 29.7 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 13 | 1 | 34 | 8.8 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 20 | 0 | 22 | 8.4 | A | 5.3 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 471 | 10 | 160 | 5.0 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 36 | 11 | 166 | 6.9 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 14 | 0 | 9 | 3.3 | A | 2.8 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 840 | 6 | 141 | 2.8 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 26 | 7 | 143 | 2.7 | A |  |  |  |  |


| Main Ave/7th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2-Way Stop } \\ \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Overall } \\ \text { LOS } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | Overall Delay (sec/veh) |  |
| Northbound | Left | 12 | 2 | 39 | 26 | D | 19.9 | C | 0.6 | A |
|  | Right | 8 | 1 | 39 | 10.0 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Thru | 497 | 0 | 1 | 0.4 | A | 0.4 | A |  |  |
|  | Right | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0.9 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 19 | 0 | 17 | 2.8 | A | 0.4 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 866 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | A |  |  |  |  |


| Main Ave/8th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | Movement LOS | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 352 | 47 | 264 | 23 | C | 21.9 | C | 23.4 | C |
|  | Thru | 411 | 33 | 196 | 24.8 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 84 | 0 | 28 | 1.6 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 8 | 1 | 20 | 35.0 | D | 41.3 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 201 | 25 | 191 | 44.6 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 57 | 27 | 195 | 30.4 | C |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 62 | 7 | 66 | 26.7 | C | 19.1 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 258 | 24 | 124 | 25.9 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 183 | 6 | 108 | 7.0 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 139 | 13 | 126 | 20.8 | C | 21.3 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 474 | 34 | 220 | 21.5 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 21 | 35 | 223 | 18.7 | B |  |  |  |  |

MOE Results

| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | Movement LOS | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northbound | Left | 21 | 2 | 34 | 16 | B | 14.0 | B | 16.3 | B |
|  | Thru | 43 | 4 | 52 | 19.8 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 30 | 0 | 30 | 4.2 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 35 | 18 | 247 | 35.2 | D | 27.1 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 145 | 17 | 239 | 31.7 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 118 | 4 | 109 | 19.0 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 74 | 4 | 66 | 15.0 | B | 13.2 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 187 | 9 | 91 | 13.0 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 26 | 9 | 93 | 9.5 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 78 | 4 | 61 | 11.8 | B | 12.8 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 496 | 23 | 160 | 13.2 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 42 | 25 | 162 | 9.9 | A |  |  |  |  |


| Center Ave/8th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ (\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}) \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 99 | 5 | 117 | 21 | C | 25.4 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 320 | 26 | 223 | 27.5 | C |  |  | 20.2 | C |
|  | Right | 78 | 25 | 222 | 22.5 | C |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 6 | 0 | 15 | 25.3 | C | 32.9 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 163 | 10 | 110 | 34.1 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 22 | 11 | 110 | 26.8 | C |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 12 | 1 | 35 | 23.9 | C | 13.3 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 158 | 11 | 121 | 13.1 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 32 | 12 | 123 | 10.5 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 75 | 5 | 77 | 16.7 | B | 13.3 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 416 | 17 | 172 | 12.5 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 27 | 19 | 178 | 15.4 | B |  |  |  |  |



| Center Ave/14th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ (\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 15 | 37 | 225 | 56 | E | 43.8 | D | 21.5 |  |
|  | Thru | 142 | 38 | 230 | 51.8 | D |  |  |  | C |
|  | Right | 39 | 0 | 14 | 10.2 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 7 | 19 | 148 | 42.3 | D | 50.3 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 115 | 21 | 157 | 51.7 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 16 | 19 | 155 | 43.4 | D |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 8 | 1 | 16 | 23.6 | C | 12.7 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 245 | 12 | 123 | 12.3 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 7 | 0 | 18 | 12.9 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 93 | 5 | 77 | 13.0 | B | 11.9 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 528 | 19 | 186 | 11.4 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 8 | 34 | 232 | 32.1 | C |  |  |  |  |

MOE Results

| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue (ft) | Maximum Queue (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Movement } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Movement } \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Approach } \\ & \text { Los } \end{aligned}$ | Overall Delay (sec/veh) | Overall LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northbound | Left | 73 | 71 | 255 | 39 | D | 26.5 | C | 26.3 | C |
|  | Thru | 479 | 71 | 255 | 36.2 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 246 | 1 | 49 | 3.8 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 120 | 49 | 181 | 40.3 | D | 39.2 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 240 | 49 | 181 | 39.5 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 7 | 20 | 154 | 7.0 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 15 | 5 | 42 | 55.8 | E | 26.7 | c |  |  |
|  | Thru | 225 | 26 | 160 | 28.6 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 49 | 2 | 56 | 8.7 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 467 | 80 | 231 | 51.3 | D | 22.8 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 548 | 18 | 135 | 10.5 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 434 | 11 | 139 | 7.7 | A |  |  |  |  |


| Center Ave/TH 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Southbound | Left | 68 | 23 | 124 | 45.8 | D | 18.4 | B | 8.8 | A |
|  | Right | 285 | 40 | 155 | 11.9 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 138 | 24 | 137 | 38.8 | D | 9.3 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 453 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Thru | 1,166 | 17 | 201 | 6.1 | A | 5.8 | A |  |  |
|  | Right | 86 | 0 | 10 | 1.1 | A |  |  |  |  |


| Center Ave/28th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2-Way Stop |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 18 | 0 | 5 | 21 | C | 17.0 | C | 1.2 |  |
|  | Thru | 0 | - | - | 0.0 | A |  |  |  | A |
|  | Right | 8 | 0 | 4 | 8.8 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 23 | 4 | 56 | 25.4 | D | 17.8 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 7 | 4 | 57 | 27.6 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 29 | 2 | 65 | 9.4 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 7 | 1 | 27 | 14.5 | B | 0.4 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 488 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1.1 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 6 | 0 | 23 | 4.2 | A | 0.5 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 1,241 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0.9 | A |  |  |  |  |




