

Ref: 9474

March 8, 2024

Franklin Zoning Board of Appeals Bruce Hunchard, Chair 355 East Central Street Franklin, MA 02038

Re: Response to 2nd Transportation Peer Review 121 Grove Street Franklin, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Hunchard:

Vanasse & Associates, Inc. (VAI) is pleased to provide responses to comments raised in the February 14, 2024 *Transportation Peer Review – Response to Comments* letter prepared by Howard Stein Hudson (HSH) concerning their review of the February 8, 2024 Response to Comments letter that was prepared by VAI in support of the proposed residential development to be located along Grove Street in Franklin, Massachusetts (hereafter referred to as the "Project"). Listed below are the comments that were identified by HSH in the subject letter that pertain to the February 8, 2024 letter, with the comment followed by a response from VAI.

Traffic Impact Assessment Comments

Comment 1:	Based on the American Community Survey (ACS) table provided, a discrepancy was found with the trip distribution at the intersection of Route 140/Beaver Street. HSH request the Applicant clarify why the percentages in the Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) differ from the provided ACS table and revise the analysis at this intersection accordingly.
Response:	VAI concurs. The distribution was corrected and the analysis was revised. The overall delay increased by 0.2 seconds during the weekday morning peak hour and decreased by 1.2 seconds compared to the previous 2030 Build analysis. The revised analysis Table 10R and the analysis worksheets are provided in the appendix.
Comment 2:	The Applicant did not provide the breakdown of the number of units per building to confirm if the number of parking spaces is adequate for each building. HSH requests the Applicant update the TIA to represent the number of units and parking spaces as well as confirm if the Project will meet the parking demand for each building.
Response:	According to estimated parking demand for this development, there is ample parking for residents. Residents may have to walk a short distance but the parking is provided, and property management will otherwise manage the parking supply.
Comment 3:	The turning movements provided confirm that moving and trash/recycling trucks can safely access all buildings; although the Applicant did not specify the areas where move-in/move-out will take place, the Applicant asserts that property management will facilitate

Mr. Bruce Hunchard March 8, 2024 Page 2 of 3

parking for moving trucks as needed. We generally agree with this approach. No further action is required.

Response: VAI concurs, no response required.

Comment 4: *HSH agrees with the locations of the accessible ramps and details provided. The Applicant asserts that indoor and outdoor bike storage will be provided; however, no bike*

accommodations were provided on the site plans. We recommend that as part of the order of conditions of any approvals that may be granted for the Project, the Applicant provide the number of indoor and outdoor bike spaces, and its locations.

Response: Fairfield provides indoor and outdoor bike storage. The concept architectural plans show the bike storage rooms which can accommodate a minimum of 20 bicycles per room. Final landscape design will include outdoor storage racks, typically one at the clubhouse and one at each of the residential buildings.



Typical Indoor Bike Storage (Dean Ave project)

- **Comment 5:** The Applicant explained and conducted a satisfactory sight distance analysis. We generally agree with the Applicant's sight distance measurement approach. No further action required.
- **Response:** VAI concurs, no response required
- **Comment 6:** The AutoTURN analysis confirms that the fire trucks can enter and exit the proposed driveway safely from both the north and south on Grove Street. No further action is required.
- **Response:** VAI concurs, no response required
- **Comment 7:** The Applicant provided a revised Parking and Traffic Control Plan with the locations of the accessible ramps. We agree with the locations of the accessible ramps and corresponding details provided. No further action is required.
- **Response:** VAI concurs, no response required
- **Comment 8:** The Applicant agrees to assign a transportation coordinator, an Uber waiting area at the clubhouse building, and electric vehicle (EV) parking spaces for residents. We generally agree with the additional TDM measures but request the Applicant provide a plan that shows the designated rideshare pick-up/drop-off area as well as the number of EV parking spaces for residents.



Mr. Bruce Hunchard March 8, 2024 Page 3 of 3

Response: Specific areas for rideshare pickups and similar are typically determined on an as-needed basis by the onsite management staff. EV parking quantities are an evolving demand and based on recent experience any number of spaces estimated at this time are likely to be short of the demand quantity at the time of occupancy. Shown here is a typical EV charging station at a Fairfield project recently constructed.



