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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) has initiated an assessment of the existing interchange on Interstate 90 (I-90) at Exit 46 (Elk Creek Road) near Piedmont, South Dakota. This interchange modification justification report (IMJR) is the culmination of several steps that have been completed to document the benefits and impacts associated with a range of modification alternatives for the existing interchange. This document was completed following the outline provided in the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) August 2010 Interstate System Access Informational Guide and meets the requirements of the Access to the Interstate System policy printed in the Federal Register on August 27, 2009.

## FHWA REQUIREMENTS

The FHWA has requirements that need to be addressed when evaluating changes to access points on interstate facilities (Federal Register, Volume 74, Number 165, August 27, 2009). The requirements are part of a policy that was put in place to maintain high levels of safety and mobility on the Interstate System. The policy consists of eight requirements that new access locations should meet. As this modification request is to maintain the existing Exit 46 interchange's diamond interchange configuration, the following is the summarized response to each requirement. The full response to each requirement can be found in Chapter 9:
Recommendations.

1. The need being addressed by the request cannot be adequately satisfied by existing interchanges to the Interstate, and/or local roads and streets in the corridor can neither provide the desired access, nor can they be reasonably improved (such as access control along surface streets, improving traffic control, modifying ramp terminals and intersections, adding turn bays or lengthening storage) to satisfactorily accommodate the design year traffic demands (23 CFR 625.2(a)).

This modification request is to reconfigure an existing interchange. No additional access to the Interstate System is being requested. The reconfiguration of the existing interchange will have a negligible effect on the Interstate's traffic operations when compared with the existing interchange's configuration.
2. The need being addressed by the request cannot be adequately satisfied by reasonable transportation system management (such as ramp metering, mass transit, and HOV facilities), geometric design, and alternative improvements to the Interstate without the proposed change(s) in access (23CFR 625.2(a)).

This modification request is to reconfigure the geometrics of an existing interchange. No additional access to the Interstate System is being requested.

The Interstate 90 Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study initially developed three build alternatives, which were narrowed down to two feasible alternatives for the corridor's EA. The two alternatives evaluated in the EA were a single point and a diamond interchange. The EA noted that both alternatives would require the realignment of Elk Creek Road to the east to provide a greater separation distance between the east interchange ramps and the interstate service road intersection. Realigned Elk Creek Road would be grade-separated over both the railroad tracks and I-90.

The single point interchange alternative would have relocated the Exit 46 interchange to the east and constructed a single point interchange. The single point interchange was ruled out for three reasons. It was not considered practical at Exit 46, and it would have required installation of a traffic signal, which is not warranted with the diamond interchange configuration. It also would have cost more to construct because of the need for a larger bridge, traffic signal and more retaining walls.
The relocated diamond interchange was selected as the preferred option in the EA primarily because of cost as well as the reconstructed interchange being able to eliminate the sharp skew angle, provide better spacing between the ramp terminal and service road intersections, and greatly improve sight distance on the bridge. The EA's preferred option also includes the realignment of Elk Creek Road in order to improve spacing between the ramp terminal, service road intersections and provide for a gradeseparated crossing of the railroad. The increase in distance between the ramp terminal intersections and Sturgis Road would improve the operation of the crossroad intersections, including the ramp terminal intersections by providing additional queue space for left turn and width for auxiliary lanes to be added, as warranted. The grade separation of the railroad is another benefit that would improve traffic operations and safety in the vicinity of the Exit 46 interchange.
There are no areas within the State of South Dakota that will consistently experience congestion levels extreme enough for TSM measures such as ramp metering or HOV facilities to be economically feasible in the foreseeable future.
3. An operational and safety analysis has concluded that the proposed change in access does not have a significant adverse impact on the safety and operation of the Interstate facility (which includes mainline lanes, existing, new, or modified ramps, ramp intersections with crossroad) or on the local street network based on both the current and the planned future traffic projections. The analysis shall, particularly in urbanized areas, include at least the first adjacent existing or proposed interchange on either side of the proposed change in access (23 CFR 625.2(a), 655.603(d) and 771.111(f)). The crossroads and the local street network, to at least the first major intersection on either side of the proposed change in access, shall be included in this analysis to the extent necessary to fully evaluate the safety and operational impacts that the proposed change in access and other transportation improvements may have on the local street network (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)).

Requests for a proposed change in access must include a description and assessment of the impacts and ability of the proposed changes to safely and efficiently collect, distribute and accommodate traffic on the Interstate facility, ramps, intersection of ramps with crossroad, and local street network (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)). Each request must also include a conceptual plan of the type and location of the signs proposed to support each design alternative (23 U.S.C. 109(d) and 23 CFR 655.603(d)).

The operational analyses contained in this study indicate that mainline I-90 and ramp junction, and ramp terminal intersections are projected to operate within operational goals for both the Build and No Build scenarios through the planning horizon year of 2045.

An analysis of crash records for the most recent available five-year period (2010-2014) has been provided in the "Existing Safety Conditions" section. The safety analysis indicates that there are no discernable or correctable crash patterns within the influence area of the Exit 46 interchange. The relocated diamond interchange and reconstructed bridge would improve spacing between the ramp terminal and service road intersections, improve vertical sight distance and provide for a grade-separate crossing of the railroad. The bridge is planned to provide enough width to accommodate turn lanes at the ramp terminal intersections and a shared-use path, all of which should improve traffic operations and pedestrian/bicycle connectivity in the vicinity of Exit 46.
4. The proposed access connects to a public road only and will provide for all traffic movements. Less than "full interchanges" may be considered on a case-by-case basis for applications requiring special access for managed lanes (e.g., transit, HOVs, HOT lanes) or park and ride lots. The proposed access will be designed to meet or exceed current standards (23 CFR 625.2(a), 625.4(a) (2), and 655.603(d)).

The access improvement will maintain a connection to a public road (Elk Creek Road) and will replace the current full access interchange with a reconfigured full access interchange. The reconfigured interchange will continue to provide for all traffic movements. The improvement will meet or exceed current standards for Federal-aid projects on the Interstate system.
5. The proposal considers and is consistent with local and regional land use and transportation plans. Prior to receiving final approval, all requests for new or revised access must be included in an adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan, in the adopted Statewide or Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (STIP or TIP), and the Congestion Management Process within transportation management areas, as appropriate, and as specified in 23 CFR part 450, and the transportation conformity requirements of 40 CFR parts 51 and 93.

The proposed interchange improvement is consistent with local land use plans and the RCAMPO RapidTrip 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan and Meade Moving Forward 2040 Transportation Plan.
6. In corridors where the potential exists for future multiple interchange additions, a comprehensive corridor or network study must accompany all requests for new or revised access with recommendations that address all of the proposed and desired access changes within the context of a longer-range system or network plan (23 U.S.C. 109(d), 23 CFR 625.2(a), 655.603(d), and 771.111).

Previous studies conducted in the past 15 years, including the South Dakota Department of Transportation Decennial Interstate Corridor Study completed in February 2001; the Interstate 90 Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study completed in December 2004; and the 2010 South Dakota Department of Transportation Decennial Interstate Corridor Study completed in November 2010 indicated no need for any future interchange additions along the segments of I-90 between Exit 46 and the adjacent exits.
7. When a new or revised access point is due to a new, expanded, or substantial change in current or planned future development or land use, requests must demonstrate appropriate coordination has occurred between the development and any proposed transportation system improvements (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)). The request must describe the commitments agreed upon to assure adequate collection and dispersion of the traffic resulting from the development with the adjoining local street network and Interstate access point (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)).

The proposed interchange modification is the result of the Interstate 90 Black Hawk Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study and the corresponding l-90 Environmental Assessment (Exit 40 to Exit 51). The study was jointly coordinated by SDDOT, Meade County, and FHWA staff.
The reconfiguration of the interchange is being proposed to accommodate future traffic growth relative to the anticipated future population growth of the entire Northern Black Hills. After analysis of several alternatives for the corridor, the Interstate 90 Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study recommended the relocation of several service roads, the redesign of several interchanges, and the reconstruction and widening of the I-90 mainline in some areas between Black Hawk and Sturgis when traffic and conditions warrant. Unfortunately, both terrain restraints of the Northern Black Hills and the location of nearby federal lands create a geographic bottleneck that limits the amount of parallel corridors to operationally support I-90 that can be feasibly constructed.
8. The proposal can be expected to be included as an alternative in the required environmental evaluation, review and processing. The proposal should include supporting information and current status of the environmental processing (23 CFR 771.111).

The proposed revised access is identified in the RCAMPO RapidTrip 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan and planned to be included in the 2017-2020 STIP as a result of the corridor's Environmental Assessment that was completed in September 2008 and reevaluated in September 2014. A Categorical Exclusion document will be developed upon completion of the IMJR, using the EA information as a reference. A preliminary concept of the Preferred Alternative is illustrated on Figure ES-1.

Figure ES-1. Exit 46 Proposed Action


### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) has been making progress implementing the recommendations from the Interstate 90 (I-90) Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study. As part of that progression, the SDDOT has reached the milestone to conduct a more detailed study of the Exit 46 interchange's traffic operations and affects upon the Interstate System, and request permission from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to make modifications to the Elk Creek Road interchange. This Interstate Modification Justification Report (IMJR) is prepared on behalf of the SDDOT for submittal to the FHWA.

### 1.1 Background

Table 1 provides an overview of the planning history of the Exit 46 interchange modification project.

Table 1. Exit 46 Planning Background

| Year | Document/ <br> Procedural Step | Exit 46 Findings |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2000 | Decennial <br> Interstate Corridor <br> Study | Identified concern of close service road spacing, recommended <br> project to realign service roads. Identified similar concerns at nearby <br> interchanges along the I-90 corridor. |
| 2004 | I-90 Black Hawk to <br> Sturgis Corridor <br> Preservation Study | Study was done to preserve transportation improvement opportunities <br> amidst growth pressures along I-90 between Black Hawk and Sturgis. <br> Addressed potential for widening of I-90 to six lanes and evaluated <br> Exit 46 interchange alternatives. |
| 2008 | Environmental <br> Assessment, I-90 <br> Exit 40 to Exit 51 | Selected Preferred Alternative of Realigned Exit 46 Diamond <br> Interchange and refined design to reflect updated information. <br> Included environmental resource evaluation for Exit 46 modification in <br> addition to several other corridor projects. |
| 2010 | Decennial <br> Interstate Corridor <br> Study | Reaffirmed Exit 46 concerns of close service road spacing and <br> substandard interchange design. |
| 2013 | Piedmont Valley <br> Shared-Use Path <br> Study and <br> Recommendations | Identified path along Elk Creek Road and crossing of I-90 at Exit 46 <br> as high priorities. |
| 2014 | Statewide Planning <br> Process | SDDOT included Exit 46 reconstruction in the Developmental <br> Program of its statewide planning process and completed an EA <br> reevaluation. |
| 2016 | IMJR | Will provide documentation of preferred alternative needed for Federal <br> approval of Exit 46 project. |

As shown, the SDDOT's 2000 Decennial Interstate Corridor Study identified concerns with the existing Exit 46 configuration and determined that the I-90 corridor between Black Hawk and Sturgis would be one of the top segments of South Dakota's Interstate System to target for improvement. The SDDOT responded by completing the Interstate 90 Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study in 2004, which determined that relocating the I-90 Exit 46 (Elk Creek Road) interchange would be the best alternative to prepare I-90 for future expansion. In 2008, an Environmental Assessment (EA) of Exit 40 to Exit 51 confirmed the need to relocate the Exit 46 interchange in preparation for potential future mainline I-90 expansion and determined a diamond configuration to be the preferred alternative for that relocated interchange. These findings have been confirmed by subsequently completed plans.

### 1.2 Purpose

The purpose of the Exit 46 interchange modification is to address deficiencies inherent in the current interchange condition and preserve future mainline I-90 expansion opportunities.

### 1.3 Project Location

Exit 46 is an existing interchange connection between I-90 and Elk Creek Road in the vicinity of the Cities of Piedmont and Summerset, South Dakota. The interchange is located approximately 46 miles to the east of the Wyoming state line and 11 miles to the west of the I-90/I-190 System Interchange. The interchange is located within the Rapid City Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (RCAMPO) boundary. Figure 1 depicts the location of Exit 46.

The current configuration of Exit 46 is a skewed diamond interchange as shown on Figure 2. The proposed interchange modification would realign Elk Creek Road to create a perpendicular crossing of the Rapid City, Pierre and Eastern (RCP\&E) Railroad and mainline I-90 to the south of the existing bridge. I-90 would continue to connect to Elk Creek road via a diamond interchange configuration. The modified interchange would create additional distance along Elk Creek Road between the interchange ramp termini and adjacent surface street intersections. The result would improve safety and efficiency of the interchange and surrounding intersections.

Figure 1. Study Area and Vicinity Map


Figure 2. Current Exit 46 Configuration


### 2.0 METHODOLOGY

This IMJR demonstrates that the action associated with implementing the proposed project does not have any fatal flaws. Demonstrating that no fatal flaws exist does not endorse the action, but rather allows for the conclusion that the identified access alternatives are not flawed from the perspective of traffic operations and safety, as required by FHWA. Fatal flaws would include a proposed interchange modification that:

- Does not provide full access to roads.
- Would negatively impact interstate facility traffic operations and cannot be reasonably mitigated.
- Would negatively impact interstate facility/cross street safety and cannot be reasonably mitigated.
- Conflicts with or is inconsistent with local and regional plans.
- Would create the potential for environmental consequences which could not be mitigated.


### 2.1 Methods and Assumptions

This IMJR was developed through the following steps, which are detailed in a Methods and Assumptions Document and Amendment can be found in Appendix A:

1. Establishing an appropriate study area: The study area is documented in Figure 1. Study corridors include:

- Elk Creek Road from the intersection with Sturgis Road to the intersection with Glenwood Drive, approximately 0.70 mile;
- Deer View Road from Sturgis Road to Spring Valley Road, approximately 0.75 mile;
- Stage Stop Road from Sturgis Road to La Rue Road, approximately 0.80 mile;
- Mainline I-90 from west of I-90 Exit 44 to east of I-90 Exit 48, approximately 4½ miles;
- The ramps for the I-90 Exit 46 (Elk Creek Road) interchange;
- The ramps for the I-90 Exit 44 (Bethlehem Road) interchange; and
- The ramps for the I-90 Exit 48 (Stage Stop Road) interchange.

2. Completing data collection. Conducting peak hour turning movement counts and daily traffic counts at the study area intersections and select roadway and interstate segments. Reviewing previous studies and available existing and future land use information for the study area.
3. Addressing the FHWA requirements for interstate access modifications. This step includes completion of the necessary analyses and evaluations that document the benefits and impacts of the access modification as it relates to the FHWA requirements. These analyses include:

- Preparing horizon year traffic forecasts. Average weekday daily and peak hour traffic forecasts for both the anticipated year of project completion (2021) and the planning horizon year (2045) were prepared for the study area interstate
segments, interchanges, interstate ramp terminal intersections and adjacent arterial street intersections based on the Year 2040 RCAMPO regional travel demand model.
- Analyzing current and future traffic operations along study area roadway links. The traffic analyses were completed using the procedures and methodologies documented in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), 2010 (Transportation Research Board [TRB], 2010) in accordance with the approved Methods and Assumptions document. In addressing the FHWA requirements, this report includes documentation of predicted traffic operations with and without the interchange modification. Traffic operations analyses were completed using Highway Capacity Software (HCS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ ) 2010 software. However, bicycle and pedestrian level of service (LOS) evaluations for segments of facilities, in particular along Elk Creek Road, used methodologies from TRB's National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 616: Multimodal Level of Service Analysis for Urban Streets.
- Reviewing the reported crash history data for the most recently available fiveyear period (2010-2014) to identify crash concentrations and trends at the current Exit 46 interchange, mainline I-90 through the interchange and adjacent intersections along Elk Creek Road.
- Evaluating the potential future lane geometry and traffic control needed for the interchange modification. This includes an evaluation of auxiliary lanes, traffic signal warrants and all-way stop control.

This IMJR document is organized in accordance with section 3.5.3 of FHWA's Interstate System Access Information Guide, August 2010.

### 3.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

### 3.1 Demographics

A radius of approximately 1 mile from Exit 46 encompasses portions of the Cities of Summerset, Piedmont and unincorporated Meade County. The interchange is located within the boundary of the RCAMPO.

Because the interchange is located within the RCAMPO, population and employment information and forecasts for the area surrounding Exit 46 are included in the Year 2040 Regional Travel Demand Model. The model, updated in 2015, includes Year 2013 base information and Year 2040 forecasts. The model compiles information for individual Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ's) surrounding the interchange, depicted on Figure 3.

Figure 3. Transportation Analysis Zones


Table 2 provides base year information for the TAZ's surrounding Exit 46. As shown, the travel demand model contains a base year assumption of nearly 1,000 households and more than 600 employees in the shaded area on Figure 3.

Table 2. Base Year (2013) Model Demographics by TAZ

| TAZ | Households | Employees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 234 | 203 | 85 |
| 235 | 321 | 210 |
| 236 | 62 | 84 |
| 237 | 52 | 41 |
| 238 | 135 | 190 |
| 239 | 174 | 18 |
| TOTAL | 947 | 628 |

### 3.2 Existing Land Use

The Exit 46 interchange is surrounded by a mix of uses. The City of Summerset jurisdiction immediately to the south of the interchange includes land designated as single-family residential and general commercial. Land uses within the City of Piedmont (to the north and west of the interchange) include commercial retail, church, and residential. Meade County designations include residential and agricultural uses.

### 3.3 Existing Roadway Network

The following roadways comprise the primary roadway network surrounding Exit 46. Figure 4 depicts the roadways and the federal functional classification.

Interstate 90: I-90 is an interstate freeway extending across state lines. It is oriented on a northsouth alignment through the study area, although it is designated as an east-west interstate. Mainline I-90 provides two travel lanes in each direction through the study area.

Sturgis Road: Sturgis Road is a major collector that parallels I-90 on its west side and provides access and circulation for development in addition to serving some regional travel. South of the interchange it is three lanes wide, narrowing to two lanes north of the interchange.

Elk Creek Road: Elk Creek Road (Meade County Road 4) is the cross road for Exit 46. It serves as a major collector and extends 18 miles to the east from Sturgis Road across a significant portion of Meade County, 8 miles as a paved surface. Elk Creek Road provides two travel lanes.

Figure 4. Roadway Network


### 3.4 Alternative Travel Modes

Alternative (non-single occupant vehicle) travel modes that currently utilize the Exit 46 area are described as follows:

## Bus Transit

Prairie Hills Transit provides weekday bus service by request between various communities along the I-90 corridor and Rapid City, including the cities of Piedmont and Summerset. Riders must contact Prairie Hills to schedule trips. Inter-state transit is provided daily along I-90 by Jefferson Bus Lines between Rapid City and Billings, Montana. No stops are provided in the vicinity of Exit 46.

## Airports

There are several airports in the area, the closest of which is the Sturgis Municipal Airport, located approximately 22 miles' drive to the north from the interchange. The Sturgis Municipal Airport provides General Aviation services. The nearest commercial airport is the Rapid City Regional Airport, located approximately 26 miles' drive to the south from Exit 46.

## Railroad

The RCP\&E Railroad is a Class II freight railroad affiliated with the Genesee \& Wyoming, Inc. rail company. The RCP\&E rail line parallels I-90 on its east side through the interchange area, and crosses Elk Creek Road at grade to the east of the Exit 46 interchange.