MOE Results

| Center Ave/34th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | Movement LOS | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Overall Los |
| Northbound | Left | 254 | 45 | 250 | 31 | C | 22.4 | C | 19.1 |  |
|  | Thru | 219 | 22 | 116 | 28.7 | C |  |  |  | B |
|  | Right | 258 | 9 | 109 | 8.6 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 39 | 4 | 47 | 23.2 | C | 27.0 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 155 | 23 | 98 | 38.4 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 80 | 2 | 54 | 6.7 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 80 | 4 | 62 | 15.8 | B | 15.5 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 273 | 19 | 120 | 19.7 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 117 | 2 | 68 | 5.3 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 494 | 51 | 329 | 20.3 | C | 17.2 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 897 | 47 | 268 | 17.0 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 111 | 2 | 54 | 4.6 | A |  |  |  |  |


| 8th St/2nd St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2-Way Stop |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 143 | 2 | 67 | 6 | A | 2.7 | A | 5.6 | A |
|  | Thru | 836 | 29 | 148 | 2.2 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 94 | 1 | 23 | 2.4 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 21 | 1 | 42 | 11.0 | B | 0.7 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 480 | 0 | 14 | 0.2 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 22 | 0 | 14 | 0.8 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 8 | 16 | 103 | 58.6 | F | 40.6 | E |  |  |
|  | Thru | 22 | 16 | 102 | 65.5 | F |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 58 | 20 | 116 | 28.7 | D |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 21 | 11 | 66 | 77.2 | F | 65.1 | F |  |  |
|  | Thru | 14 | 11 | 65 | 60.5 | F |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 7 | 13 | 74 | 37.9 | E |  |  |  |  |


| 8th St/4th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | Overall Delay (sec/veh) | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 25 | 0 | 25 | 7 | A | 2.7 | A | 3.9 | A |
|  | Thru | 1,100 | 0 | 0 | 2.6 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 32 | 0 | 0 | 2.9 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 8 | 0 | 15 | 11.1 | B | 2.0 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 586 | 0 | 8 | 1.9 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 8 | 0 | 8 | 1.7 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 8 | 3 | 46 | 42.8 | E | 31.5 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 13 | 3 | 47 | 41.9 | E |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 13 | 3 | 47 | 14.0 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 18 | 6 | 60 | 44.1 | E | 32.0 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 7 | 6 | 61 | 42.4 | E |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 27 | 6 | 61 | 21.3 | C |  |  |  |  |


| 8th St/7th Ave |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | Movement LOS | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | Overall Delay (sec/veh) | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 67 | 2 | 61 | 14 | B | 11.3 | B | 12.9 | B |
|  | Thru | 1,159 | 46 | 439 | 11.1 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 91 | 47 | 445 | 11.6 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 25 | 1 | 21 | 14.1 | B | 9.8 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 589 | 16 | 166 | 9.7 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 18 | 17 | 169 | 8.4 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 21 | 19 | 122 | 37.0 | D | 26.0 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 59 | 19 | 120 | 31.8 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 63 | 23 | 129 | 16.8 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 49 | 18 | 111 | 42.0 | D | 35.9 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 28 | 18 | 110 | 34.7 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 18 | 20 | 114 | 20.9 | C |  |  |  |  |


| 8th St/10th Av |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2-Way Stop |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Movement } \\ & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (sec/veh) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Thru | 1,275 | 22 | 344 | 4.4 | A | 4.4 | A | 4.5 | A |
|  | Right | 71 | 0 | 5 | 4.3 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 20 | 10 | 167 | 17.5 | C | 4.0 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 680 | 7 | 150 | 3.6 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 9 | 5 | 60 | 32.2 | D | 15.7 | C |  |  |
|  | Right | 45 | 3 | 48 | 12.4 | B |  |  |  |  |

2045 AM No Build

## MOE Results




Note: Results are the average of ten (10) simulation runs

MOE Results


| Main Ave/5th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | Movement LOS | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | Overall Delay (sec/veh) | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 226 | 27 | 134 | 31 | C | 27.8 | C | 15.1 | B |
|  | Thru | 84 | 17 | 124 | 41.8 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 105 | 4 | 62 | 9.3 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 57 | 26 | 182 | 67.8 | E | 54.8 | D |  |  |
|  | Right | 59 | 27 | 185 | 42.2 | D |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 33 | 2 | 33 | 20.8 | C | 9.4 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 1,092 | 34 | 309 | 9.1 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Thru | 724 | 27 | 212 | 10.5 | B | 10.7 | B |  |  |
|  | Right | 41 | 28 | 215 | 13.1 | B |  |  |  |  |


| Main Ave/6th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ (\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}) \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 39 | 9 | 77 | 26 | C | 20.3 | C | 9.0 |  |
|  | Thru | 20 | 9 | 77 | 25.0 | C |  |  |  | A |
|  | Right | 35 | 10 | 80 | 11.6 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 76 | 19 | 115 | 32.7 | C | 26.0 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 34 | 19 | 115 | 31.6 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 41 | 2 | 47 | 8.9 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 28 | 1 | 24 | 8.5 | A | 8.2 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 1,170 | 38 | 322 | 8.2 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 50 | 39 | 327 | 8.4 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 35 | 1 | 32 | 11.4 | B | 5.4 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 688 | 11 | 162 | 5.1 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 33 | 12 | 170 | 5.0 | A |  |  |  |  |


| Main Ave/7th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2-Way Stop } \\ \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Overall } \\ \text { LOS } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Northbound | Left | 8 | 4 | 47 | 61 | F | 32.5 | D | 3.3 | A |
|  | Right | 19 | 4 | 47 | 20.4 | C |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Thru | 1,253 | 14 | 199 | 4.1 | A | 4.1 | A |  |  |
|  | Right | 19 | 16 | 218 | 2.7 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 23 | 2 | 34 | 18.7 | C | 0.9 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 749 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | A |  |  |  |  |


| Main Ave/8th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | Movement LOS | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 303 | 85 | 318 | 43 | D | 34.5 | C | 35.8 | D |
|  | Thru | 405 | 54 | 244 | 39.3 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 159 | 4 | 84 | 5.4 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 33 | 5 | 66 | 39.0 | D | 45.3 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 450 | 76 | 370 | 46.4 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 61 | 78 | 373 | 40.3 | D |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 170 | 47 | 257 | 47.2 | D | 32.9 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 797 | 116 | 371 | 36.8 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 304 | 23 | 218 | 14.6 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 196 | 45 | 225 | 46.1 | D | 35.2 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 412 | 40 | 199 | 30.5 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 41 | 42 | 201 | 30.8 | C |  |  |  |  |

MOE Results

| Main Ave/11th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ (\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}) \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 54 | 5 | 64 | 19 | B | 19.8 | B | 21.3 | C |
|  | Thru | 101 | 14 | 101 | 28.3 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 57 | 1 | 39 | 5.8 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 46 | 40 | 362 | 39.0 | D | 28.9 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 236 | 40 | 361 | 32.5 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 128 | 5 | 103 | 18.8 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 151 | 21 | 196 | 28.0 | C | 20.7 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 636 | 58 | 349 | 19.4 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 104 | 59 | 352 | 17.8 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 49 | 2 | 43 | 16.1 | B | 16.7 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 395 | 26 | 156 | 17.1 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 48 | 27 | 158 | 13.8 | B |  |  |  |  |


| Center Ave/8th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement <br> Delay (sec/veh) | Movement LOS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Approach } \\ & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (sec/veh) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Approach LOS | Overall Delay (sec/veh) | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 93 | 12 | 169 | 28 | C | 32.2 | C | 29.9 | C |
|  | Thru | 338 | 57 | 318 | 35.5 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 186 | 56 | 319 | 28.1 | C |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 13 | 1 | 22 | 46.8 | D | 61.0 | E |  |  |
|  | Thru | 259 | 40 | 248 | 62.8 | E |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 29 | 41 | 252 | 51.3 | D |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 33 | 3 | 40 | 23.1 | C | 20.7 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 673 | 61 | 308 | 20.2 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 156 | 63 | 310 | 22.5 | C |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 131 | 28 | 177 | 43.1 | D | 23.0 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 270 | 14 | 131 | 13.5 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 13 | 15 | 138 | 16.4 | B |  |  |  |  |