- **Comment 9:** As part of the order of conditions of any approvals that may be granted for the Project, we request the Applicant provide to the Board the overall construction schedule, working hours, number of construction workers, worker transportation and parking plan, number of construction vehicles, and routes to and from the Project site as part of the Construction Plan to be submitted prior to any construction activities taking place
- **Response:** Fairfield acknowledges that this information might be a typical requirement as a condition of approval, to be met prior to a Building Permit and will provide upon request.

We trust that this information is responsive to the comments that were identified by Howard Stein Hudson concerning their review of the VAI February 8, 2024 letter. If you should have any questions or would like to discuss our responses in more detail, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

VANASSE & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Scott W. Thornton

Scott W. Thornton, P.E. Principal

Professional Engineer in CT, MA, NH

Attachments

Cc: R. Hewitt, Fairfield Residential J. Shipe, Shipe Consulting B. McCarthy, RJOC



APPENDIX

TRIP DISTRIBUTION DATA REVISED ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE



TRIP DISTRIBUTION DATA



Proposed Residential Development Franklin, Massachusetts

Table 3. Residence MCD/County to Workplace MCD/County Commuting Flows for the United States and Puerto Rico Sorted by Residence Geography: 5-Year ACS, 2011-2015

For more information on sampling and estimation methods, confidentiality protection, and sampling and nonsampling errors, see http://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/tech_docs/accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2015.pdf>. Universe: Workers 16 years and over.

Commuting flows are sorted by residence state, residence county, and residence minor civil division.

															Washingto	
Residence	Workplace	Number	I-495 (Beaver Stre		I-495 (Sc		Route 14		Washington S		Route 14		(We	
Franklin Town city	Franklin Town city	4,085	17%	694	9%	368	15%	613	19%	776		531	11%	449	16%	654
Franklin Town city	Boston city	1,832	55%	1008		0	45%	824		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Framingham town	804	100%	804		0		0		0		0		0		0
	Milford town	495	100%	495		0		0		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Norwood town	433		0	25%	108	75%	325		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Wellesley town	406	30%	122	70%	284		0		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Natick town	376	30%	113	70%	263		0		0		0		0		0
/	Wrentham town	348		0		0	34%	118	33%	115		115		0		0
Franklin Town city	Cambridge city	275	50%	138		0	50%	138		0		0		0		0
	Providence city	270		0		0	50%	135		0		0		0	50%	135
/	Mansfield town	254		0		0	100%	254		0		0		0		0
	Bellingham town	248		0		0		0		0		0	100%	248		0
Franklin Town city	Hopkinton town	246	100%	246		0		0		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Norfolk town	243		0	100%	243		0		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Foxborough town	242		0		0	100%	242		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Needham town	238		0	70%	167	30%	71		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Walpole town	235		0	34%	80	33%	78	33%	78		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Medway town	234		0	100%	234		0		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Braintree Town city	219		0	40%	88	60%	131		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Marlborough city	214	100%	214		0		0		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Quincy city	211		0	40%	84	60%	127		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Worcester city	205	100%	205		0		0		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Canton town	194		0	25%	49	75%	146		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Waltham city	190	50%	95		0	50%	95		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Westborough town	183	100%	183		0		0		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Woonsocket city	176		0		0		0		0		0		0	100%	176
Franklin Town city	Smithfield town	172		0		0		0		0		0	40%	69	60%	103
Franklin Town city	Newton city	151	35%	53	35%	53	30%	45		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Westwood town	150		0	100%	150		0		0		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Dedham town	144		0	30%	43	40%	58	30%	43		0		0		0
	Burlington town	121	100%	121		0		0		0		0		0		0
	Weymouth Town city	121		0	45%	54	55%	67		0		0		0		0
	Holliston town	105	70%	74	30%	32		0		0		0		0		0
	Brockton city	101		0		0	100%	101		0		0		0		0
	Watertown Town city	100	40%	40	25%	25	35%	35		0		0		0		0
	Medfield town	100		0	100%	100		0		0		0		0		0
,	Brookline town	98	35%	34	30%	29	35%	34		0		0		0		0
	Bridgewater town	93	5070	0	5075	0	70%	65	30%	28		0		0		0
Franklin Town city	Taunton city	86		0		0	70%	60	30%	26		0		0		0
,	Shrewsbury town	72	100%	72		0	7070	0	0070	0		0		0		0
	North Attleborough to	70		0		0	30%	21		0		0		0		49
	Littleton town	70	100%	70		0	0070	0		0		0		0	. 0 / 0	
	Sudbury town	69	100%	69		0		0		0	1	0		0		0
	Northborough town	63	100%	63		0		0		0		0		0		0
	Warwick city	62	100 /0	0		0	50%	31		0		0		0	50%	31
	Lincoln town	62		0		0	0070	0		0		0		0		62
	Ashland town	60	100%	60		0		0		0		0		0	10070	0
	Mendon town	60	33%	20		0		0	34%	20		20		0		0
		00	5570	20		0		0	J4 /0	20		20		0		0
L				Ĵ		0				-	1					0
		14,986		4,992		2,454		3,813		1,086		666		766		1,210
				33.3%		16.4%		25.4%		7.2%		4.4%		5.1%		8.1%
		C A V		33%		16%		26%								8%
		<u>SAY</u>		55%		10%		20%		7%		5%		5%		ō%