## Bicycle/Pedestrian

Exit 46 crosses I-90 at a desired location for pedestrian and bicycle travel, connecting residential neighborhoods to the east of I-90 with residential, commercial and institutional uses to the west of I-90. Though strategically located, the existing interchange configuration and surrounding infrastructure are not pedestrian and bicycle friendly. The current Elk Creek Road bridge over I-90 is restricted from pedestrian usage due to narrow width and vertical curvature, and the at-grade railroad crossing inhibits non-motorized travel.

### 3.5 Interchanges

## I-90 Exit 46: Elk Creek Road

The existing interchange at I-90 and Elk Creek Road (Exit 46) is a skewed diamond configuration, with a spacing of approximately 525 feet between the interchange ramp intersections along Elk Creek Road. Both ramp terminal intersections are currently controlled with STOP signs on the ramps. All ramps were originally designed and striped as single lane ramps. Elk Creek Road has a two-lane cross-section. The existing bridge over mainline I-90 does not provide pedestrian or bicycle facilities, and in fact, the use of these alternate modes is currently prohibited across the bridge. There is an at-grade crossing of the RCP\&E Railroad that is located approximately 115 feet to the east of the east (westbound I-90) ramp terminal intersection. The Elk Creek Road / Sturgis Road intersection lies within 100 feet of the west ramp terminal intersection. The westbound I-90 on-ramp and east service road (Sidney Stage Road) currently intersect. The existing Exit 46 interchange configuration is shown on the aerial photo in Figure 5.
Figure 5. Existing Configuration - I-90 Exit 46


## I-90 Exit 44: Bethlehem Road

The adjacent interchange to the northwest of the I-90 Exit 46 interchange is the Exit 44 interchange. The existing interchange of I-90 and Deerview Road (218 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street) is a skewed diamond configuration, with a spacing of approximately 450 feet between the interchange ramp intersections along Deerview Road. Both ramp terminal intersections are currently controlled with STOP signs on the ramps. All ramps were originally designed and striped as single lane ramps. Deerview Road has a two-lane cross-section. There is an at-grade crossing of the RCP\&E Railroad that is located approximately 110 feet to the east of the east (westbound I-90) ramp terminal intersection. The existing Exit 44 interchange configuration is shown on the aerial photo in Figure 6.

## Figure 6. Existing Configuration - I-90 Exit 44



Exit 44 is planned to be reconstructed in the year 2017. The planned configuration is shown on Figure 7.

Figure 7. Planned Configuration - I-90 Exit 44


## I-90 Exit 48: Stage Stop Road

The adjacent interchange to the southeast of the I-90 Exit 46 interchange is the Exit 48 interchange. The interchange is a skewed diamond configuration, with a spacing of approximately 800 feet between the interchange ramp intersections along Stage Stop Road. Both ramp terminal intersections are currently controlled with STOP signs on the ramps. Exclusive left turn lanes are provided on Stage Stop Road at the interchange ramp intersections. Stage Stop Road has a five-lane cross-section between the interchange and Sturgis Road and a two-lane cross-section to the east of the interchange. There is an at-grade crossing of the RCP\&E Railroad that is located approximately 350 feet to the east of the east (westbound I-90) ramp terminal intersection. The existing Exit 48 interchange configuration is shown on the aerial photo in Figure 8.

Figure 8. Existing Configuration - I-90 Exit 48


Exit 48 is planned to be reconstructed in the 2021-2030 timeframe. The line diagram of the proposed interchange configuration from the I-90 Environmental Assessment (Exit 40 to Exit 51) is shown on Figure 9.

Figure 9. Planned Configuration - I-90 Exit 48


### 3.6 Existing Data

## Traffic Volumes

Traffic volume information was provided by SDDOT staff and additional data were gathered by subconsultant resources. The portion of the data provided by the SDDOT included daily traffic volumes summarized by hour along mainline I-90 and historic data from the ATR along I-90 at the Tilford WIM location. The ATR information was used to develop seasonal factors used to adjust counted traffic levels to a representative time of the year designated in collaboration with the Study Advisory Team.
Subconsultant staff conducted intersection turning movement counts and 15-minute interval vehicle classification counts along mainline I-90 and Sturgis Road. Peak hour intersection turning movements were recorded on Tuesday, November 3, 2015 at the 15 arterial street intersections within the study area listed in Table 3. The traffic counts were collected in 15-minute intervals between the hours of 6:30 to 8:30 AM and 4:00 to 6:00 PM. All turning movement counts were field collected using video cameras, with counts conducted after compiling video footage. Traffic counts are provided in Appendix B.

Table 3. Peak Hour Intersection Turning Movement Count Locations

| Ref \# | Street \#1 |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | Chimney Canyon | Sturgis Rd |
| 2. | Deerview Road | EB Ramps |
| 3. | Deerview Road | WB Ramps |
| 4. | Deerview Road | Sidney Stage Rd |
| 5. | Deerview Road | Spring Valley Road |
| 6. | Elk Creek Road | Sturgis Road |
| 7. | Elk Creek Road | EB Ramps |
| 8. | Elk Creek Road | WB Ramps |
| 9. | Exit 46 WB On Ramp | Sidney Stage Road |
| 10. | Elk Creek Road | Future Spring Valley Road / Hills View Drive (East) |
| 11. | Elk Creek Road | Glenwood Drive |
| 12. | Stage Stop Road | Sturgis Road |
| 13. | Stage Stop Road | EB Ramps |
| 14. | Stage Stop Road | WB Ramps |
| 15. | Stage Stop Road | LaRue Road |

Daily vehicle classification counts were conducted on Tuesday, November 3, 2015 along Sturgis Road to the north and to the south of Elk Creek Road and along mainline I-90 to the east of the Exit 46 interchange.

The peak hour traffic data were adjusted to represent a September 2015 weekday using seasonal adjustment factors obtained from the Tilford Weigh-In-Motion ATR \#901 along mainline I-90 near Tilford to the west of the study area. Daily traffic volumes were adjusted to represent an average annual weekday using data from the Tilford Weigh-In-Motion ATR \#901.

## Traffic Crash Data

The SDDOT provided GIS information for all of the crashes reported in the study area during the 5 -year time period between 2010 and 2014. The information included location and severity along with basic information about type and contributing factors. Individual crash reports were provided for Elk Creek Road through the interchange area to allow the project team to review safety conditions in greater detail.

## Regional Travel Demand Model

The RCAMPO recently updated their travel demand model to the Year 2040, and model information was available for use in developing traffic forecasts.

### 3.7 Operational Performance

Traffic operations were evaluated for the study area interstate segments, interchanges, interstate ramp terminal intersections and adjacent arterial street intersections according to techniques documented in the HCM 2010. LOS is a qualitative measure of traffic operational conditions based on roadway capacity and vehicle delay. Levels of service are described by a letter designation ranging from LOS A to LOS F, with LOS A representing the best possible conditions and LOS F representing congested conditions. For unsignalized intersections, motor vehicle LOS is determined for movements that must yield to other vehicles, typically each minorstreet movement (or shared movement) and for major-street left turns using criteria from Exhibit 19-1 in HCM 2010, as presented in Table 4. The critical movement/approach delay is reported for each intersection that was analyzed in this study.

## Table 4. STOP-Controlled Intersection Level of Service Criteria

| Control Delay <br> (sec/veh) | LOS by Volume-to-Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | v/c $\leq 1.0$ | v/c $>1.0$ |
| $0-10$ | A | F |
| $>10-15$ | B | F |
| $>15-25$ | C | F |
| $>25-35$ | D | F |
| $>35-50$ | E | F |
| $>50$ | F | F |
| Note: The LOS criteria apply to each lane on a given approach and to each <br> approach on the minor street. LOS is not calculated for major-street <br> approaches or for the intersection as a whole. <br> Source: HCM 2010 Exhibit 19-1 |  |  |

The LOS criteria for basic freeway segments and merge/diverge analyses is based on density, measured in passenger cars per mile per lane ( $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ ), as presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Basic Freeway Segments \& Merge/Diverge Level of Service Criteria

| Level of Service | Freeway Segments <br> Density <br> $(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln})$ | Ramp Junctions <br> Density <br> $(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | $\leq 11$ | $\leq 10$ |
| B | $>11-18$ | $>10-20$ |
| C | $>18-26$ | $>20-28$ |
| D | $>26-35$ | $>28-35$ |
| E | $>35-45$ | $>35$ |
| F | Demand exceeds capacity |  |
| 445 |  |  |

HCS $^{\text {TM }} 2010$ software was used to develop the LOS calculations based on HCM 2010 methodology, as contained in the following chapters of HCM 2010:

- Chapter 11 - Basic Freeway Segments
- Chapter 13 - Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments
- Chapter 19 - Two-Way STOP-Controlled Intersections

In general, the primary mobility goal for the study is LOS D or better for overall signalized intersection operations and for individual movements at unsignalized intersections; however, it is understood that there might be some instances where minor street level of service is LOS E or LOS F, in which case the volume-to-capacity ratio and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths will also be considered. LOS C or better is the goal for mainline interstate, merge/diverge segments ramp terminal intersections. The distances between interchanges within the study area is far enough such that weaving segments do not exist.

The vehicle classification counts conducted along Sturgis Road indicate a truck percentage of 14 percent, and the vehicle classification counts conducted along mainline I-90 indicate a truck percentage of 12 percent. These truck percentages were used in the analyses. Other parameters, such as peak hour factor (PHF), used in the analyses were determined in accordance with the approved Methods and Assumptions Document.

The existing AM and PM peak hour intersection turning movements at the study area intersections are shown on Figure 10.

Figure 10. Existing Intersection Traffic Volumes


Figure 11 depicts the existing lane geometry and peak hour intersection LOS. Table 6 summarizes the results of the existing intersection LOS analyses.

Table 6. Existing Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service

| \multirow{2}{*}{ Intersection } |  | Level of Service <br> Critical Approach/Movement |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| 1 | Chimney Canyon Rd / Sturgis Rd | B (SB) | B (SB) |
| 2 | Deerview Rd / EB Ramps | A (SB) | A (SB) |
| 3 | Deerview Rd / WB Ramps | A (NB) | A (NB) |
| 4 | Deerview Rd / Sidney Stage Rd | A (NB) | A (NB) |
| 5 | Deerview Rd / Spring Valley Rd | A (NB) | A (NB) |
| 6 | Elk Creek Rd / Sturgis Rd | E (WB) | B (WB) |
| 7 | Elk Creek Rd / EB Ramps | B (SB) | A (SB) |
| 8 | Elk Creek Rd / WB Ramps | B (NB) | A (NB) |
| 9 | Sidney Stage Rd / WB On Ramp | B (SB) | A (SB) |
| 10 | Elk Creek Rd / Hills View Dr | B (NB) | B (NB) |
| 11 | Elk Creek Rd / Glenwood Dr | B (NB) | B (NB) |
| 12 | Stage Stop Rd / Sturgis Rd | C (WB TH/LT) | B (WB TH/LT) |
| 13 | Stage Stop Rd / EB Ramps | A (WB LT) | A (SB) |
| 14 | Stage Stop Rd / WB Ramps | A (NB) | B (NB) |
| 15 | Stage Stop Rd / LaRue Rd | A (SB) | A (SB) |
| Notes: <br> TB <br> TH = northbound; EB = eastbound; SB $=$ southbound; WB = westbound; |  |  |  |

As shown, critical movements through the study intersections currently operate at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the westbound approach at the Elk Creek Road/Sturgis Road intersection during AM peak hour, which operates at LOS E.

Figure 11. Existing Intersection Lane Geometry and Levels of Service


Figure 12 depicts the existing I-90 average weekday daily, eastbound and westbound peak hour mainline I-90 and ramp merge/diverge traffic volumes. Figure 12 also shows the results of the basic freeway segments and merge/diverge LOS analyses for existing conditions. Table 7 summarizes the results of the basic freeway segments analyses. Basic freeway segments along mainline I-90 currently operate at LOS A during the AM and PM peak hours.
Table 7. Existing Mainline I-90 Levels of Service

| Interstate Direction/Segment | AM Peak Hour LOS | PM Peak Hour LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB I-90 west of Exit 44 | A | A |
| WB I-90 west of Exit 44 | A | A |
| EB I-90 west of Exit 46 | A | A |
| WB I-90 west of Exit 46 | A | A |
| EB I-90 east of Exit 46 | A | A |
| WB I-90 east of Exit 46 | A | A |
| EB I-90 east of Exit 48 | A | A |
| WB I-90 east of Exit 48 | A | A |

Ramp junctions within the study area currently operate at LOS B or better during the AM and PM peak hours, as depicted on Figure 12 and summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. Existing Ramp Junction Levels of Service

| Interchange | Ramp | Movement | AM Peak LOS | PM Peak LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exit 44 | I-90 EB Off-Ramp | Diverge | B | B |
|  | I-90 WB Off-Ramp | Diverge | A | A |
|  | I-90 EB On-Ramp | Merge | A | A |
|  | I-90 WB On-Ramp | Merge | B | B |
| Exit 46 | I-90 EB Off-Ramp | Diverge | A | A |
|  | I-90 WB Off-Ramp | Diverge | A | B |
|  | I-90 EB On-Ramp | Merge | B | A |
|  | I-90 WB On-Ramp | Merge | A | B |
| Exit 48 | I-90 EB Off-Ramp | Diverge | B | A |
|  | I-90 WB Off-Ramp | Diverge | A | B |
|  | I-90 EB On-Ramp | Merge | B | A |
|  | I-90 WB On-Ramp | Merge | A | B |

[^0]Figure 12. Existing I-90 Traffic Volumes and Levels of Service


## Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

To facilitate a quantitative comparison of existing conditions and build-out conditions, the NCHRP Report 616 methodology was used to analyze bicycle and pedestrian LOS. The LOS analysis described in this report does not focus on delay and capacity of the pedestrian and bicyclist facilities, but rather the quality of the experience for a user of the facilities. This approach was selected because of the relatively low traffic volume nature of this interchange. The analysis methodology considers facility width, hourly and daily traffic volumes, travel speeds, and other quantitative measures of the facility's components. The result of the analysis is a LOS rating with "A" representing the best possible conditions and "F" representing a poor experience for the end user, similar to the LOS described in previous sections.
There is some demand for non-motorized travel across I-90 in the vicinity of Exit 46, given the presence of residential neighborhoods on both sides of I-90 and amenities such as schools and retail located to the west of I-90. However, the existing Exit 46 interchange and the Elk Creek Road corridor on either side of the interchange currently has no designated pedestrian or bicycle facilities. The Elk Creek Road bridge over I-90 is narrow and without sidewalks or paths, and no sidewalks exist along Elk Creek Road. Reflecting this deficient condition, existing conditions LOS analyses reveal an average LOS C for pedestrians and LOS D for bicyclists.

### 3.8 Existing Safety Conditions

Crash data for the most recent five-year period (2010-2014) was analyzed. Within the Exit 46 influence area (including Elk Creek Road through the interchange, mainline I-90, and interchange ramps), a total of 56 crashes were reported over this five-year period. General crash trends are summarized as follows:

- There were no fatalities, 11 injury crashes, and 45 property damage only (PDO) crashes.
- Thirty-seven of the crashes involved one motor vehicle and 19 of the crashes involved two motor vehicles.
- Nine crashes occurred during icy, snowy, or wet roadway conditions.
- There were 17 fixed object related crashes, 14 wild/domestic animal related crashes, 11 angle crashes, four overturning crashes, three rear end crashes, one side swipe same direction crash, and one head on crash. Of the fixed object related crashes, nine were guardrail crashes, two were light/luminaire supports, and the remaining six crashes were other roadside objects.

The crashes reported within the Exit 46 influence area between the years 2010-2014 are depicted on Figure 13.
No correctable patterns of crashes were detected within the Exit 46 influence area; however, a higher percentage of crashes were concentrated around the Elk Creek Road / Sturgis Road intersection. This intersection accounted for 14 of the 56 total crashes reported ( 25 percent). No specific patterns were identified at this intersection, but several contributing factors exist along Elk Creek Road. These contributing factors include closely spaced intersections, skewed intersection approaches, poor vertical sight distance over the Exit 46 bridge, and poor turning radii for large vehicles. A diagram of collisions in this area is provided on Figure 13.

Figure 13. 2010-2014 Crash History
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### 3.9 Existing Environmental Constraints

An Environmental Assessment (EA) was conducted in 2008 for the entire I-90 corridor from MRM 40 to MRM 51, following from the I-90 Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study. The EA evaluated environmental impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative for the study corridor, which included Exit 46. Some environmental resources were noted in the Exit 46 area, including right-of-way and hazardous materials. The EA concluded in 2008 with a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) associated with the Preferred Alternative.

### 4.0 NEED

### 4.1 Geometric

The following substandard conditions would persist when analyzed in light of the current South Dakota Department of Transportation Road Design Manual:

1. No provision for turn lanes along Elk Creek Road, which would be needed based on minimum traffic volume thresholds listed in the standards
2. Substandard sag $k$-values relating to headlight sight distance on Ramps C (I-90 EB OffRamp) and D (I-90 WB On-Ramp
3. Though extended in recent years, the taper rates for the ramps to l-90 remain just below the $50: 1$ standard at 39:1 for the WB on ramp and 43:1 for the EB on ramp.
4. Substandard control of access spacing between the ramp terminal intersections and adjacent intersections (approximately 50 feet to Sturgis Road on the west and 125 feet to the nearest access to the east) and at-grade railroad crossing (approximately 45 feet east of ramp terminal). Standards specify a desired spacing of 660 feet, with a minimum of 100 feet.
5. Substandard intersection: connection of the Sidney Stage Road with the I-90 westbound on ramp
6. The clear zone for recovery along ramps less than 30 feet
7. The inslopes for the on ramps being 3:1 (6:1 standard)
8. The minimum right shoulder width measured at $2-4$ feet along ramps (8 feet standard)
9. The minimum horizontal curve radius along ramps, measured at 310 feet ( 838 feet standard)

These substandard geometric conditions contribute to the prohibition of pedestrians crossing the bridge, as shown in the photo on the right, taken from the west side of the interchange looking across the bridge. The photo also illustrates the substandard control of access spacing between the ramp terminals and adjacent intersection.



In addition, the skew of the interchange creates conflicts between vehicles on the bridge and semi-tractor trailer turning movements at the ramp terminal/service road intersections, as depicted in the photo on the left (photo credit: A. Olson, September 2015).

### 4.2 Pavement

The need to replace or rehabilitate the pavement is often the driving force behind the timing of the majority of construction projects on the state highway system. The pavement of the existing I-90 mainline through Exit 46 is Hot Mix Asphalt on Portland Cement Concrete, last improved in the Year 2012. Pavement conditions along I-90 are currently acceptable, with improvements beyond the developmental program, but anticipated for the Year 2026 or 2027. No pavement information was available for Elk Creek Road.

### 4.3 Safety

The Exit 46 interchange ranked $53^{\text {rd }}$ of 62 interchanges evaluated in Phase 1 of the 2000 Interstate Corridor Study and 39 th of 126 interchanges in the 2010 Interstate Corridor Study. Neither study noted Exit 46 as a high crash location. A review of reported crashes between the Year 2010 and Year 2014 revealed no significant recurring crash patterns. Multiple safety concerns associated with the interchange were noted in meetings with members of the public and project stakeholders, including the observation that large semi tractor-trailers regularly experience difficulty making the tight turns inherent in the interchange configuration and occasionally strike guardrail or get stuck.