MOE Results


| Center Ave/TH 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Southbound | Left | 102 | 34 | 152 | 52.4 | D | 20.0 | B | 11.9 | B |
|  | Right | 360 | 54 | 183 | 10.8 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 284 | 57 | 219 | 50.5 | D | 8.2 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 1,572 | 0 | 0 | 0.6 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Thru | 883 | 33 | 234 | 16.3 | B | 15.2 | B |  |  |
|  | Right | 106 | 0 | 33 | 6.0 | A |  |  |  |  |


| Center Ave/28th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2-Way Stop |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 14 | 0 | 4 | 64 | F | 46.6 | E |  |  |
|  | Thru | 0 | - | - | 0.0 | A |  |  | 2.3 | A |
|  | Right | 7 | 0 | 5 | 11.4 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 43 | 5 | 66 | 38.8 | E | 27.1 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 9 | 5 | 65 | 52.3 | F |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 39 | 2 | 69 | 8.4 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 38 | 3 | 57 | 11.4 | B | 1.3 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 1,609 | 0 | 0 | 1.1 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1.8 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 7 | 7 | 88 | 33.6 | D | 0.6 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 908 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 33 | 0 | 0 | 1.0 | A |  |  |  |  |



| Center Ave/32nd St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (sec/veh) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 134 | 27 | 156 | 36 | D | 27.8 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 19 | 9 | 99 | 39.5 | D |  |  | 18.8 | B |
|  | Right | 103 | 11 | 103 | 15.1 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 60 | 10 | 76 | 33.8 | C | 26.9 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 27 | 10 | 91 | 41.4 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 66 | 12 | 96 | 14.8 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 123 | 6 | 97 | 13.3 | B | 18.7 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 1,262 | 95 | 490 | 20.6 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 136 | 2 | 57 | 5.6 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 49 | 2 | 47 | 18.8 | B | 14.7 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 725 | 33 | 206 | 14.9 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 29 | 0 | 27 | 3.6 | A |  |  |  |  |

## MOE Results

| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue (ft) | Maximum Queue (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Approach } \\ & \text { Los } \end{aligned}$ | Overall Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northbound | Left | 162 | 28 | 168 | 33 | C | 29.7 | C | 23.0 | C |
|  | Thru | 377 | 60 | 227 | 44.0 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 373 | 28 | 189 | 14.0 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 251 | 61 | 251 | 44.1 | D | 34.7 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 382 | 53 | 192 | 40.8 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 172 | 5 | 77 | 7.4 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 239 | 12 | 119 | 13.7 | B | 14.3 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 903 | 48 | 341 | 16.7 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 264 | 5 | 109 | 6.5 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 343 | 46 | 262 | 27.8 | C | 19.4 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 477 | 24 | 153 | 16.2 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 95 | 2 | 53 | 4.9 | A |  |  |  |  |



| 8th St/4th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2-Way Sto |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | Movement LOS | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 38 | 2 | 38 | 19 | C | 8.0 | A | 12.0 | B |
|  | Thru | 1,017 | 0 | 3 | 7.6 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 40 | 0 | 2 | 6.6 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 39 | 1 | 37 | 13.9 | B | 8.6 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 1,058 | 0 | 21 | 8.4 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 26 | 0 | 21 | 9.5 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 12 | 49 | 130 | 235.7 | F | 143.5 | F |  |  |
|  | Thru | 7 | 42 | 120 | 146.4 | F |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 32 | 46 | 123 | 108.2 | F |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 7 | 7 | 40 | 133.2 | F | 88.5 | F |  |  |
|  | Thru | 0 | - | - | 0.0 | A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 11 | 7 | 39 | 60.1 | F |  |  |  |  |


| 8th St/7th Ave |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Movement } \\ & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (sec/veh) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 58 | 3 | 67 | 20 | C | 11.7 | B | 17.5 | B |
|  | Thru | 997 | 40 | 416 | 11.2 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 56 | 42 | 422 | 11.2 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 38 | 2 | 37 | 30.3 | C | 19.8 | B |  |  |
|  | Thru | 1,099 | 131 | 438 | 19.4 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 13 | 137 | 447 | 21.0 | C |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 34 | 20 | 133 | 30.6 | C | 23.9 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 64 | 20 | 133 | 28.1 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 63 | 24 | 142 | 16.1 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 91 | 33 | 173 | 37.4 | D | 33.4 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 47 | 33 | 174 | 35.0 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 39 | 35 | 176 | 22.1 | C |  |  |  |  |


| 8th St/10th Ave |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2-Way Stop |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume <br> (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | Movement LOS | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ (\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}) \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Thru | 1,049 | 13 | 244 | 3.2 | A | 3.2 | A | 5.6 | A |
|  | Right | 39 | 0 | 3 | 3.4 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 12 | 21 | 266 | 11.5 | B | 6.6 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 1,232 | 22 | 259 | 6.5 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 21 | 12 | 90 | 42.6 | E | 21.8 | C |  |  |
|  | Right | 66 | 8 | 77 | 15.2 | C |  |  |  |  |


| 8th St/12th Ave |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Signa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach <br> Delay <br> (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Overall } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Overall LOS |
| Northbound | Left | 145 | 36 | 176 | 51 | D | 42.6 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 915 | 168 | 645 | 41.1 | D |  |  |  | D |
|  | Right | 135 | 168 | 645 | 43.9 | D |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 94 | 18 | 110 | 52.8 | D | 45.3 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 1,054 | 207 | 641 | 44.6 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 94 | 208 | 642 | 45.4 | D |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 67 | 9 | 71 | 36.2 | D | 51.4 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 217 | 121 | 448 | 54.2 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 112 | 122 | 448 | 55.2 | E |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 288 | 107 | 467 | 53.2 | D | 43.1 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 175 | 26 | 157 | 31.5 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 106 | 20 | 117 | 34.8 | C |  |  |  |  |



Note: Results are the average of ten (10) simulation runs

Appendix B
Year 2045 Build MOEs

## Downtown Focus Area

## - Consideration of 3-lane roadway on

 8th between Center and Main:- A.M. Peak hour operations are anticipated to be acceptable
- During the P.M. Peak hour, EB movements will break down at the Main Avenue/4th Avenue intersection, not allowing vehicles through the network which causes model failure
- During the P.M. Peak Hour, the Southbound queue at the Main