REVISED ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE



Table 10R SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY

		2030 N	lo-Build			2030	Build			2030 Rev	ised Build	l
Signalized Intersection/ Peak Hour/Movement	V/C ^a	Delay ^b	LOS ^c	Queue ^d Avg/95 th	V/C	Delay	LOS	Queue Avg/95 th	V/C	Delay	LOS	Queue Avg/95 ^{tt}
Route 140 at Beaver Street												
Weekday Morning:												
Route 140 EB LT	0.91	72.2	E	7/18	0.91	72.4	Е	7/18	0.91	72.6	E	7/18
Route 140 EB TH/RT	0.75	46.0	D	6/12	0.75	46.1	D	6/12	0.75	46.1	D	6/12
Route 140 WB LT	0.22	33.8	С	2/4	0.23	34.1	С	2/4	0.22	34.0	С	2/4
Route 140 WB TH	0.79	48.6	D	9/15	0.79	48.6	D	9/15	0.79	48.7	D	9/15
Route 140 WB RT	0.01	0.0	А	0/0	0.01	0.0	А	0/0	0.01	0.0	А	0/0
Beaver Street NB LT/TH/RT	0.81	58.7	Е	7/14	0.89	68.6	Е	8/16	0.90	69.1	E	8/16
Beaver Street SB LT/TH	0.59	55.4	E	4/8	0.60	55.6	Е	4/8	0.60	55.8	E	4/8
Beaver Street SB RT	0.45	4.5	А	0/2	0.45	4.5	А	0/2	0.44	4.5	А	0/2
Overall		45.1	D			46.9	D			47.1	D	
Weekday Evening:												
Route 140 EB LT	1.02	>80.0	F	8/23	1.02	>80.0	F	8/19	1.03	>80.0	F	9/23
Route 140 EB TH/RT	0.61	41.7	D	8/16	0.77	48.9	D	8/16	0.61	42.2	D	9/16
Route 140 WB LT	0.17	30.4	С	1/4	0.18	31.1	С	2/4	0.18	31.0	С	2/4
Route 140 WB TH	0.87	50.7	D	15/25	0.87	50.9	D	15/25	0.87	51.1	D	15/25
Route 140 WB RT	0.02	0.1	А	0/0	0.02	0.1	А	0/0	0.02	0.1	А	0/0
Beaver Street NB LT/TH/RT	0.87	70.6	Е	8/22	0.91	77.0	Е	8/23	0.92	79.5	Е	9/23
Beaver Street SB LT/TH	0.51	61.3	Е	3/7	0.53	61.8	Е	3/7	0.56	62.5	Е	3/7
Beaver Street SB RT	0.50	5.5	А	0/2	0.50	5.5	А	0/2	0.50	5.4	А	0/2
Overall		49.1	D			52.3	D			51.1	D	

^aVolume-to-capacity ratio. ^bControl (signal) delay per vehicle in seconds. ^cLevel of service. ^dQueue length in vehicles. NB = northbound; SB = southbound; EB = eastbound; WB = westbound; LT = left-turning movements; TH = through movements; RT = right-turning movements.