### 4.4 Structural

Constructed in 1957, the Elk Creek Road bridge over mainline I-90 at the current interchange is in structurally sufficient condition, but is functionally obsolete. The bridge is functionally obsolete because of its narrow width, insufficient span to accommodate future mainline I-90 widening, and sharp vertical curvature causing a posted regulatory speed limit of 15 mph , well below the posted speed limit along Elk Creek Road away from the interchange.

### 4.5 Traffic

The updated future traffic forecasts and operational analyses completed for the IMJR indicate that, in general, the Exit 46 interchange and study area intersections, are projected to operate acceptably through the year 2045, with the exception of a few critical movements/intersection approaches.

The analyses indicate that the No Build and Build scenarios are anticipated to operate comparably; however, the Build scenario provides the ability to evaluate the need for auxiliary
lanes at intersections and add them, as necessary. There are currently no intersection turn lanes at the Exit 46 interchange ramp terminal intersections or along Elk Creek Road, though future traffic volumes would warrant installation of turn lanes based on SDDOT Road Design Manual criteria.
Previous traffic analysis of the interchange resulted in similar findings, described as follows:

- The Interstate 90 Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study concluded that traffic operations are not currently an issue at the Exit 46 interchange. When the existing (No Build) configuration was evaluated for the year 2025, the interchange ramp terminal intersections with the crossroad indicated an anticipated deterioration to a LOS C during the average AM and PM peak hours. The Study also indicated that mainline capacity may require an expansion of mainline from 2 through lanes to 3 through lanes in each direction sometime beyond the planning horizon. This potential future expansion of mainline I-90 capacity could not be accommodated with the current Exit 46 bridge.
- South Dakota Department of Transportation Decennial Interstate Corridor Study completed in February 2001 evaluated projected year 2010 and 2020 traffic conditions at the Exit 46 interchange and concluded that all ramp merge/diverge movements and ramp terminal intersections are projected to operate at LOS B or better through the year 2020.

Figure 14 provides an overview of the deficiencies associated with Exit 46, all of which contribute to the need for an interchange modification.

Figure 14. Exit 46 Deficiencies


### 5.0 ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives for the Exit 46 interchange were initially developed and evaluated as part of the Interstate 90 Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study. The study developed three configuration options for the interchange area. A brief description of the No Build and three build alternatives follows:

### 5.1 No Build Alternative

The No Build Alternative would maintain the Exit 46 interchange in its current configuration. The ramp terminals at the existing diamond interchange at Exit 46 (Elk Creek Road) are extremely close to the interstate service road, and in fact, the service road on the east side (Sidney Stage Road) currently intersects with the westbound I-90 on ramp. A project that realigned the east service road (Spring Valley Road) to the east to align opposite Hills View Drive has been completed, and the east service road intersection with the westbound I-90 on ramp is planned to be removed in the future as a separate standalone project, likely prior to the Year 2020.

### 5.2 Interchange Build Alternatives

The interchange build alternatives are depicted on Figures 15-17, as conceptualized in the $I-90$ Black Hawk to Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study.

Shown on Figure 15, Alternative 1 would keep the existing diamond interchange configuration in its current location but realign the interstate service roads to provide increased intersection spacing. A new bridge over I-90 would be constructed with a flatter crest vertical curve to improve vertical sight distance crossing over I-90. A grade-separated railroad crossing would also be incorporated into the design with a second structure provided over the railroad. The eastbound and westbound on and off ramps would also be rebuilt to provide increased length. Alternative 1 also reserves the option to construct a six-legged, single-lane roundabout intersection that would tie together the intersections of Elk Creek Road and Sturgis Road with the eastbound ramp terminal and access to the Big D.

Figure 15. Alternative 1: Diamond Interchange with Realigned Service Roads


Shown on Figure 16, Alternative 2 was identified in the EA as the preferred alternative. Alternative 2 would relocate the Exit 46 interchange approximately $1 / 4$ mile to the southeast, where Sturgis Road lies farther away from mainline I-90, and reconfigure the diamond interchange to cross over I-90 at a nearly perpendicular angle, significantly reducing the skew angle at the ramp terminal intersections. A new bridge over I-90 would be constructed with a flatter crest vertical curve to improve vertical sight distance crossing over I-90, and a shared-use path could be added on the new bridge to provide a pedestrian/bicycle facility across I-90. A grade-separated railroad crossing would be incorporated into the design with a second bridge provided over the railroad. The north access to the Foothills Community Baptist Church would be closed upon implementation of Alternative 2.

Figure 16. Alternative 2: Relocated Diamond with Realigned North Service Road


As the design of Alternative 2 progressed through development of the EA, the proposed realignment of Elk Creek Road became more pronounced to the north to allow for additional distance to accumulate height to cross the railroad and I-90 and the Elk Creek Road bridge became more perpendicular to mainline I-90. The design is further depicted on Figures 29 and 30 in this IMJR.

Shown on Figure 17, Alternative 3 would relocate the Exit 46 interchange approximately $1 / 4$ mile to the southeast and construct a single point urban interchange (SPUI) interchange that would cross mainline I-90 at a nearly perpendicular angle. With a SPUI, the four exit and entrance ramps converge to one intersection on the cross street, typically controlled with a traffic signal. A new bridge over I-90 would be constructed with a flatter crest vertical curve to improve vertical sight distance crossing over I-90, and a shared-use path could be added on the new bridge to provide a pedestrian/bicycle facility across I-90. A grade-separated railroad crossing would be incorporated into the design with a second bridge provided over the railroad.
Figure 17. Alternative 3: Single Point Interchange with North Service Road Connection


### 5.3 Transportation System Management Alternative

There are no areas within the State of South Dakota that will consistently experience congestion levels extreme enough for Transportation System Management (TSM) measures such as ramp metering or high occupancy vehicle (HOV) facilities to be economically feasible in the foreseeable future.

### 6.0 FUTURE YEAR TRAFFIC

### 6.1 Travel Demand Forecasting

The IMJR Methods and Assumptions Document describes the growth projection methodology used in the study. As outlined therein, information from the RCAMPO Year 2040 travel demand model was used to develop traffic volume forecasts for both the anticipated year of project completion (2021) and the planning horizon year (2045) along the study corridor.

To enhance the accuracy of the forecasts, and as requested by FHWA staff, the forecasting process also incorporated a comparison of base year traffic volumes in the model with comparable current traffic counts. Differences between the model information and actual counts may be utilized to adjust future year forecasts to address any systemic errors in the travel demand model.

Existing year daily count data were recorded for one location on mainline I-90 in November 2015. The mainline I-90 count data required a conversion from Average Daily Traffic (ADT) to Average Annual Weekday Traffic (AAWDT) because the model information reflects an average weekday condition. This adjustment was made using information from the Tilford Weigh-InMotion ATR \#901, which continuously records traffic volumes along mainline I-90 to the west of the study area. A comparison of the base year model estimated volume compared to the recorded count is shown in Table 9. There is good correlation between the counts and model.

Table 9. Traffic Count Comparison

| Road Location |  | 2015 Count <br> AAWDT | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ Model | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ Model | Adjusted <br> 2040 <br> Forecast |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mainline I-90 | Exit 46 to Exit 48 | 21,800 | 23,533 | 35,459 | 35,121 |

Because modeled I-90 traffic volumes and counted traffic demonstrated good consistency, future year travel demand forecasts were developed using straight line growth rates calculated directly from the model. Traffic volumes were assumed to grow on a straight line basis between the model years of 2013 and 2040. Year 2021 forecasts were developed by interpolating growth along a straight line between the travel demand model base year of 2013 and 2040. Year 2045 forecasts were developed by extending the growth rates from the travel demand model an additional five years beyond the year 2040 along a straight line.
Determined by the study area for this IMJR, growth rates were developed for mainline I-90 and each interchange area.
To begin, a growth rate was developed for locations within the study area by comparing the year 2013 and year 2040 travel demand models. Where growth rates determined from the model for interchange ramps were lower than the intersecting cross-street growth rates, the rate for the interchange ramps was matched to the intersecting cross-street. The minimum rate of growth throughout the study area was set to 1.50 percent per year, which is consistent with the mainline I-90 growth rate. The growth rates and growth factors developed for each road segment are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Study Area Growth Rates \& Growth Factors

| Road Location | Growth <br> Rate | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ <br> Growth <br> Factor | $\mathbf{2 0 4 5}$ <br> Growth <br> Factor |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mainline I-90 | $1.52 \%$ | 1.12 | 1.58 |
| Exit 44 / Deerview Rd | $2.48 \%$ | 1.19 | 1.97 |
| Sturgis Rd n/o Deerview Rd \& n/o Elk Creek Rd | $1.50 \%$ | 1.11 | 1.53 |
| Exit 46 / Elk Creek Rd | $1.63 \%$ | 1.12 | 1.58 |
| Exit 48 / Stage Stop Rd | $1.77 \%$ | 1.13 | 1.64 |
| Sturgis Rd | $1.57 \%$ | 1.11 | 1.56 |

The respective growth factors for the years 2021 and 2045 were applied to the existing intersection turning movements. Turning movements between intersections along the respective study corridors were balanced, as appropriate.

Figure 18 illustrates the future growth forecasts for mainline I-90 and the Exit 44, Exit 46 and Exit 48 interchanges.

Future traffic volume forecasts were developed for both the No Build and Build scenarios. The differences for projected traffic volumes between the No Build and Build scenarios are limited to the Exit 46 interchange and Elk Creek Road corridor. For this reason, the Build scenario analyses focus on these areas and assumes that the traffic volumes along the Exit 44, Exit 48, Deerview Road, Sturgis Road and Stage Stop Road corridors will remain the same regardless of whether Exit 46 is modified.

Figure 18. Future Growth Forecasts


### 6.2 Traffic Conditions

## Year 2021 No Build Alternative

The projected year 2021 AM and PM peak hour intersection turning movements corresponding to the No Build alternative are shown on Figure 19.

Figure 20 depicts the year 2021 peak hour intersection LOS for the No Build alternative.
Table 11 summarizes the results of the intersection LOS analyses.
Table 11. Year 2021 No Build Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service

| Intersection |  | Level of Service Critical Approach/Movement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| 1 | Chimney Canyon Rd / Sturgis Rd | B (SB) | B (SB) |
| 2 | Deerview Rd / EB Ramps | A (SB) | A (SB) |
| 3 | Deerview Rd / WB Ramps | A (NB) | A (NB) |
| 4 | Deerview Rd / Sidney Stage Rd | A (NB) | A (NB) |
| 5 | Deerview Rd / Spring Valley Rd | A (NB/SB) | A (NB/SB) |
| 6 | Elk Creek Rd / Sturgis Rd | D (WB) | B (WB) |
| 7 | Elk Creek Rd / EB Ramps | B (SB) | A (SB) |
| 8 | Elk Creek Rd/ WB Ramps | B (NB) | B (NB) |
| 9 | Sidney Stage Rd / WB On Ramp | A (NB) | A (NB) |
| 10 | Elk Creek Rd / Hills View Dr | B (NB) | B (NB) |
| 11 | Elk Creek Rd / Glenwood Dr | B (NB) | B (NB) |
| 12 | Stage Stop Rd / Sturgis Rd | C (WB TH/LT) | B (WB TH/LT) |
| 13 | Stage Stop Rd / EB Ramps | A (WB LT) | A (SB) |
| 14 | Stage Stop Rd / WB Ramps | A (NB) | B (NB) |
| 15 | Stage Stop Rd / LaRue Rd | A (SB) | A (SB) |
| Notes: NB = northbound; EB = eastbound; SB = southbound; WB = westbound; $\mathrm{TH}=$ through; $\mathrm{LT}=$ left turn |  |  |  |

Based on the Year 2021 No Build scenario, movements through the study intersections are projected to operate at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the westbound approach at the Elk Creek Road/Sturgis Road intersection during AM peak hour, which is projected to operate at LOS D. This slight improvement compared to existing conditions is attributable to a higher peak hour factor being applied in accordance with the Methods and Assumptions Document. This was done because vehicle arrivals tend to become more evenly distributed throughout the peak hour as traffic volumes increase.

Figure 19. Year 2021 No Build Intersection Traffic Volumes


Figure 20. Year 2021 No Build Intersection Lane Geometry and Level of Service


Basic freeway segments along mainline I-90 are projected to operate at LOS B or better during the AM and PM peak hours based on the Year 2021 No Build analyses. Figure 21 depicts the projected year 2021 I-90 average weekday daily, eastbound and westbound mainline and ramp merge/diverge traffic volumes for the No Build Alternative. Figure 21 also shows the results of the basic freeway segments and merge/diverge LOS analyses for the Year 2021 No Build alternative. Table 12 summarizes the results of the basic freeway segments analyses.
Table 12. Year 2021 No Build Mainline I-90 Levels of Service

| Interstate Direction/Segment | AM Peak Hour LOS | PM Peak Hour LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB I-90 west of Exit 44 | A | A |
| WB I-90 west of Exit 44 | A | A |
| EB I-90 west of Exit 46 | A | A |
| WB I-90 west of Exit 46 | A | A |
| EB I-90 east of Exit 46 | A | A |
| WB I-90 east of Exit 46 | A | A |
| EB I-90 east of Exit 48 | B | A |
| WB I-90 east of Exit 48 | A | B |

Compared to existing conditions, the eastbound and westbound directions of mainline I-90 to the east of Exit 48 are projected to degrade from LOS A to LOS B during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively, based on the Year 2021 No Build scenario.
Ramp junctions within the study area are projected to operate at LOS B or better during the AM and PM peak hours based on the Year 2021 No Build scenario, as depicted on Figure 21 and summarized in Table 13.
Table 13. Year 2021 No Build Ramp Junction Levels of Service

| Interchange | Ramp | Movement | AM Peak LOS | PM Peak LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exit 44 | I-90 EB Off-Ramp | Diverge | B | B |
|  | I-90 WB Off-Ramp | Diverge | B | B |
|  | $\mathrm{I}-90$ EB On-Ramp | Merge | B | B |
|  | $\mathrm{I}-90$ WB On-Ramp | Merge | B | B |
|  | $\mathrm{I}-90$ EB Off-Ramp | Diverge | B | A |
|  | $\mathrm{I}-90$ WB Off-Ramp | Diverge | A | B |
|  | $\mathrm{I}-90$ EB On-Ramp | Merge | B | B |
|  | $\mathrm{I}-90$ WB On-Ramp | Merge | A | B |
| Exit 48 | $\mathrm{I}-90$ EB Off-Ramp | Diverge | A | A |
|  | $\mathrm{I}-90$ WB Off-Ramp | Diverge | A | B |
|  | $\mathrm{I}-90$ EB On-Ramp | Merge | B | B |
|  | $\mathrm{I}-90$ WB On-Ramp | Merge | A | B |

Compared to existing conditions, a number of ramp junction movements are projected to degrade from LOS A to LOS B based on the Year 2021 No Build scenario.

Figure 21. Year 2021 No Build I-90 Traffic Volumes and Level of Service


## Year 2045 No Build Alternative

The projected year 2045 AM and PM peak hour intersection turning movements corresponding to the Year 2045 No Build Alternative are shown on Figure 22.
The year 2045 No Build peak hour intersection LOS is depicted on Figure 23 and summarized in Table 14.

Table 14. Year 2045 No Build Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service

| Intersection |  | Level of Service Critical Approach/Movement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| 1 | Chimney Canyon Rd / Sturgis Rd | C (SB) | B (SB) |
| 2 | Deerview Rd/EB Ramps | A (SB) | A (SB) |
| 3 | Deerview Rd / WB Ramps | A (NB) | A (NB) |
| 4 | Deerview Rd / Sidney Stage Rd | A (NB) | A (NB) |
| 5 | Deerview Rd / Spring Valley Rd | A (NB/SB) | A (NB/SB) |
| 6 | Elk Creek Rd / Sturgis Rd | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{WB}) \\ \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c} \text { ratio }=1.40 \\ 95 \% \text { queue }=21.3 \text { veh } \end{gathered}$ | C (WB) |
| 7 | Elk Creek Rd / EB Ramps | C (SB) | B (SB) |
| 8 | Elk Creek Rd/ WB Ramps | D (NB) | C (NB) |
| 9 | Sidney Stage Rd / WB On Ramp | A (NB) | A (NB) |
| 10 | Elk Creek Rd / Hills View Dr | B (NB) | B (NB) |
| 11 | Elk Creek Rd/ Glenwood Dr | B (NB) | B (NB) |
| 12 | Stage Stop Rd / Sturgis Rd | D (WB TH/LT) | C (WB TH/LT) |
| 13 | Stage Stop Rd/ EB Ramps | A (SB) | B (SB) |
| 14 | Stage Stop Rd/ WB Ramps | B (NB) | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{NB}) \\ \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c} \text { ratio }=0.86 \\ 95 \% \text { queue }=9.3 \text { veh } \end{gathered}$ |
| 15 | Stage Stop Rd / LaRue Rd | A (SB) | A (SB) |

Notes: $\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound; $\mathrm{EB}=$ eastbound; $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound; $\mathrm{WB}=$ westbound;
TH = through; LT = left turn

Based on the Year 2045 No Build scenario, movements through the study intersections are projected to operate at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the movements or approaches at the four intersections detailed below:

- At the Elk Creek Road/Sturgis Road intersection, the westbound approach is projected to operate at LOS F during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour.
- At the Elk Creek Road/EB Ramps intersection, the northbound (eastbound exiting I-90) approach is projected to operate at LOS D during the AM peak hour.
- At the Stage Stop Road/Sturgis Road intersection, the westbound shared through/left turn movement is projected to operate at LOS D during the AM peak hour.
- At the Stage Stop Road/EB Ramps intersection, the northbound (eastbound exiting l-90) approach is projected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour.

Figure 22. Year 2045 No Build Intersection Traffic Volumes


Figure 23. Year 2045 No Build Intersection Lane Geometry and Level of Service


Figure 24 depicts the projected year 2045 I-90 average weekday daily, eastbound and westbound mainline and ramp merge/diverge peak hour traffic volumes for the No Build Alternative. Figure 24 also shows the results of the basic freeway segments and merge/diverge LOS analyses for the Year 2045 No Build scenario. Table 15 summarizes the results of the basic freeway segments analyses. The Year 2045 No Build analyses assumed that mainline I-90 would remain a four-lane interstate.