Table 1. 2045-3-Lane Alternative Operations

| Intersection | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/4th Street | A | 9 sec. | F | 102 sec. |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/5th Street | C | 23 sec. | E | 69 sec. |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/6th Street | A | 8 sec. | C | 24 sec. |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/7th Street (1) | $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{D}$ | 32 sec. | $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{F}$ | 201 sec. |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/8th Street (US 75) | C | 30 sec. | F | 81 sec. |
| Center Avenue (US 10/US 75)/8th Street | B | 19 sec. | F | $\mathbf{1 6 5 ~ s e c .}$ |

(1) Indicates an unsignalized intersection with side-street stop control, where the overall LOS is shown followed by the worst side-street approach LOS. The delay shown represents the worst side-street approach delay, Avenue/8th Street intersection will queue into the Center Avenue/8th Street intersection, impacting operations

## Downtown Focus Area

## - Consideration of 3-lane roadway

 on Main between River and 8th:- A.M. Peak hour operations are anticipated to be acceptable
- Main Avenue/5th Street intersection will be the most challenging with NBL queues extending beyond 2nd Avenue
- During the P.M. Peak hour, EB movements will break down at the Main Avenue/4th Avenue intersection, not allowing vehicles through the network which causes model failure

Table 1. 2045-3-Lane Alternative Operations

| Intersection | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/4th Street | A | 9 sec. | F | 102 sec. |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/5th Street | C | 23 sec. | E | 69 sec. |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/6th Street | A | 8 sec. | C | 24 sec. |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/7th Street (1) | $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{D}$ | 32 sec. | $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{F}$ | 201 sec. |
| Main Avenue (US 10)/8th Street (US 75) | C | 30 sec. | F | 81 sec. |
| Center Avenue (US 10/US 75)/8th Street | B | 19 sec. | F | $\mathbf{1 6 5 ~ s e c .}$ |

(1) Indicates an unsignalized intersection with side-street stop control, where the overall LOS is shown followed by the worst side-street approach LOS. The delay shown represents the worst side street approach delay.

## Downtown Focus Area

- Consideration of 3-lane roadway on Main between River and 8th:
- Congestion expected eastbound for $\sim 7$ hours



## Downtown Focus Area

- Consideration of 3-lane roadway on Main between River and 8th:
- Congestion expected westbound for $\sim 1$ hour
- Nearing capacity westbound for $\sim 5$ hours

Traffic Volume Profile - Main Avenue - East of 2nd Street (Westbound)


70: 8th St \& Center Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 9.9 | 12.4 | 13.5 | 14.9 | 12.8 |

80: 11th St \& Center Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 8.7 | 9.2 | 25.4 | 30.5 | 15.9 |

Total Zone Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.4 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1142.9 |

Intersection: 70: 8th St \& Center Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | $R$ | L | T | $R$ | L | T | TR | L | T | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 44 | 130 | 49 | 174 | 266 | 109 | 121 | 165 | 181 | 29 | 106 | 69 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 9 | 53 | 15 | 45 | 127 | 15 | 44 | 57 | 77 | 8 | 44 | 26 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 33 | 104 | 41 | 127 | 236 | 62 | 97 | 124 | 157 | 26 | 84 | 57 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 449 |  |  | 1193 |  |  | 345 | 345 |  | 613 | 613 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 150 | 100 |  | 75 | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 100 |  | 150 |  | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 2 |  |  | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |

Intersection: 80: 11th St \& Center Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | TR | L | T | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 63 | 126 | 30 | 107 | 258 | 23 | 46 | 76 | 90 | 61 | 109 | 223 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 15 | 50 | 6 | 25 | 94 | 2 | 14 | 33 | 45 | 17 | 20 | 108 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 47 | 109 | 25 | 72 | 206 | 15 | 40 | 65 | 77 | 48 | 61 | 185 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1193 |  |  | 1229 | 1229 |  | 359 | 359 |  | 1064 | 1064 |
| Upstream BIk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 125 |  | 125 | 175 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |

## Zone Summary

Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 16

70: 8th St \& Center Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(s)$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 20.2 | 19.1 | 27.1 | 27.0 | 22.8 |

80: 11th St \& Center Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 14.4 | 12.3 | 20.9 | 31.3 | 17.8 |

Total Zone Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.4 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1575.9 |

Intersection: 70: 8th St \& Center Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | TR | L | T | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 174 | 458 | 225 | 173 | 280 | 104 | 124 | 223 | 265 | 46 | 176 | 144 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 34 | 279 | 97 | 82 | 101 | 8 | 57 | 97 | 134 | 9 | 86 | 47 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 124 | 459 | 242 | 155 | 221 | 50 | 119 | 185 | 234 | 32 | 148 | 110 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 449 |  |  | 1193 |  |  | 345 | 345 |  | 613 | 613 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 100 |  | 150 | 100 |  | 75 | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 32 |  | 6 | 11 |  | 1 | 9 |  |  | 7 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 62 |  | 17 | 16 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 1 |  |

Intersection: 80: 11th St \& Center Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | TR | L | T | R | L | T | TR | L | T | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 109 | 381 | 175 | 140 | 268 | 48 | 59 | 113 | 169 | 53 | 111 | 268 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 19 | 126 | 103 | 41 | 106 | 3 | 11 | 51 | 82 | 15 | 27 | 131 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 64 | 268 | 185 | 97 | 222 | 21 | 39 | 92 | 139 | 43 | 80 | 218 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1193 |  |  | 1229 | 1229 |  | 359 | 359 |  | 1064 | 1064 |
| Upstream BIk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 125 |  | 125 | 175 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 5 | 5 |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 26 | 20 |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## Zone Summary

Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 163

## 50: 8th St \& Main Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 15.0 | 19.4 | 15.0 | 26.7 | 17.0 |

70: 8th St \& Center Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 9.3 | 14.0 | 14.1 | 15.2 | 13.4 |

Total Zone Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.3 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 145.6 |

Intersection: 50: 8th St \& Main Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | R | L | T | TR | L | T | R | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 71 | 140 | 117 | 110 | 172 | 193 | 208 | 298 | 265 | 222 | 31 | 250 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 20 | 72 | 49 | 51 | 82 | 91 | 107 | 143 | 113 | 13 | 4 | 102 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 48 | 128 | 99 | 91 | 141 | 171 | 177 | 239 | 213 | 97 | 21 | 187 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 678 | 678 |  |  | 1201 | 1201 | 2347 | 2347 |  |  | 344 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 150 |  |  | 175 | 250 |  |  |  |  | 175 | 150 |  |
| Storage BIk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  | 0 |