2030 Build Weekday Morning Peak Hour 5: Beaver Street & Route 140

02/14	/2024
-------	-------

	۶	+	*	4	+	•	•	1	1	1	ţ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	٦ ۲	≜ ⊅		٦	•	1		\$			र्भ	1
Traffic Volume (vph)	264	395	72	73	313	2	61	107	63	3	132	301
Future Volume (vph)	264	395	72	73	313	2	61	107	63	3	132	301
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95	0.95	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Frt		0.977				0.850		0.963				0.850
Flt Protected	0.950			0.950				0.987			0.999	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1703	3233	0	1770	1949	1830	0	1817	0	0	1880	1636
Flt Permitted	0.615			0.615				0.987			0.999	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1102	3233	0	1146	1949	1830	0	1817	0	0	1880	1636
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		12				101		10				350
Adj. Flow (vph)	293	439	80	95	406	3	87	153	90	3	153	350
Lane Group Flow (vph)	293	519	0	95	406	3	0	330	0	0	156	350
Turn Type	pm+pt	NA		pm+pt	NA	Perm	Split	NA		Split	NA	pt+ov
Protected Phases	5	2		1	6		3	3		4	4	4 5
Permitted Phases	2			6		6						
Detector Phase	5	2		1	6	6	3	3		4	4	4 5
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	
Minimum Split (s)	11.0	11.0		11.0	11.0	11.0	10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0	
Total Split (s)	21.0	47.0		41.0	67.0	67.0	25.0	25.0		25.0	25.0	
Total Split (%)	13.0%	29.0%		25.3%	41.4%	41.4%	15.4%	15.4%		15.4%	15.4%	
Maximum Green (s)	15.0	41.0		35.0	61.0	61.0	20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0	
Yellow Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
All-Red Time (s)	2.0	2.0		2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0		2.0	2.0	
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0			0.0	
Total Lost Time (s)	6.0	6.0		6.0	6.0	6.0		5.0			5.0	
Lead/Lag	Lead	Lead		Lag	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lead		Lag	Lag	
Lead-Lag Optimize?	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
Recall Mode	None	Min		None	Min	Min	None	None		None	None	
Walk Time (s)												
Flash Dont Walk (s)												
Pedestrian Calls (#/hr)												
Act Effct Green (s)	22.2	22.1		27.5	27.5	27.5		20.7			14.4	35.5
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.21	0.21		0.26	0.26	0.26		0.20			0.14	0.34
v/c Ratio	0.91	0.75		0.22	0.79	0.01		0.90			0.60	0.44
Control Delay	72.6	46.1		34.0	48.7	0.0		69.1			55.8	4.5
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0			0.0	0.0
Total Delay	72.6	46.1		34.0	48.7	0.0		69.1			55.8	4.5
LOS	E	D		С	D	А		Е			Е	А
Approach Delay		55.7			45.7			69.1			20.3	
Approach LOS		Е			D			E			С	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	175	156		46	234	0		195			91	0
Queue Length 95th (ft)	#453	298		96	375	0		#400			210	46
Internal Link Dist (ft)		1991			447			2470			1228	
Turn Bay Length (ft)	330			115		40						115
Base Capacity (vph)	323	1322		687	1179	1147		368			373	781
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0			0	0
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0			0	0

Lanes, Volumes, Timings S:\Jobs\9474\Analysis\From Peer Review\2030 Build Weekday Morning.syn