Table 15. Year 2045 No Build Mainline I-90 Levels of Service

| Interstate Direction/Segment | AM Peak Hour LOS | PM Peak Hour LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB I-90 west of Exit 44 | A | A |
| WB I-90 west of Exit 44 | A | A |
| EB I-90 west of Exit 46 | A | A |
| WB I-90 west of Exit 46 | A | B |
| EB I-90 east of Exit 46 | B | A |
| WB I-90 east of Exit 46 | A | B |
| EB I-90 east of Exit 48 | B | B |
| WB I-90 east of Exit 48 | A | B |

Basic freeway segments along mainline I-90 are projected to operate at LOS B or better during the AM and PM peak hours based on the 2045 No Build scenario. I-90 remains at acceptable operational levels by the Year 2045 with two travel lanes in each direction.
Ramp junctions that were analyzed within the study area are projected to operate at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours based on the 2045 No Build scenario, as depicted on Figure 24 and summarized in Table 16.
Table 16. Year 2045 No Build Ramp Junction Levels of Service

| Interchange | Ramp | Movement | AM Peak LOS | PM Peak LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exit 44 | I-90 EB Off-Ramp | Diverge | A | A |
|  | I-90 WB Off-Ramp | Diverge | B | B |
|  | I-90 EB On-Ramp | Merge | B | B |
|  | I-90 WB On-Ramp | Merge | B | B |
| Exit 46 | I-90 EB Off-Ramp | Diverge | B | B |
|  | I-90 WB Off-Ramp | Diverge | B | B |
|  | I-90 EB On-Ramp | Merge | B | B |
|  | I-90 WB On-Ramp | Merge | B | B |
| Exit 48 | I-90 EB Off-Ramp | Diverge | B | B |
|  | I-90 WB Off-Ramp | Diverge | B | C |
|  | I-90 EB On-Ramp | Merge | C | B |
|  | I-90 WB On-Ramp | Merge | B | B |

Figure 24. Year 2045 No Build I-90 Traffic Volumes and Level of Service


For the year 2045 No Build Alternative, a number of ramp junction movements are projected to operate at LOS C, particularly at Exit 48. At Exit 46, the EB On-Ramp merge movement is projected to operate at LOS C during the AM peak hour, and the WB Off-Ramp diverge movement is projected to operate at LOS C during the PM peak hour, reflecting a pattern of heavier vehicle travel oriented to/from the east (toward Rapid City) during these peak periods.
Future No Build LOS worksheets are provided in Appendix D.
Alternative 1: Diamond Interchange with Realigned Service Roads
Although Alternative 1 would replace the existing bridge and address sight distance and $k$-value deficiencies, keeping the bridge in the same location would not correct the skew angle at the ramp terminal intersections, nor would it improve spacing between the west ramp terminal intersection and Sturgis Road. Alternative 1 would have major impacts to Big D if the six-legged single-lane roundabout were to be constructed. Alternative 1 was demonstrated to operate satisfactorily in the I-90 Black Hawk to Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study analyses of future conditions; however, it is eliminated because it does not fully address all of the deficiencies noted at the Exit 46 interchange.

## Alternative 2: Relocated Diamond with Realigned North Service Road

Alternative 2 represents the Preferred Alternative carried forward from the Environmental Assessment for further analyses. Because of its selection as the Preferred Alternative, Alternative 2 is analyzed in detail in the IMJR, while Alternatives 1 and 3 are described as analyzed in the I-90 Black Hawk to Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study. The analyses of Alternative 2 focus solely on the Exit 46 interchange and Elk Creek Road corridor. It is assumed that the traffic volumes along the Exit 44, Exit 48, Deerview Road, Sturgis Road and Stage Stop Road corridors will remain the same regardless of whether Exit 46 is modified.

Figure 25 depicts the projected Year 2021 peak hour intersection turning movements at Exit 46 and along Elk Creek Road, the mainline I-90 average weekday daily and peak hour directional segment and ramp junction traffic volumes and the results of the LOS analyses corresponding to the Year 2021 Build scenario.

Figure 25 and Table 17 summarize the results of the Year 2021 Build peak hour intersection LOS analyses.

Table 17. Year 2021 Alternative 2 Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service

| Intersection |  | Level of Service Critical Approach/Movement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| 6 | Elk Creek Rd / Big D Access | B (EB) | A (EB) |
| 7 | Elk Creek Rd / Sturgis Road | D (WB LT) | B (WB LT) |
| 8 | Elk Creek Rd/ EB Ramps | C (SB LT/TH) | B (SB LT/TH) |
| 9 | Elk Creek Rd/ WB Ramps | C (NB LT/TH) | B (NB LT/TH) |
| 10 | Elk Creek Rd/ Spring Valley Road | B (NB) | B (NB) |
| 11 | Elk Creek Rd / Glenwood Dr | B (NB) | B (NB) |
| Notes: NB = northbound; EB = eastbound; $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound; WB = westbound; $\mathrm{TH}=$ through; $\mathrm{LT}=$ left turn |  |  |  |

Figure 25. Year 2021 Alternative 2 Traffic Volumes and Level of Service


| LEGEND |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| X/X XXXX(XXX) | AM/PM Mainline Eastbound Level of Service and AM(PM) Seasonally Adjusted Existing Traffic Volumes |
| X/X XXX(XXX) | AM/PM Mainline Westbound Level of Service and AM(PM) Seasonally Adjusted Existing Traffic Volumes |
| $\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{X} \times \mathrm{XX}(\mathrm{XX})$ | AM/PM Ramp Junction Level of Service and AM(PM) Seasonally Adjusted Existing Traffic Volumes |
| X, XXX | $=$ Daily Traffic Volumes <br> Existing Road Network |



Based on the Year 2021 Build scenario, the Exit 46 interchange ramp terminal intersections and the study intersections along the Elk Creek Road corridor are projected to operate at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the westbound left turn movement at the Elk Creek Road/Sturgis Road intersection during AM peak hour, which is projected to operate at LOS D.
Since the intersection delay for the left turn movement exceeded the LOS threshold, a signal warrant analysis was completed to evaluate how close the projected peak hour intersection volumes are to satisfying signalization warrants. Based on the data available for this study, only Warrant 3, Peak Hour could be evaluated. For the Year 2021, the Elk Creek Road/Sturgis Road intersection volumes were less than 10 percent of the Warrant 3 criteria. Additionally, as a result of feedback from stakeholder meetings, an all-way STOP was evaluated at the Elk Creek Road/Sturgis Road intersection. Both a signal and all-way STOP were analyzed for illustrative purposes, and the results of each are displayed on Figure 25.
Basic freeway segments along mainline I-90 are projected to operate at LOS A during the AM and PM peak hours based on the 2021 Build scenario, as depicted on Figure 25 and summarized in Table 18. Based on the analyses completed for the Year 2021 Build scenario, mainline I-90 is expected to operate comparably to the Year 2021 No Build scenario.
Table 18. Year 2021 Alternative 2 Mainline I- 90 Levels of Service

| Interstate Direction/Segment | AM Peak Hour LOS | PM Peak Hour LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB I-90 west of Exit 46 | A | A |
| WB I-90 west of Exit 46 | A | A |
| EB I-90 east of Exit 46 | A | A |
| WB I-90 east of Exit 46 | A | A |

Ramp junction LOS for the Year 2021 Build scenario is depicted on Figure 25 and summarized in Table 19.

Table 19. Year 2021 Alternative 2 Ramp Junction Levels of Service

| Interchange | Ramp | Movement | AM Peak LOS | PM Peak LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exit 46 | I-90 EB Off-Ramp | Diverge | B | A |
|  | I-90 WB Off-Ramp | Diverge | A | B |
|  | I-90 EB On-Ramp | Merge | B | B |
|  | I-90 WB On-Ramp | Merge | A | B |

Ramp junctions at Exit 46 are anticipated to operate comparably to the Year 2021 No Build scenario based on the analyses completed for the Year 2021 Build scenario. The reconfigured Exit 46 ramps are anticipated to be longer than the existing ramps and provide additional acceleration/deceleration length; however, this additional length does not cause merge/diverge operations at the ramp junctions to change on the LOS scale.

## Year 2045 Alternative 2 Build Scenario

Figure 26 depicts the projected year 2045 peak hour intersection turning movements at Exit 46 and along Elk Creek Road, the mainline I-90 average weekday daily and peak hour directional segment and ramp junction traffic volumes and the results of the LOS analyses corresponding to the Year 2045 Build scenario.

Figure 26 and Table 20 summarize the results of the Year 2045 Build peak hour intersection LOS analyses.
Table 20. Year 2045 Alternative 2 Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service

| Intersection |  | Level of Service <br> Critical Approach/Movement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| 6 | Elk Creek Rd / Big D Access | B (EB) | B (EB) |
| 7 | Elk Creek Rd / Sturgis Road | $\begin{gathered} \text { F (WB LT }) \\ \text { v/c ratio }=0.49 \\ 95 \% \text { queue }=2.2 \text { veh } \end{gathered}$ | C (WB LT) |
| 8 | Elk Creek Rd/ EB Ramps | D (SB LT/TH) | C (SB LT/TH) |
| 9 | Elk Creek Rd/ WB Ramps | D (NB LT/TH) | C (NB LT/TH) |
| 10 | Elk Creek Rd / Spring Valley Road | C (NB) | B (NB) |
| 11 | Elk Creek Rd/ Glenwood Dr | B (NB) | B (NB) |
| Notes: $\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound; $\mathrm{EB}=$ eastbound; $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound; WB = westbound; $\mathrm{TH}=$ through; $\mathrm{LT}=$ left turn |  |  |  |

Based on the Year 2045 Build scenario, movements through the Exit 46 interchange ramp terminal intersections and the study intersections along the Elk Creek Road corridor are projected to operate at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the westbound left turn movement at the Elk Creek Road/Sturgis Road intersection during AM peak hour, which is projected to operate at LOS F. For Alternative 2, the westbound approach geometry is anticipated to consist of exclusive left, through and right turn lanes. These additional approach lanes assist the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths reported on the westbound approach.

Since the reported intersection delay exceeded the LOS threshold at the Elk Creek Road/Sturgis Road and Elk Creek Road/l-90 ramp terminal intersections, a preliminary signal warrant analysis was completed to evaluate how close the projected intersection volumes are to satisfying signalization warrants. Based on the data available for this study, only Warrant 3, Peak Hour, could be evaluated as a preliminary check on the need for signalization (Warrant 3 is only applicable to conditions with extreme peaks in traffic and is not ultimately applicable to the Exit 46 area). For the Year 2045, the peak hour intersection volumes at all three intersections were less than 25 percent of the Warrant 3 criteria. Thus, it is not anticipated that any traffic signals will be warranted by the year 2045. The decision to install a future traffic signal would need to be based on a more thorough assessment of all nine MUTCD traffic signal warrants completed based on actual count data.

All-way STOP sign control was also evaluated at the Elk Creek Road/Sturgis Road intersection for the 2045 Build scenario. Though the overall LOS was found to be acceptable, individual movement LOS and delay would cause queueing concerns at the interchange.

Figure 26. Year 2045 Alternative 2 Traffic Volumes and Level of Service


Basic freeway segments along mainline I-90 are projected to operate at LOS B or better during the AM and PM peak hours based on the Year 2045 analyses, as depicted on Figure 26 and summarized in Table 21. For the Year 2045 Alternative 2 scenario, mainline I-90 is expected to operate comparably to the Year 2045 No Build scenario.
Table 21. Year 2045 Alternative 2 Mainline I- 90 Levels of Service

| Interstate Direction/Segment | AM Peak Hour LOS | PM Peak Hour LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB I-90 west of Exit 46 | A | A |
| WB I-90 west of Exit 46 | A | B |
| EB I-90 east of Exit 46 | B | A |
| WB I-90 east of Exit 46 | A | B |

Ramp junction LOS for the Year 2045 Alternative 2 scenario is depicted on Figure 26 and summarized in Table 22.
Table 22. Year 2045 Alternative 2 Ramp Junction Levels of Service

| Interchange | Ramp | Movement | AM Peak LOS | PM Peak LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exit 46 | I-90 EB Off-Ramp | Diverge | B | B |
|  | I-90 WB Off-Ramp | Diverge | B | B |
|  | I-90 EB On-Ramp | Merge | B | B |
|  | I-90 WB On-Ramp | Merge | B | B |

For the Year 2045 Alternative 2 scenario, the ramp junctions at Exit 46 are anticipated to operate comparably to the Year 2045 No Build scenario. The reconfigured Exit 46 ramps are anticipated to be longer than the existing ramps and provide additional acceleration/deceleration length; however, this additional length does not cause ramp junction merge/diverge LOS to change. Future Build condition LOS worksheets are provided in Appendix E.

## Alternative 3: Single Point Interchange with North Service Road Connection

The SPUI proposed in Alternative 3 would control movements at the ramp terminal intersection with a traffic signal, shown to operate acceptably in the I-90 Black Hawk to Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study. The relocated interchange would eliminate the existing bridge skew; however, the design of the SPUI would require a larger bridge and would likely require more retaining walls than a diamond configuration due to the proximity of the ramps and I-90. The SPUI was eliminated from consideration because it is more practical in an urban environment that necessitates a smaller interchange footprint and signalization to control traffic movements.

## Bicycle and Pedestrian Analysis

With Alternative 2 and the other build alternatives, a 10-foot wide, barrier-separated shared-use path would be constructed along the south side of Elk Creek Road. This path would provide a route for cyclists and pedestrians to travel on from Sturgis Road to Sun Valley Drive along Elk Creek Road. For the build alternatives, improvements can be seen for both users with an average LOS of $B$ for pedestrians and cyclists. This is an improvement when compared to existing conditions analysis, which indicated LOS C for pedestrians and LOS D for cyclists. Provision would also be made with each alternative for the future addition of a sidewalk along the north side of Elk Creek Road through the interchange area.

### 7.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

The three build alternatives were examined to understand their relative performance and facilitate selection of a Preferred Alternative. This evaluation borrows and builds upon alternative analyses included in the 2000 and 2010 Interstate Corridor Studies, I-90 Black Hawk to Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study, and the I-90 Exit 40 to 51 Environmental Assessment.

### 7.1 Conformance with Transportation Plans

Each of the interchange alternatives conform with current local and state transportation plans. The proposed revised access is identified in the RCAMPO RapidTRIP 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan .

The existing Exit 46 interchange was first identified as having geometric needs in the 2000 Statewide Interstate Corridor Study. An interchange improvement has been in the statewide transportation planning process since 2014, and is currently listed in the developmental program for the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Reconstruction of the interchange is currently identified for implementation between the Years of 2021 and 2025.

### 7.2 Compliance with Policies and Engineering Standards

The No Build Alternative will not address the known geometric needs of the existing interchange. The following substandard conditions would persist when analyzed in light of the current South Dakota Department of Transportation Road Design Manual:

1. No provision for turn lanes along Elk Creek Road, which would be needed based on minimum traffic volume thresholds listed in the standards
2. Substandard sag k-values relating to headlight sight distance on Ramps C (I-90 EB OffRamp) and D (I-90 WB On-Ramp
3. Though extended in recent years, the taper rates for the ramps to l-90 remain just below the $50: 1$ standard at 39:1 for the WB on ramp and $43: 1$ for the EB on ramp.
4. Substandard control of access spacing between the ramp terminal intersections and adjacent intersections (approximately 50 feet to Sturgis Road on the west and 125 feet to the nearest access to the east) and at-grade railroad crossing (approximately 45 feet east of ramp terminal). Standards specify a desired spacing of 660 feet, with a minimum of 100 feet.
5. Substandard intersection: connection of the Sidney Stage Road with the I-90 westbound on ramp
6. The clear zone for recovery along ramps less than 30 feet
7. The inslopes for the on ramps being 3:1 (6:1 standard)
8. The minimum right shoulder width measured at $2-4$ feet along ramps ( 8 feet standard)
9. The minimum horizontal curve radius along ramps, measured at 310 feet ( 838 feet standard)

The build alternatives would correct all geometric deficiencies except for \#4, which none of the alternatives would completely correct. Alternative 1 would address intersection spacing west of the interchange by consolidating movements at a roundabout intersection-while the at-grade railroad crossing and access intersection remain east of the interchange. Alternatives 2 and 3
would address spacing concerns west of the interchange by improving existing spacing to Sturgis Road to over 100 feet (meeting minimum spacing requirements but short of desired 660foot spacing).

### 7.3 Environmental Impacts

The I-90 Exit 40 to 51 Environmental Assessment was completed and approved in 2008, clearing the Preferred Alternative with no significant impact. The approved EA may be found at: http://www.sddot.com/business/environmental/assessments/Default.aspx. A Categorical Exclusion document is being created to address issues specific to the Exit 46 interchange.

### 7.4 Safety

After review of the existing crash data summarized in Section 3.8, a large percentage of crashes (25 percent) occur near Elk Creek Road and its intersection with Sturgis Road. Specific correctable crash patterns were not identified, but several contributing factors have been identified along this stretch of roadway. The factors include closely spaced intersections, skewed intersection approaches, poor vertical sight distance over the Exit 46 bridge, and poor turning radii for large vehicles. These contributing factors are removed through the construction of Alternative 2 and will likely result in an overall reduction in crashes along the Elk Creek Road corridor.

### 7.5 Operational Performance

The No Build Alternative was shown to provide acceptable peak hour traffic operations for all mainline, ramp merge/diverge sections at Exit 46 through the Year 2045. Surface street intersection movements would also operate acceptably, with the exception of movements noted in section 6.2 at the EB ramps intersection with Elk Creek Road and the Elk Creek Road/Sturgis Road intersection.

All of the build alternatives would provide operational conditions equal to or better than the No Build Alternative, based both on traffic analyses included in the I-90 Black Hawk to Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study and updated analyses of Alternative 2 in this IMJR. The current Alterntative 2 concept has been designed to incorporate additional exclusive turn lanes as warranted by SDDOT standards, and these turn lanes would provide operational benefits over the No Action condition, which provides no intersection turn lanes at Exit 46.

### 7.6 Evaluation Matrix

Table 23. Alternative Evaluation Matrix

|  | No Build | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ramp Terminal LOS | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable, but signalization not warranted initially, making single point intersection not feasible |
| I-90 LOS | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable |
| Bicycle/Pedestrian Performance | No sidewalks/ paths and narrow bridge, at-grade RR Crossing | Shared-use path and potential future sidewalk provided, roundabout would be difficult to navigate | Shared-use path and potential future sidewalk provided, diamond interchange navigable | Shared-use path and potential future sidewalk provided, single point interchange can be difficult to navigate |
| Meets all SDDOT Geometric Design Criteria | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Meets SDDOT Access Criteria | No | No | Yes, meets minimum acceptable | Yes, meets minimum acceptable |
| Ramp Terminal to Nearest Access Distance | 30' | 45 | 100' | 100' |
| Right-of-Way Impacts | None | Realignment of Sturgis Road would affect property | Property along new Elk Creek Road alignment owned by SDDOT | Property along new Elk Creek Road alignment owned by SDDOT |
| Environmental Impacts | None | Minimal | Minimal | Minimal |
| Utility Impacts | None | Minimal | Some | Some |
| Constructability | NA | Would require more bridge closure time to construct | More efficient construction as new bridge relocated from current | More efficient construction as new bridge relocated from current |

### 7.7 Coordination

The SDDOT has a long history of public involvement in the development of transportation plans and projects. Public and stakeholder meetings were held as part of this project on Wednesday, January 20, 2016. The public meeting was attended by a total of 66 people, including members of the SAT and consultant team. The public meeting sought feedback as to the whether the proposed shared-use path should be located on the north or south side of the new Exit 46 bridge. The feedback received favors the south side as the location for the shared-use path. Other public comments were generally positive and indicate people are looking forward to the project being completed.

The project team also met with stakeholders who own property adjacent to the Exit 46 interchange and representatives of the Cities of Summerset and Piedmont. Feedback from the stakeholders was received to understand their transportation interests and how the proposed modifications to the Exit 46 interchange could affect them.