Intersection: 70: 8th St \& Center Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | TR | L | TR | L | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 35 | 134 | 41 | 150 | 316 | 117 | 233 | 31 | 132 | 36 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 6 | 46 | 9 | 29 | 141 | 44 | 80 | 5 | 54 | 10 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 26 | 99 | 29 | 92 | 263 | 104 | 176 | 22 | 98 | 33 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 448 |  |  | 1211 |  | 344 |  | 624 | 624 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 150 | 100 |  | 100 |  | 100 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 100 |  | 150 |  | 10 | 0 | 4 |  | 1 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 1 |  |  | 5 | 1 | 4 |  | 0 |  |

## Zone Summary

Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 15

## 50: 8th St \& Main Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 37.1 | 40.7 | 43.2 | 91.0 | 45.6 |

70: 8th St \& Center Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 22.8 | 26.1 | 31.3 | 84.2 | 31.7 |

Total Zone Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 1.2 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 688.8 |

Intersection: 50: 8th St \& Main Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | R | L | T | TR | L | T | R | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 225 | 522 | 536 | 215 | 349 | 480 | 237 | 562 | 511 | 225 | 174 | 365 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 115 | 287 | 301 | 159 | 225 | 134 | 112 | 317 | 165 | 53 | 60 | 320 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 255 | 458 | 490 | 275 | 349 | 321 | 192 | 549 | 347 | 193 | 169 | 421 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 678 | 678 |  |  | 1201 | 1201 | 2347 | 2347 |  |  | 344 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 108 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 150 |  |  | 175 | 250 |  |  |  |  | 175 | 150 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 0 | 38 | 28 | 0 | 18 | 0 |  |  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 42 | 90 | 0 | 37 | 0 |  |  | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

Intersection: 70: 8th St \& Center Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | TR | L | TR | L | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 174 | 441 | 225 | 170 | 259 | 124 | 339 | 149 | 435 | 44 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 24 | 265 | 115 | 70 | 110 | 63 | 174 | 14 | 155 | 12 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 104 | 424 | 263 | 141 | 217 | 131 | 316 | 67 | 352 | 37 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 448 |  |  | 1211 |  | 344 | 624 | 624 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 100 |  | 150 | 100 |  | 100 |  | 100 |  |  |
| Storage BIk Time (\%) |  | 28 | 3 | 13 | 9 | 1 | 24 |  | 37 | 5 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 52 | 20 | 38 | 7 | 3 | 21 |  |  |  |

## Zone Summary

Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 474

## 20: 5th St \& Main Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 5.3 | 7.5 | 27.4 | 21.7 | 12.5 |

Intersection: 20: 5th St \& Main Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | T | TR | L | T | R | LT | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 35 | 99 | 116 | 182 | 191 | 272 | 183 | 115 | 75 | 63 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 7 | 34 | 44 | 74 | 88 | 160 | 61 | 26 | 26 | 29 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 27 | 78 | 97 | 145 | 160 | 243 | 133 | 67 | 62 | 57 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 283 | 283 | 298 | 298 |  | 700 |  | 358 | 358 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  | 250 |  | 100 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 90 | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |

## 20: 5th St \& Main Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied DelVeh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 5.5 | 7.7 | 23.2 | 30.1 | 10.7 |

Intersection: 20: 5th St \& Main Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | T | TR | L | T | $R$ | LT | R |
| Maximum Queue ( ft$)$ | 52 | 205 | 182 | 127 | 164 | 218 | 106 | 101 | 173 | 69 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 16 | 56 | 63 | 61 | 77 | 111 | 53 | 45 | 72 | 28 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 43 | 146 | 147 | 118 | 140 | 182 | 92 | 86 | 137 | 59 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 283 | 283 | 298 | 298 |  | 700 |  | 358 | 358 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  |  |  | 200 |  | 200 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 90 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 10: 4th St \& Main Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 4.3 | 9.2 | 35.6 | 31.6 | 9.6 |

## 20: 5th St \& Main Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 0.9 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 7.0 | 13.4 | 42.6 | 23.7 | 19.6 |

## 30: 6th St \& Main Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 3.6 | 6.2 | 28.8 | 33.4 | 6.5 |

50: 8th St \& Main Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 10.6 | 19.7 | 41.5 | 32.6 | 29.2 |

Total Zone Performance

| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 1.8 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 317.9 |

Intersection: 10: 4th St \& Main Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | TR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 39 | 165 | 106 | 150 | 318 | 138 | 95 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 10 | 57 | 24 | 22 | 194 | 63 | 38 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 34 | 124 | 66 | 90 | 360 | 118 | 77 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1242 |  |  | 300 | 736 | 942 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 200 | 130 | 24 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 210 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 | 0 |  | 11 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  |  |

Intersection: 20: 5th St \& Main Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | TR | TR | L | T | R | L | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 61 | 216 | 306 | 343 | 409 | 70 | 83 | 56 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 11 | 82 | 196 | 213 | 79 | 24 | 19 | 32 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 43 | 164 | 350 | 338 | 240 | 56 | 61 | 59 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 300 | 296 |  | 712 |  | 931 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 90 |  |  | 300 |  | 115 |  | 25 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 4 | 23 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 19 |

Intersection: 30: 6th St \& Main Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | TR | L | TR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 46 | 140 | 67 | 252 | 49 | 81 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 14 | 45 | 9 | 110 | 22 | 35 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 41 | 113 | 44 | 241 | 50 | 72 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 296 |  | 312 | 719 | 913 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 175 |  | 150 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  | 4 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  | 1 |  |  |

Intersection: 50: 8th St \& Main Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 106 | 213 | 143 | 258 | 373 | 45 | 400 | 790 | 432 | 65 | 205 | 75 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 26 | 95 | 48 | 83 | 173 | 10 | 265 | 300 | 46 | 6 | 98 | 40 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 70 | 175 | 94 | 165 | 315 | 35 | 435 | 842 | 383 | 36 | 188 | 89 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 309 |  |  | 1201 | 1201 |  | 2360 | 2360 |  | 345 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 150 |  | 175 | 300 |  |  | 300 |  |  | 150 |  | 50 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  | 25 | 0 |  |  | 35 | 1 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  | 71 | 0 |  |  | 18 | 1 |

## Zone Summary

[^0]
## 10: 4th St \& Main Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 511.9 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 297.8 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 181.5 | 7.2 | 62.0 | 58.1 | 101.7 |

## 20: 5th St \& Main Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.2 | 120.0 | 7.7 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 37.5 | 5.9 | 70.7 | 804.6 | 69.4 |

## 30: 6th St \& Main Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 31.9 | 4.3 | 45.5 | 45.8 | 23.8 |

40: 7th St \& Main Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 21.3 | 1.9 | 201.4 | 17.0 |

50: 8th St \& Main Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 38.2 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 8.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 30.8 | 121.5 | 86.3 | 136.4 | 81.1 |

Total Zone Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 318.4 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1517.8 |