Synchro 11 Report Page 1

Lane Group	Ø9	
LaneConfigurations		
Traffic Volume (vph)		
Future Volume (vph)		
Lane Util. Factor		
Frt		
Flt Protected		
Satd. Flow (prot)		
Flt Permitted		
Satd. Flow (perm)		
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		
Adj. Flow (vph)		
Lane Group Flow (vph)		
Turn Type		
Protected Phases	9	
Permitted Phases		
Detector Phase		
Switch Phase		
Minimum Initial (s)	1.0	
Minimum Split (s)	24.0	
Total Split (s)	24.0	
Total Split (%)	15%	
Maximum Green (s)	22.0	
Yellow Time (s)	2.0	
All-Red Time (s)	0.0	
Lost Time Adjust (s)		
Total Lost Time (s)		
Lead/Lag		
Lead-Lag Optimize?		
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	
Recall Mode	None	
Walk Time (s)	7.0	
Flash Dont Walk (s)	15.0	
Pedestrian Calls (#/hr)	3	
Act Effct Green (s)		
Actuated g/C Ratio		
v/c Ratio		
Control Delay		
Queue Delay		
Total Delay LOS		
Approach Delay		
Approach LOS		
Queue Length 50th (ft)		
Queue Length 95th (ft)		
Internal Link Dist (ft)		
Turn Bay Length (ft)		
Base Capacity (vph)		
Starvation Cap Reductn		
Spillback Cap Reductn		

Lanes, Volumes, Timings S:\Jobs\9474\Analysis\From Peer Review\2030 Build Weekday Morning.syn

2030 Build Weekday Morning Peak Hour 5: Beaver Street & Route 140

	٨	+	\mathbf{F}	4	+	•	•	1	1	1	ţ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0			0	0
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.91	0.39		0.14	0.34	0.00		0.90			0.42	0.45
Intersection Summary												
Cycle Length: 162												
Actuated Cycle Length: 104.8	5											
Natural Cycle: 110												
Control Type: Actuated-Unco	ordinated											
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.91												
Intersection Signal Delay: 47	.1			In	tersection	n LOS: D						
Intersection Capacity Utilizati	ion 69.4%			IC	U Level o	of Service	С					
Analysis Period (min) 15												
# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.												
Queue shown is maximum	n after two	cycles.	· ·									

Splits and Phases: 5: Beaver Street & Route 140

A ₀₂		√ Ø1	↑ _{Ø3}	↓ _{Ø4}	. ∦ . k ø9
47 s		41 s	25 s	25 s	24 s
₽ Ø5					
21 s	67 s				

02/14/2024

Lane Group	Ø9			
Storage Cap Reductn				
Reduced v/c Ratio				
Intersection Summary				