As part of the project, a website has been established that provides an overview of the reason for the study, a description of the study limits, and links previous studies and materials presented and disseminated at the public meeting. The website can be accessed at the following address:
http://www.sddot.com/transportation/highways/planning/specialstudies/I90Exit46/
A screenshot of the website's contents is shown on Figure 27.
Figure 27. I-90 Exit 46 IMJR Website
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Reason for Study:
The 2000 intestate Corridor Study determined that the l-90 corridor between Black Hawk and Sturgis would be one of the top segments of South Dakota's interstate System to target for improvement. The SDDOT responded by having the Interstate 90 Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study completed in 2004, which
determined that relocating the 1-90 Exit 46 (Elk Creek Road) interchange would be the bestalternative to prepare I-90 for future expansion. In 2008, an determined that /
a diamond configuration to be the preferred alternative for that relocated interchange.
The SDDOT has been making progress implementing the recommendations from the Interstate 90 Black Hawk - Sturg is Corridor Preservation Study. As part of that progression, the SDDOT has reached the milestone to conduct a more in depth study of the Exit 46 interchange's traffic operations, affects to the interstate System, and request permission from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to make modifications to the Elk Creek Road interchange,
Study Limits:
The study improvement corridors for the 1-90 Exit 46 (Elk Creek Road) Interchange Modification Study will include:

- Elk Creek Road from the intersection with Sturgis Road to the intersection with Glenwood Drive, approximately 0.70 miles,
- Deer View Road from Sturgis Road to Spring Valley Road, approximately 0.75 miles,
- Stage Stop Road from Sturgis Road to La Rue Road, approximately 0.80 miles,
- The ramps for the l-90 Exit 46 (Elk Creek Road) interchange,
- The ramps for the I-90 Exit 44 (Bethlehem Road) interchange, and
- The ramps for the l-90 Exit 48 (Stage Stop Road) interchange.

Map of Study Area
Public Involvement
The South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) has a long history of public involvement in the development of transportation plans and projects. The 2005 passage of the Safe, Accountable, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires a public involvement process. In accordance with the Department's public participation document, the l-90 Exit 46 (Elk Creek Road) Interchange Options Study strives to keep the public involved with the study as much as possible. Public meetings for the study will occasionally be scheduled to collect public input, provide information and answer questions.

### 8.0 FUNDING PLAN

The South Dakota Department of Transportation Decennial Interstate Corridor Study, Phase One Report completed in August 2010 prepared a probable construction cost estimate of approximately $\$ 8.7$ million (year 2010 dollars) for a relocated diamond interchange at Exit 46.
In the year 2014, the SDDOT included Exit 46 reconstruction in the Developmental Program of its statewide planning process. The planned project for replacing the existing Exit 46 interchange is currently estimated to cost $\$ 8.774$ million (in 2015 dollars). The SDDOT is currently anticipating funding the project with the combination of funding sources shown in Table 24.

Table 24. Anticipated Funding Allocation Breakdown

| Project Number | State Funding Category | Federal Funding Category | Federal Funds | State Funds | Total Funds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { IM 0901(187)46 } \\ & \text { PCN 034J } \end{aligned}$ | Interstate | National Highway Performance Program | \$7.982 Million | \$0.792 Million | \$8.774 Million |
| Total |  |  | \$7.982 Million | \$0.792 Million | \$8.774 Million |

Note: As funding is fluid, category breakdown may be different at time of project authorization.

As the project is anticipated to be let to contract in Federal fiscal year 2020, the inflated estimated cost for the overall project is $\$ 9.686$ million.

### 9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

This modification request is to reconfigure the existing Exit 46 interchange, but maintain the diamond configuration, as shown in Figure 16 in Chapter 5.

This recommendation addresses the eight policy requirements for new or revised access points to the existing Interstate system published in the Federal Register Volume 74 Number 165; August 27, 2009.

1. The need being addressed by the request cannot be adequately satisfied by existing interchanges to the Interstate, and/or local roads and streets in the corridor can neither provide the desired access, nor can they be reasonably improved (such as access control along surface streets, improving traffic control, modifying ramp terminals and intersections, adding turn bays or lengthening storage) to satisfactorily accommodate the design year traffic demands (23 CFR 625.2(a)).

This modification request is to reconfigure an existing interchange. No additional access to the Interstate System is being requested. The reconfiguration of the existing interchange will have a negligible effect on the Interstate's traffic operations when compared with the existing interchange's configuration.
Previous studies and a desktop review of current aerial photography have revealed the following geometric deficiencies associated with the current Exit 46:

1. No provision for turn lanes along Elk Creek Road, which would be needed based on minimum traffic volume thresholds listed in the standards
2. Substandard sag k-values relating to headlight sight distance on Ramps C (I-90 EB Off-Ramp) and D (I-90 WB On-Ramp
3. Though extended in recent years, the taper rates for the ramps to I-90 remain just below the 50:1 standard at 39:1 for the WB on ramp and 43:1 for the EB on ramp.
4. Substandard control of access spacing between the ramp terminal intersections and adjacent intersections (approximately 50 feet to Sturgis Road on the west and 125 feet to the nearest access to the east) and at-grade railroad crossing (approximately 45 feet east of ramp terminal). Standards specify a desired spacing of 660 feet, with a minimum of 100 feet.
5. Substandard intersection: connection of the Sidney Stage Road with the I-90 westbound on ramp
6. The clear zone for recovery along ramps less than 30 feet
7. The inslopes for the on ramps being 3:1 (6:1 standard)
8. The minimum right shoulder width measured at 2-4 feet along ramps (8 feet standard)
9. The minimum horizontal curve radius along ramps, measured at 310 feet ( 838 feet standard)

## Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations

The Elk Creek Road bridge over I-90 at Exit 46 was constructed in 1957. is functionally obsolete and does not provide for future widening of mainline I-90 to six lanes, nor does it provide for pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

The proposed modification request includes a 10-foot wide shared-use path along the south side of Elk Creek Road extending between Hillsview Drive and Sturgis Road. To accommodate potential future needs, provision is made in the interchange design concept for the future addition of a 5-foot sidewalk along the north side of Elk Creek Road on either side of the bridge, and the bridge could be modified to carry this sidewalk over I-90.
2. The need being addressed by the request cannot be adequately satisfied by reasonable transportation system management (such as ramp metering, mass transit, and HOV facilities), geometric design, and alternative improvements to the Interstate without the proposed change(s) in access (23CFR 625.2(a)).

This modification request is to reconfigure the geometrics of an existing interchange. No additional access to the Interstate System is being requested.

The Interstate 90 Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study initially developed three build alternatives, which were narrowed down to two feasible alternatives for the corridor's EA. The two alternatives evaluated in the EA were a single point and a diamond interchange. The EA noted that both alternatives would require the realignment of Elk Creek Road to the south to provide a greater separation distance between the east interchange ramps and the interstate service road intersection. Realigned Elk Creek Road would be grade-separated over both the railroad tracks and I-90.
The single point interchange alternative would have relocated the Exit 46 interchange to the east and constructed a single point interchange. The single point interchange was ruled out because it was not considered practical at Exit 46 and would have required installation of a traffic signal and would have cost more to construct because it would require a larger bridge, a traffic signal and more retaining walls.

The relocated diamond interchange was selected as the preferred option in the EA primarily because of cost as well as the reconstructed interchange being able to eliminate the sharp skew angle, provide better spacing between the ramp terminal and service road intersections, and greatly improve sight distance on the bridge. The EA's preferred option also includes the realignment of Elk Creek Road in order to improve spacing between the ramp terminal and service road intersections and provide for a grade-separated crossing of the railroad. The increase in distance between the ramp terminal intersections and Sturgis Road would improve the operation of the crossroad intersections, including the ramp terminal intersections by providing additional queue space for left turn and width for auxiliary lanes to be added, as warranted. The grade separation of the railroad is another benefit that would improve traffic operations and safety in the vicinity of the Exit 46 interchange.

There are no areas within the State of South Dakota that will consistently experience congestion levels extreme enough to make ramp metering or HOV facilities economically feasible in the foreseeable future.
3. An operational and safety analysis has concluded that the proposed change in access does not have a significant adverse impact on the safety and operation of the Interstate facility (which includes mainline lanes, existing, new, or modified ramps, ramp intersections with crossroad) or on the local street network based on both the current and the planned future traffic projections. The analysis shall, particularly in urbanized areas, include at least the first adjacent existing or proposed interchange on either side of the proposed change in access (23 CFR 625.2(a), 655.603(d) and 771.111(f)). The crossroads and the local street network, to at least the first major intersection on either side of the proposed change in access, shall be included in this analysis to the extent necessary to fully evaluate the safety and operational impacts that the proposed change in access and other transportation improvements may have on the local street network (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)).
Requests for a proposed change in access must include a description and assessment of the impacts and ability of the proposed changes to safely and efficiently collect, distribute and accommodate traffic on the Interstate facility, ramps, intersection of ramps with crossroad, and local street network (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)). Each request must also include a conceptual plan of the type and location of the signs proposed to support each design alternative (23 U.S.C. 109(d) and 23 CFR 655.603(d)).

The operational analyses contained in this study indicate that mainline I-90 and ramp junction, and ramp terminal intersections are projected to operate within operational goals for both the Build and No Build scenarios through the planning horizon year of 2045.

An analysis of crash records for the most recent available five-year period (2010-2014) has been provided in the "Existing Safety Conditions" section. The safety analysis indicates that there are no discernable or correctable crash patterns within the influence area of the Exit 46 interchange. The relocated diamond interchange and reconstructed bridge would improve spacing between the ramp terminal and service road intersections, improve vertical sight distance and provide for a grade-separate crossing of the railroad. The bridge is planned to provide enough width to accommodate turn lanes at the ramp terminal intersections and a shared-use path, all of which should improve traffic operations and pedestrian/bicycle connectivity in the vicinity of Exit 46.

One of the key factors that can affect the operations of an interchange is the permanent signing associated with the interchange. As the proposal is for replacement of an existing interchange, minimal change in permanent signing is anticipated from the permanent signing that is currently in place, although some signs may need to be relocated based on the final location of the proposed future reconfigured Exit 46 interchange. A preliminary Exit 46 signing concept, showing the signs approximately one mile away on both sides of the Exit 46 interchange, is depicted on Figure 28.

The preliminary signing concept shows that the interstate guide signs associated with the relocated Exit 46 interchange design can be feasibly placed to provide adequate spacing between signs and accurate motorist guidance while not interfering with signing for adjacent interchanges.

Figure 28. Preliminary Conceptual Signing Plan

4. The proposed access connects to a public road only and will provide for all traffic movements. Less than "full interchanges" may be considered on a case-by-case basis for applications requiring special access for managed lanes (e.g., transit, HOVs, HOT lanes) or park and ride lots. The proposed access will be designed to meet or exceed current standards (23 CFR 625.2(a), 625.4(a) (2), and 655.603(d)).

The access improvement will maintain a connection to a public road (Elk Creek Road) and will replace the current full access interchange with a reconfigured full access interchange. The reconfigured interchange will continue to provide for all traffic movements. The improvement will meet or exceed current standards for Federal-aid projects on the Interstate system.
5. The proposal considers and is consistent with local and regional land use and transportation plans. Prior to receiving final approval, all requests for new or revised access must be included in an adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan, in the adopted Statewide or Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (STIP or TIP), and the Congestion Management Process within transportation management areas, as appropriate, and as specified in 23 CFR part 450, and the transportation conformity requirements of 40 CFR parts 51 and 93.

The proposed interchange improvement is consistent with local land use plans and the RCAMPO RapidTrip 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan and Meade Moving Forward 2040 Transportation Plan.
6. In corridors where the potential exists for future multiple interchange additions, a comprehensive corridor or network study must accompany all requests for new or revised access with recommendations that address all of the proposed and desired access changes within the context of a longer-range system or network plan (23 U.S.C. 109(d), 23 CFR 625.2(a), 655.603(d), and 771.111).

Previous studies conducted in the past 15 years, including the South Dakota Department of Transportation Decennial Interstate Corridor Study completed in February 2001; the Interstate 90 Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study completed in December 2004; and the 2010 South Dakota Department of Transportation Decennial Interstate Corridor Study completed in November 2010 indicated no need for any future interchange additions along the segments of I-90 between Exit 46 and the adjacent exits.
7. When a new or revised access point is due to a new, expanded, or substantial change in current or planned future development or land use, requests must demonstrate appropriate coordination has occurred between the development and any proposed transportation system improvements (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)). The request must describe the commitments agreed upon to assure adequate collection and dispersion of the traffic resulting from the development with the adjoining local street network and Interstate access point (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)).

The proposed interchange modification is the result of the Interstate 90 Black Hawk Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study and the corresponding I-90 Environmental Assessment (Exit 40 to Exit 51). The study was jointly coordinated by SDDOT, Meade County, and FHWA staff. The reconfiguration of the interchange is being proposed to accommodate future traffic growth relative to the anticipated future population growth of the entire Northern Black Hills. After analysis of several alternatives for the corridor, the

Interstate 90 Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study recommended the relocation of several service roads, the redesign of several interchanges, and the reconstruction and widening of the I-90 mainline in some areas between Black Hawk and Sturgis when traffic and conditions warrant. Unfortunately, both terrain restraints of the Northern Black Hills and the location of nearby federal lands create a geographic bottleneck that limits the amount of parallel corridors to operationally support I-90 that can be feasibly constructed.
8. The proposal can be expected to be included as an alternative in the required environmental evaluation, review and processing. The proposal should include supporting information and current status of the environmental processing (23 CFR 771.111).

The proposed revised access is planned to be included in the 2017-2020 STIP and is the result of the corridor's Environmental Assessment completed in September 2008. A Categorical Exclusion document will be developed upon completion of the IMJR, using the EA information as a reference. A preliminary concept of the Preferred Alternative is illustrated on Figure 29.
The SDDOT Road Design Manual provides criteria that are used to identify when left turn and right turn lanes are appropriate along major streets at intersections based on traffic levels. This criterion is described in Chapter 15, under the Turn Lane Warrants section of the Manual. The proposed modified interchange was evaluated in light of the Manual's guidance and, in combination with engineering judgement, turn lanes were identified for several intersections and movements. The resulting recommended turn lanes are shown on Figure 29.

Figure 29. Exit 46 Proposed Action


Figure 30. Exit 46 Proposed Action (Zoomed view)
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## 2. STAKEHOLDER ACCEPTANCE

The undersigned parties concur with the Methods and Assumptions for the Exit 46 Interchange Modification Justification Report (IMJR) as presented in this document.


FHWA


Participation of the Study Advisory Team and/or signing of this document do not constitute approval of the Exit 46 IMJR Final Report or conclusions.

All members of the Study Advisory Team will accept this document as a guide and reference as the study progresses through the various stages of development. If there are any agreed upon changes to the assumptions in this document a revision will be created, endorsed and signed by all the signatories.

## 3. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

## A. Background Information

As part of the Interstate 90 Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study completed in 2004, it was determined that relocating the l-90 Exit 46 (Elk Creek Road) interchange would be the best alternative to prepare l-90 for future expansion. The 2008 Environmental Assessment (EA) of Exit 40 to Exit 51 confirmed the need to relocate the interchange in preparation of future mainline l-90 expansion and determined a diamond configuration to be the preferred alternative for that relocated interchange.

The SDDOT has been making progress implementing the recommendations from the Interstate 90 Black Hawk - Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study. As such, the SDDOT intends to let for construction the project to relocate the Exit 46 interchange in Federal fiscal year 2020 for which this interchange study will help bring to fruition.

The Exit 46 Interchange Modification Justification Report (IMJR) must be completed to address Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements prior to implementation. This document provides the Methods and Assumptions by which the IMJR will be conducted.

## B. Location and Affected Facilities

Interstate 90 (I-90) Exit 46 is configured as a diamond interchange in Meade County serving Elk Creek Road, which lies adjacent to the cities of Piedmont and Summerset. In addition to Elk Creek Road and I-90, affected facilities include Sturgis Road, Spring Valley Road, Deerview Road (Exit 44), and Stage Stop Road (Exit 48).

## C. Need for Study

The IMJR is needed to evaluate whether Exit 46 can be relocated in a fashion that provides acceptable traffic operations and safety upon opening day and into the long term future. The IMJR will address each of FHWA's eight policy points and will be formatted according to the FHWA Interstate Access Guide, Section 3.5.3. A new environmental document will be developed alongside the IMJR to ensure that NEPA requirements are satisfied.

## D. Study Schedule

The project officially began with a kickoff meeting with the Study Advisory Team on October 1, 2015. The anticipated project schedule, provided below, assumes this initiation date and details key activities and events needed to complete the IMJR.

|  | 2015 |  |  |  | 2016 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY |
| 1. Kickoff Meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Methods \& Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Baseline Conditions / Obtain Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Existing Traffic \& Operations Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Project Future Traffic Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Refinement of Build Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Traffic \& Operations Analysis of Scenarios |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Traffic Variables for Design |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Interchange Modification Justification Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEPA Activities <br> Comparison of Curent \& Prior EA Conditions Comparison of Current \& Prior EA Impacts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public Involvement (includes SAT) <br> SAT Meetings <br> Landowner Meetings <br> Public Meeting |  |  | 0 |  |  | - |  | 0 |  |
| Document Preparation Document Submittals |  |  |  |  | reparati ㅁ | - |  | NEPA |  |
| - In-Person Meetings O Remote Meetings | raft Sub | nittal | $\square$ Final | Submitta |  |  |  |  |  |

Key events called out include:

- Public meeting and landowner meetings conducted in early/mid January of 2015.
- Study Advisory Team meetings held in October and December of 2015 and January, February and April of 2016.
It is anticipated that that a draft IMJR will be completed by January 2016 with the final report by late February 2016. Efforts will be made to accelerate the schedule.


## E. Previous Studies

The following are the known previous studies relevant to this study.

- I-90 Black Hawk to Sturgis Corridor Preservation Study
- 2010 SDDOT Decennial Interstate Corridor Study (Phases 1-3)
- I-90 Exit 40 to 51 Environmental Assessment
- Meade County Transportation Plan
- Rapid TRIP 2040
- Exit 44 Interchange Modification Justification Report (IMJR)
- Piedmont Valley Shared Use Path Plan
- Rapid City Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan
- Elk Creek Road Corridor Plan
F. Study Advisory Team Members

| Representative | Organization |
| :--- | :--- |
| Philip Anderson | City of Piedmont |
| George Mandas | City of Summerset |
| Kirk Chaffee | Meade County |
| Patsy Horton | Rapid City MPO |
| Kip Harrington | Rapid City MPO |
| Stacy Bartlett | SDDOT - Rapid City Region |
| Jeff Brosz | SDDOT - Trans. Inv. Management |
| Steve Johnson | SDDOT - Bridge Design |
| Mark Hoines | FHWA - Planning |
| Marc Hoelscher | FHWA - Operations |
| Karen Olson | SDDOT - Road Design |
| Brad Remmich | SDDOT - Project Development |
| Alice Whitebird |  |
| Steve Gramm |  |

## 4. STUDY AREA

The study area encompasses the roadway corridors indicated on the following graphic:
Figure 1. Study Area


Study corridors include:

- Elk Creek Road from the intersection with Sturgis Road to the intersection with Glenwood Drive, approximately 0.70 miles,
- Deer View Road from Sturgis Road to Spring Valley Road, approximately 0.75 miles,
- Stage Stop Road from Sturgis Road to La Rue Road, approximately 0.80 miles,
- Mainline I-90 from west of I-90 Exit 44 to east of I-90 Exit 48 , approximately $4 \frac{1}{2}$ miles,
- The ramps for the I-90 Exit 46 (Elk Creek Road) interchange,
- The ramps for the l-90 Exit 44 (Bethlehem Road) interchange, and
- The ramps for the I-90 Exit 48 (Stage Stop Road) interchange.