Intersection: 10: 4th St \& Main Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | TR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 259 | 2299 | 275 | 190 | 307 | 126 | 259 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 75 | 2120 | 266 | 48 | 132 | 47 | 147 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 246 | 2759 | 337 | 117 | 270 | 100 | 234 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 2244 |  |  | 300 | 736 | 931 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 56 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 210 |  | 250 | 130 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 54 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 287 | 6 | 0 | 4 |  |  |

Intersection: 20: 5th St \& Main Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | TR | L | T | R | L | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 164 | 318 | 228 | 325 | 409 | 160 | 805 | 50 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 44 | 302 | 94 | 166 | 148 | 99 | 505 | 23 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 151 | 339 | 177 | 303 | 431 | 183 | 1048 | 63 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 300 | 297 |  | 713 |  | 919 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 14 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 27 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 162 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 90 |  |  | 300 |  | 115 |  | 25 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 61 |  | 1 | 2 | 31 | 92 | 10 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 21 |  | 1 | 8 | 94 | 50 | 5 |

Intersection: 30: 6th St \& Main Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | TR | L | TR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 250 | 319 | 59 | 199 | 150 | 199 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 52 | 310 | 17 | 70 | 74 | 108 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 202 | 318 | 49 | 151 | 129 | 180 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 297 |  | 311 | 719 | 888 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 24 |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 302 |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 175 |  | 150 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 55 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 15 |  | 0 |  |  |

Intersection: 40: 7th St \& Main Ave

| Movement | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | TR | L | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 326 | 53 | 142 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 307 | 12 | 59 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 370 | 39 | 134 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 311 |  | 833 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 13 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 173 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 85 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 50: 8th St \& Main Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 225 | 327 | 215 | 375 | 1034 | 837 | 385 | 1120 | 959 | 174 | 361 | 75 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 96 | 314 | 173 | 301 | 558 | 207 | 315 | 627 | 282 | 48 | 342 | 32 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 237 | 328 | 288 | 471 | 1258 | 873 | 470 | 1625 | 1098 | 169 | 399 | 86 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 311 |  |  | 1201 | 1201 |  | 2360 | 2360 |  | 345 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 25 |  |  | 5 | 1 |  | 0 |  |  | 47 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 324 |  |  | 17 | 3 |  | 0 |  |  | 184 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 150 |  | 175 | 300 |  |  | 300 |  |  | 150 |  | 50 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 0 | 48 | 0 | 54 | 1 |  | 42 | 2 |  | 0 | 85 | 1 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 206 | 1 | 227 | 2 |  | 117 | 8 |  | 0 | 67 | 2 |

## Zone Summary

Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 2288

100: 21st St/1st Ave \& Center Ave Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 60.1 | 34.0 | 40.7 | 43.1 | 44.1 |

Intersection: 100: 21st St/1st Ave \& Center Ave

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | R | L | L | T | T | R | LT | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 229 | 538 | 540 | 297 | 279 | 306 | 166 | 168 | 115 | 440 | 612 | 300 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 32 | 315 | 312 | 65 | 169 | 183 | 67 | 78 | 25 | 158 | 221 | 235 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 123 | 480 | 488 | 243 | 253 | 268 | 133 | 142 | 71 | 309 | 492 | 348 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 2577 | 2577 |  |  |  | 682 | 682 |  | 1608 | 1608 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 275 |  |  | 275 | 350 | 350 |  |  | 300 |  |  | 200 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 20 | 18 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 24 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 5 | 16 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 43 |

Intersection: 100: 21st St/1st Ave \& Center Ave

| Movement | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | LT | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 299 | 341 | 72 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 184 | 207 | 5 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 275 | 312 | 34 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 784 | 784 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 61 | 0 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 4 | 0 |

2045 AM Build - Alternative 3B - Modify with Protected/Permitted Left-Turn Phasing US 10/US 75 VISSIM Analysis
MOE Results

Center Ave/1st Ave/21st St

| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | Movement LOS | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS |  | Overall LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northbound | Left | 72 | 15 | 125 | 41 | D | 27.5 | C | (sec/veh) |  |
|  | Thru | 476 | 55 | 238 | 32.4 | C |  |  | 27.2 | C |
|  | Right | 246 | 15 | 148 | 13.9 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 120 | 20 | 91 | 38.2 | D | 35.8 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 239 | 53 | 230 | 35.0 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 8 | 50 | 231 | 23.3 | C |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 15 | 4 | 34 | 47.6 | D | 23.6 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 226 | 19 | 116 | 25.4 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 49 | 3 | 93 | 7.9 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 464 | 61 | 216 | 41.0 | D | 25.5 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 545 | 27 | 173 | 16.4 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 428 | 44 | 297 | 20.4 | C |  |  |  |  |

## 2045 PM Build - Alternative 3B - Modify with Protected/Permitted Left-Turn Phasing US 10/US 75 VISSIM Analysis <br> MOE Results

Center Ave/1st Ave/21st St

| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Maximum Queue <br> (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS | Overall Delay (sec/veh) | Overall LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northbound | Left | 25 | 6 | 57 | 46 | D | 28.5 | C | 33.3 | C |
|  | Thru | 343 | 50 | 256 | 37.0 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 573 | 79 | 347 | 22.6 | C |  |  |  |  |
| Southbound | Left | 398 | 98 | 293 | 62.0 | E | 51.1 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 235 | 53 | 230 | 33.5 | C |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 8 | 51 | 232 | 25.2 | C |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 24 | 6 | 54 | 49.3 | D | 37.1 | D |  |  |
|  | Thru | 904 | 127 | 456 | 39.3 | D |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 87 | 5 | 107 | 11.0 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Left | 519 | 60 | 214 | 37.0 | D | 24.5 | C |  |  |
|  | Thru | 470 | 21 | 135 | 14.9 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | 246 | 18 | 160 | 16.3 | B |  |  |  |  |