2030 Build Weekday Evening Peak Hour 5: Beaver Street & Route 140

02/14	/2024
-------	-------

Lane Group EBL EBT EBR WBL WBR NBL NBT NBR SBL Lane Configurations ↑ ↑	SBT SBR
	a 7
	99 321
Future Volume (vph) 283 509 70 71 491 12 80 107 83 5	99 321
Lane Util. Factor 1.00 0.95 0.95 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00
Frt 0.982 0.850 0.958	0.850
Flt Protected 0.950 0.950 0.985 0	.998
Satd. Flow (prot) 1770 3368 0 1805 1968 1830 0 1899 0 0	1878 1652
Flt Permitted 0.202 0.413 0.985 0	.998
Satd. Flow (perm) 376 3368 0 785 1968 1830 0 1899 0 0	1878 1652
Satd. Flow (RTOR) 9 101 11	382
Adj. Flow (vph) 308 553 76 86 592 14 94 126 98 6	118 382
Lane Group Flow (vph) 308 629 0 86 592 14 0 318 0 0	124 382
Turn Type pm+pt NA pm+pt NA Perm Split NA Split	NA pt+ov
Protected Phases 5 2 1 6 3 3 4	4 45
Permitted Phases 2 6 6	
Detector Phase 5 2 1 6 6 3 3 4	4 4 5
Switch Phase	
Minimum Initial (s) 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0	5.0
Minimum Split (s) 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 10.5 10.5 10.0	10.0
Total Split (s) 21.0 47.0 41.0 67.0 67.0 25.0 25.0 25.0	25.0
	5.4%
Maximum Green (s) 15.0 41.0 35.0 61.0 61.0 20.0 20.0 20.0	20.0
Yellow Time (s) 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 3.0 3.0 3.0	3.0
All-Red Time (s) 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0	2.0
Lost Time Adjust (s) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s) 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 5.0	5.0
Lead/Lag Lead Lead Lag Lag Lag Lead Lead Lag	Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes
Vehicle Extension (s) 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0	3.0
Recall Mode None Min None Min Min None None None None	lone
Walk Time (s)	
Flash Dont Walk (s)	
Pedestrian Calls (#/hr)	
Act Effct Green (s) 35.4 35.4 40.5 40.5 40.5 20.8	13.9 35.0
Actuated g/C Ratio 0.30 0.30 0.35 0.35 0.35 0.18	0.12 0.30
v/c Ratio 1.03 0.61 0.18 0.87 0.02 0.92	0.56 0.50
Control Delay 100.2 42.2 31.0 51.1 0.1 79.5	62.5 5.4
Queue Delay 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0
Total Delay 100.2 42.2 31.0 51.1 0.1 79.5	62.5 5.4
LOS F D C D A E	E A
Approach Delay 61.3 47.6 79.5	19.4
Approach LOS E D E	В
Queue Length 50th (ft) ~214 214 41 384 0 216	83 0
Queue Length 95th (ft) #569 394 93 637 0 #577	183 44
Internal Link Dist (ft) 1904 667 2500	727
Turn Bay Length (ft) 330 115 40	115
Base Capacity (vph) 299 1273 644 1064 1036 346	333 757
Starvation Cap Reductn 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0
Spillback Cap Reductn 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0

Lanes, Volumes, Timings S:\Jobs\9474\Analysis\From Peer Review\2030 Build Weekday Evening.syn

Synchro 11 Report Page 1

Lane Group	Ø9	
LanetConfigurations		
Traffic Volume (vph)		
Future Volume (vph)		
Lane Util. Factor		
Frt		
Flt Protected		
Satd. Flow (prot)		
Flt Permitted		
Satd. Flow (perm)		
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		
Adj. Flow (vph)		
Lane Group Flow (vph)		
Turn Type		
Protected Phases	9	
Permitted Phases		
Detector Phase		
Switch Phase		
Minimum Initial (s)	1.0	
Minimum Split (s)	24.0	
Total Split (s)	24.0	
Total Split (%)	15%	
Maximum Green (s)	22.0	
Yellow Time (s)	2.0	
All-Red Time (s)	0.0	
Lost Time Adjust (s)		
Total Lost Time (s)		
Lead/Lag		
Lead-Lag Optimize?	3.0	
Vehicle Extension (s) Recall Mode	None	
Walk Time (s)	7.0	
Flash Dont Walk (s)	15.0	
Pedestrian Calls (#/hr)	2	
Act Effct Green (s)	2	
Actuated g/C Ratio		
v/c Ratio		
Control Delay		
Queue Delay		
Total Delay		
LOS		
Approach Delay		
Approach LOS		
Queue Length 50th (ft)		
Queue Length 95th (ft)		
Internal Link Dist (ft)		
Turn Bay Length (ft)		
Base Capacity (vph)		
Starvation Cap Reductn		
Spillback Cap Reductn		

2030 Build Weekday Evening Peak Hour 5: Beaver Street & Route 140

1								
BT SBR								
0 0								
.37 0.50								
# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.								

Splits and Phases: 5: Beaver Street & Route 140

A ₀₂		√ Ø1	↑ _{Ø3}	Ø4	₩ k ø9
47 s		41 s	25 s	25 s	24 s
21 s	67 s				

02/14/2024

Lane Group	Ø9			
Storage Cap Reductn				
Reduced v/c Ratio				
Intersection Summary				