## 5. ANALYSIS YEARS/PERIODS

It is anticipated that operational analyses will be conducted for existing conditions and for years 2021 and 2045. Existing conditions analysis will be on existing traffic data. Existing traffic counts will be collected for weekday AM and PM peak period conditions. The AM peak period is assumed to extend from 6:30 AM to 8:30 AM, and the PM peak period from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM. The peak one hour from these time frames will be selected for peak hour operational analyses.

## 6. DATA COLLECTION

Many sources of data will be used to establish the current baseline conditions assessment and identify existing issues affecting the transportation system. The data collection effort includes:

- Obtain and review current ordinances and guidelines
- Gather base mapping data from agencies
- Obtain existing traffic volume and turning movement data
- Gather other relevant data (e.g. land use, design plans, photography, utilities, existing development plans)
- Obtain and inventory existing crash history data
- Identify existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Obtain available information regarding future development in the study area

The effort to provide traffic volume data for the project will be conducted using the following two methods:

1. Compile data from available historical and recent data with the study area from studies in the area and the SDDOT sources.
2. Collect weekday peak hour turning movement data at the study intersections. It is anticipated that turning movement data will be collected from 6:30 to 8:30 AM and from 4:00 to 6:00 PM. However, this will be confirmed and adjusted if necessary based information from method \#1.

Turning movement counts will be compiled at the following intersections:

| Ref \# | Street \#1 | Street \#2 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | Chimney Canyon | Sturgis Rd |
| 2. | Deerview Road | WB Ramps |
| 3. | Deerview Road | EB Ramps |
| 4. | Deerview Road | Sidney Stage Rd |
| 5. | Deerview Road | Spring Valley Road |
| 6. | Elk Creek Road | Sturgis Road |


| Ref \# | Street \#1 | Street \#2 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 7. | Elk Creek Road | WB Ramps |
| 8. | Elk Creek Road | EB Ramps |
| 9. | Exit 46 WB On Ramp | Sidney Stage Road |
| 10. | Elk Creek Road | Future Spring Valley Road / Hills View Drive (East) |
| 11. | Elk Creek Road | Glenwood Drive |
| 12. | Stage Stop Road | Sturgis Road |
| 13. | Stage Stop Road | EB Ramps |
| 14. | Stage Stop Road | WB Ramps |
| 15. | Stage Stop Road | LaRue Road |

Traffic counts will be collected by All Traffic Data, Inc. All turning movement counts will be field collected using video cameras, with counts conducted after compiling the video footage. Daily vehicle classification counts will be conducted at two locations along Sturgis Road and along I90 east of the Exit 46 interchange.

Since traffic data will be obtained from multiple sources and from different months and years. All traffic data will be factored to September 2015 using seasonal adjustment factors obtained from the weigh-in-motion station near Tilford.

The map on the following page depicts traffic count locations. Intersection turning movement counts are depicted as yellow dots and daily counts as blue dots.

Figure 2. Traffic Count Locations


## 7. TRAFFIC OPERATIONS ANALYSIS

Operational analysis will be based on procedures documented in the Highway Capacity Manual 2010 (Transportation Research Board, 2010). More specifically, the following chapters of the HCM could be used to analyze specific operational conditions:

## Operational Analysis

- Chapter 10 - Freeway Facilities
- Chapter 11 - Basic Freeway Segments
- Chapter 12 - Freeway Weaving Segments
- Chapter 13 - Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments
- Chapter 16 - Urban Street Facilities (Multimodal Analysis)
- Chapter 18 - Signalized Intersections
- Chapter 19 - Two-Way Stop Controlled Intersections
- Chapter 20 - All-Way Stop Controlled Intersections

Highway Capacity Software will be used to conduct operational analyses. No other traffic analysis software will be used and no micro simulations of traffic will be conducted or provided.

HCM 2010 analysis procedures require the use of certain parameters, summarized in the following table:

| Traffic Parameter |  | I-90 | Surface Streets |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% heavy vehicles | Trucks and buses | Determined from recorded vehicle class on l-90 | Determined from vehicle class on Sturgis Road |
|  | RV's | 0\% | 0\% |
| Existing Conditions Peak Hour Factor |  | Determined from existing intersection counts - calculated as the PHF for the overall intersection |  |
| Future Conditions Peak Hour Factor |  | 0.92* |  |
| Free-flow Speed (mph) |  | 75 | n/a |
| Terrain/Area Type |  | Level | Level |
| Saturation Flow Rate (vehicles per hour per lane) for two-way stop- controlled and signalized intersections |  | n/a | 1800 |
| Queue Length Percentile |  | n/a | 95\%ile |

*A lower value may be used for the Peak Hour Factor at an intersection if the existing value is below 0.92 and future traffic forecasts indicate that the traffic stream will continue to demonstrate similar peaking characteristics. The PHF for future analysis scenarios will not be lowered below 0.88 , the rural default value.

The following table identifies urban street facilities and intersections for HCM analyses.

| Urban Street Facility | Intersections |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \# | Street \#1 | Street \#2 |
| Exit 44: Deer View Road from Sturgis Road to Spring Valley Road | 1 | Chimney Canyon | Sturgis Rd |
|  | 2 | Deerview Road | WB Ramps |
|  | 3 | Deerview Road | EB Ramps |
|  | 4 | Deerview Road | Sidney Stage Rd |
|  | 5 | Deerview Road | Spring Valley Road |
| Exit 46: Elk Creek Road from Sturgis Road to Deerview Road | 6 | Elk Creek Road | Sturgis Road |
|  | 7. | Elk Creek Road | WB Ramps |
|  | 8 | Elk Creek Road | EB Ramps |
|  | 9 | Exit 46 WB On Ramp | Sidney Stage Road |
|  | 10 | Elk Creek Road | Future Spring Vly Rd / Hills View Dr E |
|  | 11 | Elk Creek Road | Glenwood Drive |
| Exit 48: Stage Stop Road from Sturgis Road to La Rue Road | 12 | Stage Stop Road | Sturgis Road |
|  | 13 | Stage Stop Road | EB Ramps |
|  | 14 | Stage Stop Road | WB Ramps |
|  | 15 | Stage Stop Road | LaRue Road |

## 8. TRAVEL FORECAST

Exit 46 falls within the Rapid City Area MPO boundary. Therefore, the RCMPO regional travel demand model will be the basis for long range transportation projections. FHU possesses the 2040 version of the MPO travel demand model and will utilize the model to develop traffic forecasts for both the year of project completion (2021) and planning horizon year (2045) along the study corridor. Year 2021 forecasts will be developed by interpolating growth between the travel demand model base year of 2013 and 2040.

Year 2045 traffic forecasts will be developed by extending the growth rate(s) from the travel demand model an additional five years beyond 2040.

Future intersection turning movement forecasts will be developed by applying growth rates derived from the travel demand model to existing counts.

## 9. SAFETY ISSUES

Crash history data for the most recently available five (5) complete years will be analyzed (2010-2014) to identify crash concentrations and trends at the current Exit 46 interchange, mainline l-90 through the interchange, and adjacent intersections along Elk Creek Road. Locations showing elevated crash experience will be noted and reviewed to identify particular crash type and severity patterns.

## 10. SELECTION OF MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS (MOE)

The primary measures of effectiveness for this effort will include the following:

- Intersection and facility operations will use average delay per vehicle, density and speed as calculated by the Highway Capacity Software (HCS) to determine Level of Service (LOS).
- Bicycle and pedestrian LOS evaluations for Urban Street Analysis will rely upon scores calculated using the HCM methodology. For this analysis, no transit results will be calculated as it is assumed that no fixed route transit service will be provided.

In general, the primary mobility goal for the study will be Level of Service (LOS) D or better for overall signalized intersection operations and for individual movements at unsignalized intersections; however, it is understood that there might be some instances where minor street level of service is LOS E or LOS F, in which case the volume-to-capacity ratio and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths will also be considered. LOS C or better will be the goal for mainline freeway, ramp terminal intersections, merge/diverge and weaving segments.

## 11. FHWA INTERSTATE ACCESS MODIFICATION POLICY POINTS

The eight FHWA policy points are listed as follows, with a brief description of the level of detail anticipated to be provided for each:

1. The need being addressed by the request cannot be adequately satisfied by existing interchanges to the Interstate, and/or local roads and streets in the corridor can neither provide the desired access, nor can they be reasonably improved (such as access control along surface streets, improving traffic control, modifying ramp terminals and intersections, adding turn bays or lengthening storage) to satisfactorily accommodate the design-year traffic demands (23 CFR 625.2(a)).

The existing Exit 46 interchange will be reviewed to identify potential minor improvements that would accommodate future widening of I-90 while also serving interchange traffic volumes. The analysis will be described in the text of the IMJR to address this policy point.
2. The need being addressed by the request cannot be adequately satisfied by reasonable transportation system management (such as ramp metering, mass transit, and HOV facilities), geometric design, and alternative improvements to the Interstate without the proposed change(s) in access (23 CFR 625.2(a)).

A review of TSM strategies and tools will be conducted to determine whether any are applicable to or feasible for Exit 46. If any are found, their effect will be evaluated to determine whether they reduce peak traffic demand enough to eliminate the need for interchange relocation. SDDOT has indicated that ramp metering and HOV facilities are not used in South Dakota at this time.
3. An operational and safety analysis has concluded that the proposed change in access does not have a significant adverse impact on the safety and operation of the Interstate facility (which includes mainline lanes, existing, new, or modified ramps, ramp intersections with crossroad) or on the local street network based on both the current and the planned future traffic projections. The analysis shall, particularly in urbanized areas, include at least the first adjacent existing or proposed interchange on either side of the proposed change in access (23 CFR 625.2(a), 655.603(d) and 771.111(f)). The crossroads and the local street network, to at least the first major intersection on either side of the proposed change in access, shall be
included in this analysis to the extent necessary to fully evaluate the safety and operational impacts that the proposed change in access and other transportation improvements may have on the local street network (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)). Requests for a proposed change in access must include a description and assessment of the impacts and ability of the proposed changes to safely and efficiently collect, distribute and accommodate traffic on the Interstate facility, ramps, intersection of ramps with crossroad, and local street network (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)). Each request must also include a conceptual plan of the type and location of the signs proposed to support each design alternative (23 U.S.C. 109(d) and 23 CFR 655.603(d)).

The IMJR will include a full analysis of existing, future opening day (2021) and Year 2045 traffic operations at Exit 46, including its ramp connections to I-90 and Elk Creek Road on both sides of the interchange. Exits 44 and 48 will be analyzed similarly for current and future scenarios. The analyses are expected to yield information regarding the potential for adverse operational effects. Crash history will be reviewed to identify existing crash patterns and the influence of a relocated Exit 46 on safety will be assessed using available crash prediction methods. A preliminary Exit 46 signing concept, showing the signs one mile away on both sides of the Exit 46 interchange, will be included in the IMJR. This will be reviewed by the Region Traffic Engineer.
4. The proposed access connects to a public road only and will provide for all traffic movements. Less than "full interchanges" may be considered on a case-by-case basis for applications requiring special access for managed lanes (e.g., transit, HOVs, HOT lanes) or park and ride lots. The proposed access will be designed to meet or exceed current standards (23 CFR 625.2(a), 625.4(a)(2), and 655.603(d)).

The preferred alternative will be reviewed to ensure all movements are provided.
5. The proposal considers and is consistent with local and regional land use and transportation plans. Prior to receiving final approval, all requests for new or revised access must be included in an adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan, in the adopted Statewide or Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (STIP or TIP), and the Congestion Management Process within transportation management areas, as appropriate, and as specified in 23 CFR part 450, and the transportation conformity requirements of 40 CFR parts 51 and 93.

Relevant plans will be reviewed for inclusion of the Exit 46 project.
6. In corridors where the potential exists for future multiple interchange additions, a comprehensive corridor or network study must accompany all requests for new or revised access with recommendations that address all of the proposed and desired access changes within the context of a longer-range system or network plan (23 U.S.C. 109(d), 23 CFR 625.2(a), 655.603(d), and 771.111).

Based on a review of previous studies, no new interchanges are anticipated in the Exit 46 vicinity. This statement will be included in the IMJR.
7. When a new or revised access point is due to a new, expanded, or substantial change in current or planned future development or land use, requests must demonstrate appropriate coordination has occurred between the development and any proposed transportation system improvements ( 23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603 (d)). The request must describe the
commitments agreed upon to assure adequate collection and dispersion of the traffic resulting from the development with the adjoining local street network and Interstate access point (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)).

The IMJR effort includes outreach to local communities and landowners to understand development plans. The text will provide a qualitative description of the relationship of Exit 46 to surrounding land use and development plans. A public meeting and meetings with affected landowners are planned to be held.
8. The proposal can be expected to be included as an alternative in the required environmental evaluation, review and processing. The proposal should include supporting information and current status of the environmental processing (23 CFR 771.111).

The I-90 Exit 40 to 51 Environmental Assessment included Exit 46 relocation, and environmental documentation will be developed for current conditions. The IMJR will document the status of these efforts.

## 12. DEVIATIONS / JUSTIFICATIONS

We do not anticipate any deviations from stated standards.

## 13. CONCLUSION

The study will include performing a HCM2010 based traffic analysis comparison of the relocated interchange option of the I-90 Exit 46 interchange (As shown in Figure 2) brought forth by the Environmental Assessment (EA) of Exit 40 to Exit 51 versus the existing configuration.

In addition to the interchange specific objective listed above, the study is expected to fulfill the following additional objectives:

1. Create an Interchange Modification Justification Report (IMJR) for the SDDOT to submit to FHWA.
2. Develop new environmental document specific to the l-90 Exit 46 interchange.
3. Create final products for use by the City of Piedmont, the City of Summerset, Meade County, the Rapid City Area MPO and the SDDOT which will provide guidance to implement recommended improvements and react to future development plans within the area.

## 14. APPENDICES

Appendix A Methods \& Assumptions Meeting Notes

Appendix A Methods \& Assumptions Meeting Notes

# I-90 Exit 46 IMJR Meeting Minutes <br> Methods and Assumptions Meeting 

Thursday, October 1, 2015 at 1:30 PM MST
SDDOT Rapid City Region - Large Meeting Room

## ATTENDEES

| Name | Agency |
| :--- | :--- |
| Steve Gramm | SDDOT |
| Brad Remmich | SDDOT |
| Marc Hoelscher | FHWA |
| Kip Harrington | Rapid City MPO |
| Lyle DeVries | FHU |
| Devin Joslin | FHU |

## METHODS AND ASSUMPTIONS DOCUMENT DISCUSSION

The DRAFT Methods and Assumptions Document prepared by FHU was reviewed section by section, with discussion points summarized as follows:

## - Section 1. Cover Page

- The attendees agreed with the contents of this section as written.
- Section 2. Stakeholder Acceptance Page
- SDDOT and FHWA gave concurrence with format of stakeholder acceptance page.
- Section 3. Introduction and Project Description
- The following edits were suggested:
- Consider revising the description of the location of the interchange to more accurately describe its proximity to the boundaries of the cities of Piedmont and Summerset.
- It was noted that a new environmental document will be produced in conjunction with the IMJR report to ensure NEPA requirements are satisfied. References to an environmental "update" within the document are to be removed.
- A typo in the project schedule under item 9 is to be fixed regarding the spelling of "Justification."
- January 1, 2015 was noted as the absolute latest date acceptable for a DRAFT IMJR Report.
- The Elk Creek Road Corridor Plan is to be added to the list of Previous Studies.
- The specific name of the Meade County Transportation Plan (Meade Moving Forward) will be added.
- Marion Barber is to be removed from the Study Advisory Team. She would have been involved had an EA evaluating Elk Creek Road been required.


## - Section 4. Study Area

- The attendees agreed with the contents of this section as written.
- Section 5. Analysis Years/Periods
- The attendees agreed with the contents of this section as written.
- Section 6. Data Collection
- It was suggested the following items be removed from the bulleted list on page 6 describing the data collection effort:
- Identify freight capabilities;
* Determine functional class of the existing roadway network; and
- Identify existing transit systems.

The times of the peak hours based on the count data SDDOT had provided were discussed. It appears that the AM peak hour occurs between 7:00-8:00 AM and the PM peak hour occurs between 4:45-5:45 PM, based on counts conducted at the Exit 46 ramps conducted in 2013.

- It was agreed the peak hour intersection turning movement counts would be conducted between 6:30 AM-8:30 AM and 4:00-6:00 PM.
- A map showing the locations where traffic count data was collected will be added to the IMJR report.
- Seasonal factors were discussed and it was determined that data from the I-90 Tilford Weigh-In-Motion station should be used to factor counts to September 2015.
- It was requested that SDDOT set tubes on Interstate 90 to the north of Exit 46.


## - Section 7. Traffic Operations Analysis

- It was requested that the values planned to be used for analysis variables, such as PHF, truck percentage, saturation flow rate, etc. be listed or methodology planned to be used to calculate them be defined.
- Limitations to the methodology contained in Chapter 16 of the Highway Capacity Manual, 2010 related to analysis of Urban Street Facilities (Multimodal Analysis) were briefly discussed.
- It was noted that no signalized intersections currently exist within the study area and that certain intersections within the study area will need to be assumed to be signalized in order to conduct the multimodal analysis.
- It was reiterated that analyses will be conducted using HCS ${ }^{\text {TM }} 2010$ software; no microsimulation will be conducted and no other traffic analysis software program is to be used.
- Section 8. Travel Forecast
- It was noted that it would be difficult for the Rapid City MPO to provide year 2045 land use forecasts, given the relatively short timeframe within the traffic volume forecasts are to be completed.
- It was agreed that the method to be used to forecast year 2045 traffic volumes was to extend the growth rate(s) from the travel demand model an additional five years beyond 2040.


## - Section 9. Safety Issues

- The attendees agreed with the contents of this section as written.
- Section 10. Selection of Measures of Effectiveness (MOE)
- The LOS D or better requirement for individual movements at unsignalized intersections was to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. It was noted that there may be instances where the side-street LOS is E or F, but with acceptable $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios and manageable $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths.
- Analysis of the ramp terminal intersections is also planned to be included.
- Section 11. FHWA Interstate Access Modification Policy Points
- Under Policy Point \#2, it was deemed that ramp metering and HOV facilities are unnecessary, as they are not used in the State of South Dakota.
- Under Policy Point \#3, the requirements for the preliminary signing concept were discussed in more detail.
- It was noted that the plan should include signs within one mile in either direction of Exit 46.
- Some examples of previous signing plans were shown and a preference for the plan being shown on top of an aerial background was noted.
- The signing plan will be reviewed by the Region Traffic Engineer.
- Under Policy Point \#7, the public meeting is to be mentioned.
- Under Policy Point \#8, the word "refresh" is to be changed to study to note that a new environmental document is planned to be prepared, as opposed to an update to the EA.
- Section 12. Deviations/Justifications
- The attendees agreed with the contents of this section as written.
- Section 13. Conclusion
- Objective \#2 noted will be revised to state that a new environmental document will be prepared.
- Section 14. Appendices
- Meeting Minutes from the Methods and Assumptions meeting are to be included as an Appendix to the Methods and Assumptions document.