| HCS7 Roundabouts Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  |  |  |  |  |  | Site Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analyst | Brent Clark |  |  |  |  |  | Intersection |  |  |  | US 10/21st St/1st Ave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agency or Co. | SRF Consulting |  |  |  |  |  | E/W Street Name |  |  |  | US 10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date Performed | 1/22/2020 |  |  |  |  |  | N/S Street Name |  |  |  | 21st St/1st Ave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |  |  |  |  |  | Analysis Time Period (hrs) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time Analyzed | 2045 AM - Alternative 3C |  |  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Factor |  |  |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description | US 10/21st St/1st Ave |  |  |  |  |  | Jurisdiction |  |  |  | US 10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |  |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Number of Lanes (N) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Lane Assignment | LT |  | TR |  | LT |  | TR |  | LT |  | TR |  | LT |  | TR |  |
| Volume (V), veh/h | 0 | 13 | 236 | 47 | 0 | 472 | 553 | 431 | 0 | 74 | 492 | 249 | 0 | 121 | 243 | 7 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Flow Rate (vpce), pc/h | 0 | 15 | 264 | 53 | 0 | 528 619 | 619 | 483 | 0 | 83 | 551 | 279 | 0 | 135 | 272 | 8 |
| Right-Turn Bypass | None |  |  |  | None |  |  |  | None |  |  |  | None |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Crossing, p/h | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-Up Headway Adjustment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Lane |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass | Left |  | Right | Bypass | Left | Right |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Critical Headway (s) |  |  | 4.6453 | 4.3276 |  | 4.6453 | 53 | 4.3276 |  | 4.6453 | 4.3276 |  |  | 4.6453 | 3276 |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (s) |  |  | 2.6667 | 2.5352 |  | 2.6667 | 67 | 2.5352 |  | 2.6667 | 2.5352 |  |  | 2.6667 | . 5352 |  |
| Flow Computations, Capacity and v/c Ratios |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Lane |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass | Left |  | Right | Bypass | Left | Right |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Entry Flow (ve), pc/h |  |  | 156.04 | 175.96 |  | 766.10 |  | 863.90 |  | 429.11 | 483.89 |  |  | 195.05 | 19.95 |  |
| Entry Volume veh/h |  |  | 151.50 | 170.83 |  | 743.79 |  | 838.74 |  | 416.61 | 469.80 |  |  | 189.37 | 13.54 |  |
| Circulating Flow ( $\mathrm{cc}_{\mathrm{c}}$, pc/h |  |  | 935 |  |  | 649 |  |  |  | 414 |  |  |  | 1230 |  |  |
| Exiting Flow (vex), pc/h |  |  | 678 |  |  | 710 |  |  |  | 1049 |  |  |  | 853 |  |  |
| Capacity (cpce), pc/h |  |  | 571.15 | 641.41 |  | 743.06 |  | 817.92 |  | 922.39 | 998.76 |  |  | 435.40 | 99.15 |  |
| Capacity (c), veh/h |  |  | 554.52 | 622.73 |  | 721.42 |  | 794.10 |  | 895.53 | 969.67 |  |  | 422.72 | 84.62 |  |
| v/c Ratio (x) |  |  | 0.27 | 0.27 |  | 1.03 |  | 1.06 |  | 0.47 | 0.48 |  |  | 0.45 | 0.44 |  |
| Delay and Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Lane |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass | Left |  | Right | Bypass | Left | Right |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Lane Control Delay (d), s/veh |  |  | 10.3 | 9.3 |  | 65.6 |  | 70.3 |  | 9.8 | 9.6 |  |  | 17.5 | 15.4 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | B | A |  | F |  | F |  | A | A |  |  | C | C |  |
| 95\% Queue, veh |  |  | 1.1 | 1.1 |  | 18.2 |  | 20.7 |  | 2.5 | 2.7 |  |  | 2.3 | 2.2 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  |  | 9.8 |  |  | 68.1 |  |  |  | 9.7 |  |  |  | 16.4 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | A |  |  | F |  |  |  | A |  |  |  | C |  |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS |  |  | 39.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |
| Copyright © 2020 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved. HCS TiNA Roundabouts Version 7.6 Generated: 1/22/2020 9:30:14 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



110: Center Ave/Center Ave (TH 10) Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 17.5 | 18.1 | 16.2 | 17.6 |

Intersection: 110: Center Ave/Center Ave (TH 10)

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | T | T | R | L | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 147 | 95 | 106 | 298 | 313 | 49 | 57 | 124 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 95 | 44 | 58 | 201 | 214 | 10 | 35 | 87 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 167 | 109 | 120 | 313 | 322 | 104 | 70 | 137 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 691 | 691 | 341 | 341 |  | 744 | 744 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 3 | 4 | 0 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 450 |  |  |  | 2 | 300 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |

110: Center Ave/Center Ave (TH 10) Performance by approach

| Approach | EB | WB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 17.2 | 16.5 | 21.8 | 17.7 |

Intersection: 110: Center Ave/Center Ave (TH 10)

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | T | T | L | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 277 | 151 | 182 | 315 | 263 | 158 | 208 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 176 | 61 | 71 | 174 | 147 | 73 | 98 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 264 | 127 | 147 | 282 | 243 | 135 | 175 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 700 | 700 | 334 | 334 | 752 | 752 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 475 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

2045 AM Build - Alternative 4C - Multi-Lane Roundabout US 10/US 75 VISSIM Analysis
MOE Results

| Center Ave/TH 75 Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue (ft) | Maximum Queue (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Approach } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Approach LOS | Overall Delay (sec/veh) | Overall LOS |
| Southbound | Left | 67 | 17 | 152 | 7.5 | A | 10.7 | B | 5.7 | A |
|  | Right | 286 | 17 | 152 | 11.5 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 138 | 0 | 24 | 2.6 | A | 2.0 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 453 | 0 | 24 | 1.8 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Thru | 1,153 | 5 | 178 | 6.1 | A | 6.1 | A |  |  |
|  | Right | 84 | 4 | 178 | 5.9 | A |  |  |  |  |

## 2045 Build PM - Alternative 4C - Multi-Lane Roundabout

 US 10/US 75 VISSIM AnalysisMOE Results

| Center Ave/TH 75 Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Movement | Volume (vph) | Average Queue (ft) | Maximum Queue (ft) | Movement Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Movement } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Approach } \\ \text { Delay } \\ \text { (sec/veh) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Approach LOS | Overall Delay (sec/veh) | Overall LOS |
| Southbound | Left | 102 | 13 | 147 | 5.3 | A | 7.2 | A | 7.1 | A |
|  | Right | 358 | 13 | 147 | 7.8 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left | 284 | 7 | 223 | 7.4 | A | 6.4 | A |  |  |
|  | Thru | 1,588 | 7 | 223 | 6.2 | A |  |  |  |  |
| Westbound | Thru | 881 | 5 | 151 | 8.5 | A | 8.4 | A |  |  |
|  | Right | 104 | 5 | 150 | 7.2 | A |  |  |  |  |