## ACTION ITEMS

- SDDOT and FHWA gave verbal approval for traffic data collection to occur prior to formal acceptance of the Methods and Assumptions document.
- SDDOT to conduct daily counts on l-90 to the north of Exit 46.
- FHU to revise Methods and Assumptions document to reflect edits and changes noted in these meeting minutes.
- FHU to coordinate traffic data collection; traffic data collection was delayed until the week of November 2 due to a construction project at Exit 44 within the study area.


## 1. COVER PAGE



## INTERSTATE 90 EXIT 46

# INTERCHANGE MODIFICATION JUSTIFICATION REPORT (IMJR) 

## METHODS AND ASSUMPTIONS AMENDMENT DOCUMENT

Prepared for:<br>South Dakota Department of Transportation<br>700 East Broadway Avenue<br>Pierre, South Dakota 57501-2586<br>(605) 773-3093

and

## Federal Highway Administration

116 East Dakota Avenue, Suite A
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
(605) 224-8033

Prepared by:
Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
(303) 721-1440

Principal-In-Charge/Project Manager: Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE Deputy Project Manager: Devin Joslin, PE, PTOE

FHU Reference No. 115324-01
January 2016
(Methods and Assumptions Meeting held October 1, 2015)

## 2. STAKEHOLDER ACCEPTANCE

The undersigned parties concur with the Methods and Assumptions for the Exit 46 Interchange Modification Justification Report (IMJR) as presented in this docum int.



AMENDMENT
FHWA


Signature
$\frac{\text { Planning/Civil Rights specialist }}{\text { Title }}$


Participation of the Study Advisory Team and/or signing of this document do not constitute approval of the Exit 46 IMJR Final Report or conclusions.

All members of the Study Advisory Team will accept this document as a guide and reference as the study progresses through the various stages of development. If there are any agreed upon changes to the assumptions in this document a revision will be created, endorsed and signed by all the signatories.

Methods and Assumptions

|  | $2015$ |  |  |  | JAN $\mathrm{FEBP}^{2016}$ MAR\| APR |  |  |  | MAY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Kickoff Meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Methods \& Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Baseline Conditions / Obtain Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Existing Traffic \& Operations Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Project Future Traffic Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Refinement of Build Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Traffic \& Operations Analysis of Scenarios |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Traffic Variables for Design |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interchange Modification Justification Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEPA Activities <br> Comparison of Curent \& Prior EA Conditions Comparison of Current \& Prior EA Impacts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public Involvement (includes SAT) <br> SAT Meetings <br> Landowner Meetings <br> Public Meeting |  | - | 0 |  |  | - |  | 0 |  |
| Document Preparation Document Submittals |  |  |  |  | $\square$ | - |  | NEPA $\square$ | 回 |
| - in-Person Meetings O Remote Meetings | raft Sub | mittal | $\square$ Fina | Submitt |  |  |  |  |  |

Key events called out include:

- Public meeting and landowner meetings conducted in early/mid-January of 201.
- Study Advisory Team meetings held in October and Decem ber of 2015 and January, February and April of 2016.
It is anticipated that that a draft IMJR will be completed by January 2016 with the final report by late February 2016. Efforts will be made to accelerate the schedule.


## 4. STUDY AREA

The study area encompasses the roadway corridors indicated on the following graphic:
Figure 1. Study Area


Study corridors include:

- Elk Creek Road from the intersection with Sturgis Road to the intersection with Glenwood Drive, approximately 0.70 miles,
- Deer View Road from Sturgis Road to Spring Valley Road, approximately 0.75 miles,
- Stage Stop Road from Sturgis Road to La Rue Road, approxim ately 0.80 miles,
- Mainline I-90 from west of I-90 Exit 44 to east of I-90 Exit 48, approximately $41 / 2$ miles,
- The ramps for the I-90 Exit 46 (Elk Creek Road) interchange,
- The ramps for the I-90 Exit 44 (Bethlehem Road) interchange, and
- The ramps for the I-90 Exit 48 (Stage Stop Road) interchang e.

| Ref \# | Street \#1 | Street \#2 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 9. | Exit 46 WB On Ramp | Sidney Stage Road |
| 10. | Elk Creek Road | Future Spring Valley Road / Hills View Drive (East) |
| 11. | Elk Creek Road | Glenwood Drive |
| 12. | Stage Stop Road | Sturgis Road |
| 13. | Stage Stop Road | EB Ramps |
| 14. | Stage Stop Road | WB Ramps |
| 15. | Stage Stop Road | LaRue Road |

Traffic counts will be collected by All Traffic Data, Inc. All turning movement counts will be field collected using video cameras, with counts conducted after compiling the video footage. Daily vehicle classification counts will be conducted at two locations along Sturgis Road and along I90 east of the Exit 46 interchange.

Since traffic data will be obtained from multiple sources and from different months and years. All traffic data will be factored to September 2015 using seasonal adjustment factors obtained from the weigh-in-motion station near Tilford.

The map on the following page depicts traffic count locations. Intersection turning movement counts are depicted as yellow dots and daily counts as blue dots.

## 7. TRAFFIC OPERATIONS ANALYSIS

Operational analysis will be based on procedures docum ented in the Highway Capacity Manual 2010 (Transportation Res earch Board, 2010). More specifically, the following chapters of the HCM could be used to analyze specific operational conditions:

## Operational Analysis

- Chapter 10 - Freeway Facilities
- Chapter 11 - Basic Freeway Segments
- Chapter 12 - Freeway Weaving Segments
- Chapter 13 - Freeway Merge and Diverge Seg ments
- Chapter 16 - Urban Street Facilities (Multimodal Analysis)
- Chapter 18 - Signalized Intersections
- Chapter 19 - Two-Way Stop Controlled Intersections
- Chapter 20 - All-Way Stop Controlled Intersections

Highway Capacity Software will be used to conduct operational analyses. No other traffic analysis software will be used and no micro simulations of traffic will be conducted or provided.

HCM 2010 analysis procedures require the use of certain parameters, summarized in the following table:

| Traffic Parameter |  | I-90 | Surface Streets |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% heavy <br> vehicles | Trucks and <br> buses | Determined from recorded <br> vehicle class on I-90 | Determined from vehicle <br> class on Sturgis Road |
|  | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |

*A lower value may be used for the Peak Hour Factor at an intersection if the existing value is below 0.92 and future traffic forecasts indicate that the traffic stream will continue to demonstrate similar peaking characteristics. The PHF for future analysis scenarios will not be lowered below 0.88 , the rural default value.

- Intersection and facility operations will use average delay per vehicle, density and speed as calculated by the Highway Capacity Software (HCS) to determine Level of Service (LOS).
- Bicycle and pedestrian LOS evaluations for segments of facilities will rely upon the methodologies from the NCHRP Report 616. Transit results will not be calculated as it is assumed that no fixed route transit service will be provided.

In general, the primary mobility goal for the study will be Level of Service (LOS) D or better for overall signalized intersection operations and for individual movements at unsignalized intersections; however, it is understood that there might be some instances where minor street level of service is LOS E or LOS F, in which case the volume-to-capacity ratio and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length s will also be considered. LOS C or better will be the goal for mainline freeway, ramp terminal intersections, merge/diverge and weaving segments.

## 11. FHWA INTERSTATE ACCESS MODIFICATION POLICY POINTS

The eight FHWA policy points are listed as follows, with a brief description of the level of detail anticipated to be provided for each:

1. The need being addressed by $t$ he request cannot be adequ ately satisfied by existing interchanges to the Interstate, and/or local roads and streets in the corridor can neither provide the desired access, nor can they be reasonably improved (such as access control along surface streets, improving traffic control, modifying ramp terminals and intersections, adding turn bays or lengthening storage) to satisfactorily accommodate the design-year traffic demands (23 CFR 625.2(a)).

The existing Exit 46 interchange will be reviewed to identify potential minor improvements that would accommodate future widening of I-90 while also serving interchange traffic volumes. The analysis will be described in the text of the IMJR to address this policy point.
2. The need being addressed by the request cannot be adequately satisfied by reasonable transportation system management (such as ramp metering, mass transit, and HOV facilities), geometric design, and alternative improvements to the Interstate without the proposed change(s) in access (23 CFR 625.2(a)).

A review of TSM strategies and tools will be conducted to determine whether any are applicable to or feasible for Exit 46. If any are found, their effect will be evaluated to determine whether they reduce peak traffic demand enough to eliminate the need for interchange relocation. SDDOT has indicated that ramp metering and HOV facilities are not used in South Dakota at this time.
3. An operational and safety analy sis has concluded that the proposed change in access does not have a significant adverse impact on the safety and operation of the Interstate facility (which includes mainline lanes, existing, new, or modified ramps, ramp intersections with crossroad) or on the local street netw ork based on both the current and the planned future traffic projections. The analysis shall, particularly in urbanized areas, include at least the first adjacent existing or proposed interchange on either side of the proposed change in access (23 CFR 625.2(a), 655.603(d) and 771.111(f)). The crossroads and the local street netw ork, to at least the first major intersection on either side of the propose $d$ change in access, shall be
commitments agreed upon to assure adequate collection and dispersion of the traffic resulting from the development with the adjoining local street network and Interstate access point (23 CFR 625.2(a) and 655.603(d)).

The IMJR effort includes outreach to local communities and landowners to understand development plans. The text will provide a qualitative description of the relationship of Exit 46 to surrounding land use and development plans. A public meeting and meetings with affected landowners are planned to be held.
8. The proposal can be expected to be included as an alternative in the req uired environmental evaluation, review and processing. The proposal should inc lude supporting information and current status of the environmental processing (23 CFR 771.111).

The l-90 Exit 40 to 51 Environmental Assessment included Exit 46 relocation, and environmental documentation will be developed for current conditions. The IMJR will document the status of these efforts.

## 12. DEVIATIONS / JUSTIFICATIONS

We do not anticipate any deviations from stated standards.

## 13. CONCLUSION

The study will include performing a HCM2010 based traffic analysis comparison of the relocated interchange option of the I-90 Exit 46 interchange (As shown in Figure 2) brought forth by the Environmental Assessment (EA) of Exit 40 to Exit 51 versus the existing configuration.

In addition to the interchange specific objective listed above, the study is expected to fulfill the following additional objectives:

1. Create an Interchange Modi fication Justification Report (IMJR) for the SDDOT to submit to FHWA.
2. Develop new environmental document specific to the I-90 Exit 46 interchange.
3. Create final products for use by the City of Piedmont, the City of Summerset, Meade County, the Rapid City Area MPO and the SDDOT which will provide guidance to implement recommended improvements and react to future development plans within the area.

## 14. APPENDICES

Appendix A Methods \& Assumptions Meeting Notes

## APPENDIX B TRAFFIC COUNTS

Study Name 15350-SD 1 I-90 E-O EXIT 46
Start Date 11/03/2015
Start Time 12:00 AM
Site Code 1

| Channel Direction | Direction |  | Direction |  | WB | cumulative |  |  |  | 1.2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Westbound |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12:00 AM |  | 3 |  | 12 |  | 8 | 15 | 8 | 15 | 10 | 18 |
| 12:15 AM |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 3 | 4 | 11 | 19 | 13 | 23 |
| 12:30 AM |  | 11 |  | 6 |  | 15 | 7 | 26 | 26 | 31 | 31 |
| 12:45 AM |  | 5 |  | 7 |  | 7 | 9 | 33 | 35 | 40 | 42 |
| 1:00 AM |  | 6 |  | 3 |  | 7 | 4 | 32 | 24 | 38 | 29 |
| 1:15 AM |  | 10 |  | 3 |  | 12 | 8 | 41 | 28 | 49 | 34 |
| 1:30 AM |  | 4 |  | 8 |  | 6 | 10 | 32 | 31 | 38 | 37 |
| 1:45 AM |  | 5 |  | 2 |  | 8 | 5 | 33 | 27 | 40 | 32 |
| 2:00 AM |  | 2 |  | 5 |  | 6 | 5 | 32 | 28 | 38 | 34 |
| 2:15 AM |  | 6 |  | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 30 | 31 | 36 | 37 |
| 2:30 AM |  | 2 |  | 9 |  | 6 | 11 | 30 | 32 | 36 | 38 |
| 2:45 AM |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 6 | 25 | 33 | 30 | 40 |
| 3:00 AM |  | 1 |  | 7 |  | 7 | 8 | 26 | 36 | 31 | 43 |
| 3:15 AM |  | 3 |  | 6 |  | 7 | 11 | 23 | 36 | 28 | 43 |
| 3:30 AM |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 9 | 8 | 26 | 33 | 31 | 40 |
| 3:45 AM |  | 9 |  | 5 |  | 12 | 5 | 35 | 32 | 42 | 38 |
| 4:00 AM |  | 8 |  | 12 |  | 11 | 18 | 39 | 42 | 47 | 50 |
| 4:15 AM |  | 7 |  | 5 |  | 18 | 8 | 50 | 39 | 60 | 47 |
| 4:30 AM |  | 6 |  | 14 |  | 13 | 19 | 54 | 50 | 65 | 60 |
| 4:45 AM |  | 17 |  | 19 |  | 24 | 23 | 66 | 68 | 79 | 82 |
| 5:00 AM |  | 18 |  | 34 |  | 27 | 37 | 82 | 87 | 98 | 104 |
| 5:15 AM |  | 24 |  | 54 |  | 34 | 60 | 98 | 139 | 118 | 167 |
| 5:30 AM |  | 24 |  | 78 |  | 33 | 81 | 118 | 201 | 142 | 241 |
| 5:45 AM |  | 30 |  | 75 |  | 45 | 79 | 139 | 257 | 167 | 308 |
| 6:00 AM |  | 56 |  | 104 |  | 71 | 109 | 183 | 329 | 220 | 395 |
| 6:15 AM |  | 71 |  | 126 |  | 83 | 138 | 232 | 407 | 278 | 488 |
| 6:30 AM |  | 83 |  | 170 |  | 101 | 183 | 300 | 509 | 360 | 611 |
| 6:45 AM |  | 107 |  | 141 |  | 127 | 148 | 382 | 578 | 458 | 694 |
| 7:00 AM |  | 170 |  | 203 |  | 190 | 209 | 501 | 678 | 601 | 814 |
| 7:15 AM |  | 133 |  | 264 |  | 150 | 272 | 568 | 812 | 682 | 974 |
| 7:30 AM |  | 125 |  | 277 |  | 142 | 285 | 609 | 914 | 731 | 1097 |


| 7:45 AM | 101 | 197 | 121 | 212 | 603 | 978 | 724 | 1174 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8:00 AM | 114 | 152 | 136 | 156 | 549 | 925 | 659 | 1110 |  |
| 8:15 AM | 136 | 131 | 157 | 141 | 556 | 794 | 667 | 953 |  |
| 8:30 AM | 109 | 129 | 134 | 137 | 548 | 646 | 658 | 775 |  |
| 8:45 AM | 112 | 123 | 135 | 141 | 562 | 575 | 674 | 690 |  |
| 9:00 AM | 114 | 123 | 145 | 134 | 571 | 553 | 685 | 664 |  |
| 9:15 AM | 97 | 138 | 125 | 147 | 539 | 559 | 647 | 671 |  |
| 9:30 AM | 93 | 130 | 116 | 137 | 521 | 559 | 625 | 671 |  |
| 9:45 AM | 101 | 132 | 118 | 146 | 504 | 564 | 605 | 677 |  |
| 10:00 AM | 107 | 119 | 119 | 135 | 478 | 565 | 574 | 678 |  |
| 10:15 AM | 120 | 130 | 138 | 144 | 491 | 562 | 589 | 674 |  |
| 10:30 AM | 107 | 132 | 132 | 151 | 507 | 576 | 608 | 691 |  |
| 10:45 AM | 109 | 97 | 123 | 115 | 512 | 545 | 614 | 654 |  |
| 11:00 AM | 103 | 113 | 122 | 129 | 515 | 539 | 618 | 647 |  |
| 11:15 AM | 112 | 125 | 134 | 139 | 511 | 534 | 613 | 641 |  |
| 11:30 AM | 98 | 120 | 111 | 143 | 490 | 526 | 588 | 631 |  |
| 11:45 AM | 104 | 137 | 122 | 154 | 489 | 565 | 587 | 678 |  |
| 12:00 PM | 109 | 112 | 126 | 130 | 493 | 566 | 592 | 679 |  |
| 12:15 PM | 124 | 122 | 136 | 138 | 495 | 565 | 594 | 678 |  |
| 12:30 PM | 122 | 114 | 139 | 132 | 523 | 554 | 628 | 665 |  |
| 12:45 PM | 107 | 116 | 122 | 132 | 523 | 532 | 628 | 638 |  |
| 1:00 PM | 128 | 109 | 142 | 121 | 539 | 523 | 647 | 628 |  |
| 1:15 PM | 126 | 144 | 147 | 171 | 550 | 556 | 660 | 667 |  |
| 1:30 PM | 162 | 115 | 179 | 127 | 590 | 551 | 708 | 661 |  |
| 1:45 PM | 128 | 121 | 147 | 142 | 615 | 561 | 738 | 673 |  |
| 2:00 PM | 124 | 128 | 139 | 146 | 612 | 586 | 734 | 703 |  |
| 2:15 PM | 164 | 113 | 174 | 136 | 639 | 551 | 767 | 661 |  |
| 2:30 PM | 126 | 127 | 137 | 140 | 597 | 564 | 716 | 677 |  |
| 2:45 PM | 155 | 112 | 169 | 138 | 619 | 560 | 743 | 672 |  |
| 3:00 PM | 138 | 124 | 163 | 144 | 643 | 558 | 772 | 670 |  |
| 3:15 PM | 146 | 143 | 164 | 174 | 633 | 596 | 760 | 715 |  |
| 3:30 PM | 189 | 157 | 196 | 181 | 692 | 637 | 830 | 764 |  |
| 3:45 PM | 185 | 147 | 195 | 182 | 718 | 681 | 862 | 817 |  |
| 4:00 PM | 205 | 172 | 221 | 185 | 776 | 722 | 931 | 866 |  |
| 4:15 PM | 205 | 184 | 219 | 209 | 831 | 757 | 997 | 908 |  |
| 4:30 PM | 194 | 184 | 210 | 202 | 845 | 778 | 1014 | 934 |  |
| 4:45 PM | 238 | 179 | 251 | 194 | 901 | 790 | 1081 | 948 |  |
| 5:00 PM | 224 | 177 | 234 | 202 | 914 | 807 | 1097 | 968 |  |
| 5:15 PM | 254 | 155 | 259 | 174 | 954 | 772 | 1145 | 926 |  |
| 5:30 PM | 238 | 160 | 243 | 174 | 987 | 744 | 1184 | 893 | 2077 |
| 5:45 PM | 184 | 139 | 191 | 150 | 927 | 700 | 1112 | 840 | 9.4\% |
| 6:00 PM | 150 | 97 | 161 | 124 | 854 | 622 | 1025 | 746 |  |
| 6:15 PM | 124 | 96 | 134 | 119 | 729 | 567 | 875 | 680 |  |
| 6:30 PM | 111 | 86 | 117 | 105 | 603 | 498 | 724 | 598 |  |