| HCS7 Roundabouts Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  |  |  |  |  |  | Site Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analyst | Brent Clark |  |  |  |  |  | Intersection |  |  |  | 8th St (US 75)/20th Ave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agency or Co. | SRF Consulting |  |  |  |  |  | E/W Street Name |  |  |  | 20th Ave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date Performed | 1/22/2020 |  |  |  |  |  | N/S Street Name |  |  |  | 8th St (US 75) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Year |  |  |  |  |  |  | Analysis Time Period (hrs) |  |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time Analyzed | 2045 AM - Alternative 5B |  |  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Factor |  |  |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description | 8th St/20th Ave |  |  |  |  |  | Jurisdiction |  |  |  | 8th St (US 75) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |  |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Number of Lanes (N) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Lane Assignment | LTR |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  | LT |  | TR |  | LT |  | TR |  |
| Volume (V), veh/h | 0 | 13 | 40 | 20 | 0 | 94 | 47 | 88 | 0 | 27 | 1395 | 27 | 0 | 27 | 775 | 7 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Flow Rate (VPCE), pc/h | 0 | 15 | 45 | 22 | 0 | 105 | 53 | 99 | 0 | 30 | 1562 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 868 | 8 |
| Right-Turn Bypass | None |  |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Crossing, p/h | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-Up Headway Adjustment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  |  | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Lane |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |  | ft | Right | Bypass | Left | Right |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Critical Headway (s) |  |  |  | 4.3276 |  |  |  | 4.3276 |  | 4.5436 | 4.5436 |  |  | 4.5436 | 4.5436 |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (s) |  |  |  | 2.5352 |  |  |  | 2.5352 |  | 2.5352 | 2.5352 |  |  | 2.5352 | 2.5352 |  |
| Flow Computations, Capacity and v/c Ratios |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  |  | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Lane |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |  | ft | Right | Bypass | Left | Right |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Entry Flow (ve), pc/h |  |  |  | 82.00 |  |  |  | 257.00 |  | 762.34 | 859.66 |  |  | 425.82 | 480.18 |  |
| Entry Volume veh/h |  |  |  | 79.61 |  |  |  | 249.51 |  | 740.14 | 834.62 |  |  | 413.42 | 466.19 |  |
| Circulating Flow ( $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ), $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  | $1003$ |  |  | $1607$ |  |  |  | 90 |  |  |  | 188 |  |  |
| Exiting Flow (vex), pc/h |  |  | 105 |  |  | 91 |  |  |  | 1676 |  |  |  | 995 |  |  |
| Capacity ( $\mathrm{cpce}^{\text {e }}$, pc/h |  |  |  | 605.39 |  |  |  | 362.30 |  | 1308.34 | 1308.34 |  |  | 1196.72 | 1196.72 |  |
| Capacity (c), veh/h |  |  |  | 587.75 |  |  |  | 351.75 |  | 1270.24 | 1270.24 |  |  | 1161.86 | 1161.86 |  |
| v/c Ratio (x) |  |  |  | 0.14 |  |  |  | 0.71 |  | 0.58 | 0.66 |  |  | 0.36 | 0.40 |  |
| Delay and Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Lane |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |  | eft | Right | Bypass | Left | Right |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Lane Control Delay (d), s/veh |  |  |  | 7.8 |  |  |  | 35.2 |  | 9.6 | 11.4 |  |  | 6.6 | 7.2 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  |  | A |  |  |  | E |  | A | B |  |  | A | A |  |
| 95\% Queue, veh |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |  |  | 5.2 |  | 4.0 | 5.2 |  |  | 1.6 | 2.0 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  |  | 7.8 |  |  | 35.2 |  |  |  | $10.6$ |  |  |  | 6.9 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | A |  |  | E |  |  |  | B |  |  |  | A |  |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS |  |  | 11.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| HCS7 Roundabouts Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  |  |  |  |  |  | Site Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analyst | Brent Clark |  |  |  |  |  | Intersection |  |  |  | 8th St (US 75)/20th Ave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agency or Co. | SRF Consulting |  |  |  |  |  | E/W Street Name |  |  |  | 20th Ave |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date Performed | 1/22/2020 |  |  |  |  |  | N/S Street Name |  |  |  | 8th St (US 75) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Year | 2045 |  |  |  |  |  | Analysis Time Period (hrs) |  |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time Analyzed | 2045 PM - Alternative 5B |  |  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Factor |  |  |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description | 8th St/20th Ave |  |  |  |  |  | Jurisdiction |  |  |  | 8th St (US 75) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |  |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |
| Number of Lanes (N) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Lane Assignment | LTR |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  | LT |  | TR |  | LT |  | TR |  |
| Volume (V), veh/h | 0 | 27 | 47 | 27 | 0 | 40 | 20 | 47 | 0 | 34 | 1105 | 67 | 0 | 81 | 1476 | 7 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Flow Rate (VpcE), pc/h | 0 | 30 | 53 | 30 | 0 | 45 | 22 | 53 | 0 | 38 | 1237 | 75 | 0 | 91 | 1652 | 8 |
| Right-Turn Bypass | None |  |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Crossing, p/h | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-Up Headway Adjustment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  |  | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Lane |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |  | eft | Right | Bypass | Left | Right |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Critical Headway (s) |  |  |  | 4.3276 |  |  |  | 4.3276 |  | 4.5436 | 4.5436 |  |  | 4.5436 | 4.5436 |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (s) |  |  |  | 2.5352 |  |  |  | 2.5352 |  | 2.5352 | 2.5352 |  |  | 2.5352 | 2.5352 |  |
| Flow Computations, Capacity and v/c Ratios |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  |  | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Lane |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |  | eft | Right | Bypass | Left | Right |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Entry Flow (ve), pc/h |  |  |  | 113.00 |  |  |  | 120.00 |  | 634.50 | 715.50 |  |  | 822.97 | 928.03 |  |
| Entry Volume veh/h |  |  |  | 109.71 |  |  |  | 116.50 |  | 616.02 | 694.66 |  |  | 799.00 | 901.00 |  |
| Circulating Flow ( $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ), $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  | $1788$ |  |  | $1305$ |  |  |  | $174$ |  |  |  | 105 |  |  |
| Exiting Flow (vex), pc/h |  |  | 219 |  |  | 68 |  |  |  | 1320 |  |  |  | 1727 |  |  |
| Capacity ( $\mathrm{cpce}^{\text {e }}$, pc/h |  |  |  | 310.63 |  |  |  | 468.33 |  | 1212.06 | 1212.06 |  |  | 1290.61 | 1290.61 |  |
| Capacity (c), veh/h |  |  |  | 301.59 |  |  |  | 454.69 |  | 1176.76 | 1176.76 |  |  | 1253.01 | 1253.01 |  |
| v/c Ratio (x) |  |  |  | 0.36 |  |  |  | 0.26 |  | 0.52 | 0.59 |  |  | 0.64 | 0.72 |  |
| Delay and Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  |  | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Lane |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |  | eft | Right | Bypass | Left | Right |  |  | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Lane Control Delay (d), s/veh |  |  |  | 20.4 |  |  |  | 11.9 |  | 9.0 | 10.3 |  |  | 11.0 | 13.4 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | B |  | A | B |  |  | B | B |  |
| 95\% Queue, veh |  |  |  | 1.6 |  |  |  | 1.0 |  | 3.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.9 | 6.7 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  |  | $20.4$ |  |  | 11.9 |  |  |  | 9.7 |  |  |  | 12.3 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |  | A |  |  |  | B |  |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS |  |  | 11.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 156