| 6:45 PM | 104 | 65 | 114 | 86 | 526 | 434 | 631 | 521 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7:00 PM | 104 | 50 | 111 | 58 | 476 | 368 | 571 | 442 |
| 7:15 PM | 74 | 56 | 86 | 70 | 428 | 319 | 514 | 383 |
| 7:30 PM | 81 | 61 | 90 | 74 | 401 | 288 | 481 | 346 |
| 7:45 PM | 67 | 65 | 74 | 69 | 361 | 271 | 433 | 325 |
| 8:00 PM | 62 | 49 | 71 | 57 | 321 | 270 | 385 | 324 |
| 8:15 PM | 79 | 39 | 85 | 44 | 320 | 244 | 384 | 293 |
| 8:30 PM | 71 | 39 | 80 | 49 | 310 | 219 | 372 | 263 |
| 8:45 PM | 64 | 44 | 72 | 60 | 308 | 210 | 370 | 252 |
| 9:00 PM | 55 | 29 | 61 | 34 | 298 | 187 | 358 | 224 |
| 9:15 PM | 47 | 38 | 54 | 48 | 267 | 191 | 320 | 229 |
| 9:30 PM | 39 | 24 | 42 | 29 | 229 | 171 | 275 | 205 |
| 9:45 PM | 25 | 21 | 34 | 27 | 191 | 138 | 229 | 166 |
| 10:00 PM | 14 | 14 | 19 | 23 | 149 | 127 | 179 | 152 |
| 10:15 PM | 20 | 23 | 25 | 30 | 120 | 109 | 144 | 131 |
| 10:30 PM | 18 | 17 | 23 | 25 | 101 | 105 | 121 | 126 |
| 10:45 PM | 20 | 8 | 22 | 13 | 89 | 91 | 107 | 109 |
| 11:00 PM | 12 | 9 | 16 | 12 | 86 | 80 | 103 | 96 |
| 11:15 PM | 12 | 12 | 17 | 18 | 78 | 68 | 94 | 82 |
| 11:30 PM | 6 | 7 | 13 | 10 | 68 | 53 | 82 | 64 |
| 11:45 PM | 7 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 54 | 49 | 65 | 59 |
|  |  |  | 9215 | 9274 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 18489 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1.2 | 22186.8 | 9.4\% |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1.18 | 21817.02 |  |  |  |  |

```
Study Name 15350-SD 1
Start Date 11/03/2015
Start Time 12:00 AM
Site Code 1
```

| Channel | Direction | Direction |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Direction | Westbound | Eastbound |
|  |  |  |


| 12:00 AM | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:15 AM | 1 | 0 |
| 12:30 AM | 2 | 0 |
| 12:45 AM | 0 | 0 |
| 1:00 AM | 0 | 1 |
| 1:15 AM | 0 | 0 |
| 1:30 AM | 0 | 0 |
| 1:45 AM | 0 | 0 |
| 2:00 AM | 1 | 0 |
| 2:15 AM | 0 | 0 |
| 2:30 AM | 0 | 0 |
| 2:45 AM | 0 | 0 |
| 3:00 AM | 0 | 0 |
| 3:15 AM | 0 | 0 |
| 3:30 AM | 3 | 1 |
| 3:45 AM | 1 | 0 |
| 4:00 AM | 1 | 1 |
| 4:15 AM | 9 | 0 |
| 4:30 AM | 6 | 1 |
| 4:45 AM | 7 | 2 |
| 5:00 AM | 4 | 1 |
| 5:15 AM | 3 | 3 |
| 5:30 AM | 2 | 0 |
| 5:45 AM | 4 | 3 |
| 6:00 AM | 4 | 2 |
| 6:15 AM | 4 | 2 |
| 6:30 AM | 7 | 6 |
| 6:45 AM | 8 | 2 |
| 7:00 AM | 4 | 1 |
| 7:15 AM | 8 | 4 |
| 7:30 AM | 4 | 3 |
| 7:45 AM | 8 | 4 |
| 8:00 AM | 11 | 3 |
| 8:15 AM | 10 | 4 |
| 8:30 AM | 14 | 6 |
| 8:45 AM | 9 | 7 |
| 9:00 AM | 14 | 4 |
| 9:15 AM | 8 | 5 |
| 9:30 AM | 9 | 2 |
| 9:45 AM | 7 | 6 |


| 10:00 AM | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10:15 AM | 6 | 4 |
| 10:30 AM | 8 | 11 |
| 10:45 AM | 6 | 11 |
| 11:00 AM | 7 | 5 |
| 11:15 AM | 8 | 2 |
| 11:30 AM | 5 | 4 |
| 11:45 AM | 9 | 4 |
| 12:00 PM | 7 | 4 |
| 12:15 PM | 6 | 5 |
| 12:30 PM | 6 | 9 |
| 12:45 PM | 7 | 4 |
| 1:00 PM | 6 | 6 |
| 1:15 PM | 7 | 7 |
| 1:30 PM | 9 | 2 |
| 1:45 PM | 6 | 6 |
| 2:00 PM | 5 | 7 |
| 2:15 PM | 4 | 11 |
| 2:30 PM | 3 | 2 |
| 2:45 PM | 4 | 12 |
| 3:00 PM | 6 | 4 |
| 3:15 PM | 5 | 6 |
| 3:30 PM | 1 | 8 |
| 3:45 PM | 3 | 11 |
| 4:00 PM | 4 | 7 |
| 4:15 PM | 3 | 6 |
| 4:30 PM | 6 | 7 |
| 4:45 PM | 4 | 5 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 4 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 4 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 2 |
| 5:45 PM | 1 | 4 |
| 6:00 PM | 1 | 18 |
| 6:15 PM | 1 | 6 |
| 6:30 PM | 1 | 9 |
| 6:45 PM | 1 | 5 |
| 7:00 PM | 2 | 1 |
| 7:15 PM | 1 | 3 |
| 7:30 PM | 4 | 2 |
| 7:45 PM | 1 | 0 |
| 8:00 PM | 1 | 2 |
| 8:15 PM | 2 | 4 |
| 8:30 PM | 1 | 1 |
| 8:45 PM | 1 | 4 |
| 9:00 PM | 0 | 2 |
| 9:15 PM | 0 | 1 |
| 9:30 PM | 0 | 1 |
| 9:45 PM | 0 | 2 |
| 10:00 PM | 0 | 1 |
| 10:15 PM | 0 | 0 |
| 10:30 PM | 0 | 0 |
| 10:45 PM | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00 PM | 1 | 0 |
| 11:15 PM | 1 | 1 |
| 11:30 PM | 1 | 0 |
| 11:45 PM | 0 | 0 |

```
Study Name 15350-SD 1
Start Date 11/03/2015
Start Time 12:00 AM
Site Code 1
```

| Channel | Direction | Direction |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Direction | Westbound | Eastbound |
|  |  |  |


| 12:00 AM | 5 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:15 AM | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30 AM | 2 | 1 |
| 12:45 AM | 2 | 2 |
| 1:00 AM | 1 | 0 |
| 1:15 AM | 2 | 5 |
| 1:30 AM | 2 | 2 |
| 1:45 AM | 3 | 3 |
| 2:00 AM | 3 | 0 |
| 2:15 AM | 4 | 2 |
| 2:30 AM | 4 | 2 |
| 2:45 AM | 1 | 3 |
| 3:00 AM | 6 | 1 |
| 3:15 AM | 4 | 5 |
| 3:30 AM | 3 | 4 |
| 3:45 AM | 2 | 0 |
| 4:00 AM | 2 | 5 |
| 4:15 AM | 2 | 3 |
| 4:30 AM | 1 | 4 |
| 4:45 AM | 0 | 2 |
| 5:00 AM | 5 | 2 |
| 5:15 AM | 7 | 3 |
| 5:30 AM | 7 | 3 |
| 5:45 AM | 11 | 1 |
| 6:00 AM | 11 | 3 |
| 6:15 AM | 8 | 10 |
| 6:30 AM | 11 | 7 |
| 6:45 AM | 12 | 5 |
| 7:00 AM | 16 | 5 |
| 7:15 AM | 9 | 4 |
| 7:30 AM | 13 | 5 |
| 7:45 AM | 12 | 11 |
| 8:00 AM | 11 | 1 |
| 8:15 AM | 11 | 6 |
| 8:30 AM | 11 | 2 |
| 8:45 AM | 14 | 11 |
| 9:00 AM | 17 | 7 |
| 9:15 AM | 20 | 4 |
| 9:30 AM | 14 | 5 |
| 9:45 AM | 10 | 8 |


| 10:00 AM | 8 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10:15 AM | 12 | 10 |
| 10:30 AM | 17 | 8 |
| 10:45 AM | 8 | 7 |
| 11:00 AM | 12 | 11 |
| 11:15 AM | 14 | 12 |
| 11:30 AM | 8 | 19 |
| 11:45 AM | 9 | 13 |
| 12:00 PM | 10 | 14 |
| 12:15 PM | 6 | 11 |
| 12:30 PM | 11 | 9 |
| 12:45 PM | 8 | 12 |
| 1:00 PM | 8 | 6 |
| 1:15 PM | 14 | 20 |
| 1:30 PM | 8 | 10 |
| 1:45 PM | 13 | 15 |
| 2:00 PM | 10 | 11 |
| 2:15 PM | 6 | 12 |
| 2:30 PM | 8 | 11 |
| 2:45 PM | 10 | 14 |
| 3:00 PM | 19 | 16 |
| 3:15 PM | 13 | 25 |
| 3:30 PM | 6 | 16 |
| 3:45 PM | 7 | 24 |
| 4:00 PM | 12 | 6 |
| 4:15 PM | 11 | 19 |
| 4:30 PM | 10 | 11 |
| 4:45 PM | 9 | 10 |
| 5:00 PM | 9 | 21 |
| 5:15 PM | 4 | 15 |
| 5:30 PM | 5 | 12 |
| 5:45 PM | 6 | 7 |
| 6:00 PM | 10 | 9 |
| 6:15 PM | 9 | 17 |
| 6:30 PM | 5 | 10 |
| 6:45 PM | 9 | 16 |
| 7:00 PM | 5 | 7 |
| 7:15 PM | 11 | 11 |
| 7:30 PM | 5 | 11 |
| 7:45 PM | 6 | 4 |
| 8:00 PM | 8 | 6 |
| 8:15 PM | 4 | 1 |
| 8:30 PM | 8 | 9 |
| 8:45 PM | 7 | 12 |
| 9:00 PM | 6 | 3 |
| 9:15 PM | 7 | 9 |
| 9:30 PM | 3 | 4 |
| 9:45 PM | 9 | 4 |
| 10:00 PM | 5 | 8 |
| 10:15 PM | 5 | 7 |
| 10:30 PM | 5 | 8 |
| 10:45 PM | 2 | 5 |
| 11:00 PM | 3 | 3 |
| 11:15 PM | 4 | 5 |
| 11:30 PM | 6 | 3 |
| 11:45 PM | 1 | 2 |

Site Code: 3 Station ID: 3
STURGIS RD N/O BIG D FUEL ACCESSES STURGIS RD N/O BIG D FUEL ACCESSES

| NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Cars \& | 2 Axle |  | 2 Axle | 3 Axle | 4 Axle | <5 AxI | 5 Axle | >6 AxI | <6 AxI | 6 Axle | >6 AxI |  |
| Time | Bikes | Trailers | Long | Buses | 6 Tire | Single | Single | Double | Double | Double | Multi | Multi | Multi | Total |
| 11/03/15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 20 | 17 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| 07:00 | 0 | 55 | 33 | 3 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 |
| 08:00 | 1 | 22 | 17 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| 09:00 | 2 | 32 | 16 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| 10:00 | 1 | 20 | 13 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| 11:00 | 0 | 28 | 14 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| 12 PM | 0 | 26 | 16 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 18 | 14 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| 14:00 | 0 | 33 | 18 | 1 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| 15:00 | 0 | 26 | 14 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| 16:00 | 2 | 44 | 22 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| 17:00 | 1 | 51 | 20 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 28 | 17 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| 19:00 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| 20:00 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 7 | 435 | 254 | 12 | 152 | 8 | 3 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 888 |
| Percent | 0.8\% | 49.0\% | 28.6\% | 1.4\% | 17.1\% | 0.9\% | 0.3\% | 1.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |
| AM Peak | 09:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 10:00 | 07:00 | 10:00 | 08:00 |  |  |  |  | 07:00 |
| Vol. | 2 | 55 | 33 | 3 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 110 |
| PM Peak | 16:00 | 17:00 | 16:00 | 14:00 | 14:00 | 14:00 | 13:00 | 12:00 | 16:00 |  |  |  |  | 17:00 |
| Vol. | 2 | 51 | 22 | 1 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 83 |
| Grand Total | 7 | 435 | 254 | 12 | 152 | 8 | 3 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 888 |
| Percent | 0.8\% | 49.0\% | 28.6\% | 1.4\% | 17.1\% | 0.9\% | 0.3\% | 1.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |

Site Code: 3 Station ID: 3
STURGIS RD N/O BIG D FUEL ACCESSES STURGIS RD N/O BIG D FUEL ACCESSES

| SB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Cars \& | 2 Axle |  | 2 Axle | 3 Axle | 4 Axle | <5 AxI | 5 Axle | >6 AxI | <6 AxI | 6 Axle | >6 AxI |  |
| Time | Bikes | Trailers | Long | Buses | 6 Tire | Single | Single | Double | Double | Double | Multi | Multi | Multi | Total |
| 11/03/15 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 05:00 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 07:00 | 1 | 54 | 26 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 22 | 9 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| 09:00 | 2 | 29 | 14 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| 10:00 | 0 | 19 | 15 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| 11:00 | 1 | 30 | 17 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| 12 PM | 1 | 34 | 14 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 23 | 13 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| 14:00 | 1 | 40 | 22 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| 15:00 | 0 | 34 | 21 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
| 16:00 | 0 | 36 | 18 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| 17:00 | 1 | 35 | 25 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 29 | 14 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| 19:00 | 0 | 17 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 20:00 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 8 | 434 | 244 | 6 | 88 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 798 |
| Percent | 1.0\% | 54.4\% | 30.6\% | 0.8\% | 11.0\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |
| AM Peak | 09:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 06:00 | 09:00 | 10:00 |  | 08:00 |  |  |  |  |  | 07:00 |
| Vol. | 2 | 54 | 26 | 1 | 10 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 88 |
| PM Peak |  | 14:00 | 17:00 | 14:00 | 15:00 | 16:00 |  | 12:00 |  | 14:00 |  |  |  | 14:00 |
| Vol. | 1 | 40 | 25 | 2 | 11 | 2 |  | 3 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 70 |
| Grand Total | 8 | 434 | 244 | 6 | 88 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 798 |
| Percent | 1.0\% | 54.4\% | 30.6\% | 0.8\% | 11.0\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |

Site Code: 4 Station ID: 4
STURGIS RD N/O BAPTIST CHURCH ACCESS STURGIS RD N/O BAPTIST CHURCH ACCESS

| NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start |  | Cars \& | 2 Axle |  | 2 Axle | 3 Axle | 4 Axle | <5 AxI | 5 Axle | >6 AxI | <6 AxI | 6 Axle | >6 AxI |  |
| Time | Bikes | Trailers | Long | Buses | 6 Tire | Single | Single | Double | Double | Double | Multi | Multi | Multi | Total |
| 11/03/15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 06:00 | 1 | 26 | 9 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| 07:00 | 3 | 130 | 40 | 7 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 32 | 16 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| 09:00 | 1 | 38 | 14 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| 10:00 | 2 | 39 | 14 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 68 |
| 11:00 | 1 | 45 | 19 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| 12 PM | 0 | 42 | 16 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| 13:00 | 3 | 51 | 23 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 |
| 14:00 | 0 | 82 | 34 | 1 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 |
| 15:00 | 1 | 62 | 26 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| 16:00 | 1 | 98 | 20 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 |
| 17:00 | 3 | 107 | 34 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 56 | 28 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| 19:00 | 1 | 38 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| 20:00 | 1 | 20 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| 21:00 | 1 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Total | 19 | 899 | 321 | 13 | 148 | 9 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1428 |
| Percent | 1.3\% | 63.0\% | 22.5\% | 0.9\% | 10.4\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 1.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |  |
| AM Peak | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 |  | 07:00 |  | 10:00 | 11:00 |  |  |  | 10:00 | 07:00 |
| Vol. | 3 | 130 | 40 | 7 | 18 | 2 |  | 3 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 201 |
| PM Peak | 13:00 | 17:00 | 14:00 | 15:00 | 14:00 | 14:00 |  | 15:00 |  |  |  |  |  | 17:00 |
| Vol. | 3 | 107 | 34 | 2 | 19 | 2 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 152 |
| Grand Total | 19 | 899 | 321 | 13 | 148 | 9 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1428 |
| Percent | 1.3\% | 63.0\% | 22.5\% | 0.9\% | 10.4\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 1.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |  |

Site Code: 4 Station ID: 4
STURGIS RD N/O BAPTIST CHURCH ACCESS STURGIS RD N/O BAPTIST CHURCH ACCESS

| SB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start <br> Time | Bikes | Cars \& Trailers | 2 Axle Long | Buses | 2 Axle 6 Tire | 3 Axle Single | 4 Axle Single | $<5 \mathrm{AxI}$ Double | 5 Axle Double | $>6 \mathrm{AxI}$ <br> Double | $\begin{gathered} <6 \mathrm{AxI} \\ \text { Multi } \end{gathered}$ | 6 Axle Multi | $>6 \mathrm{AxI}$ Multi | Total |
| 11/03/15 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 01:00 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 05:00 | 1 | 22 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| 06:00 | 1 | 47 | 18 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| 07:00 | 4 | 177 | 47 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 241 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 52 | 14 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| 09:00 | 0 | 44 | 20 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| 10:00 | 3 | 48 | 12 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| 11:00 | 1 | 52 | 18 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| 12 PM | 0 | 65 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| 13:00 | 4 | 51 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| 14:00 | 1 | 94 | 29 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
| 15:00 | 1 | 76 | 19 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| 16:00 | 4 | 103 | 27 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| 17:00 | 2 | 71 | 20 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 18:00 | 1 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| 19:00 | 0 | 44 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| 20:00 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 23 | 1016 | 283 | 16 | 46 | 13 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1405 |
| Percent | 1.6\% | 72.3\% | 20.1\% | 1.1\% | 3.3\% | 0.9\% | 0.1\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |
| AM Peak | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 06:00 | 07:00 |  | 07:00 |  |  |  |  |  | 07:00 |
| Vol. | 4 | 177 | 47 | 6 | 4 | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 241 |
| PM Peak | 13:00 | 16:00 | 14:00 | 14:00 | 16:00 | 15:00 | 16:00 |  |  | 17:00 |  |  |  | 16:00 |
| Vol. | 4 | 103 | 29 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 144 |
| Grand Total | 23 | 1016 | 283 | 16 | 46 | 13 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1405 |
| Percent | 1.6\% | 72.3\% | 20.1\% | 1.1\% | 3.3\% | 0.9\% | 0.1\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.
Traffic Counts

| Interval | DEERVIEW ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | DEERVIEW ROAD Westbound |  |  |  | STURGIS RD <br> Northbound |  |  |  | STURGIS RD <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 40 | 192 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 36 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 61 | 203 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 55 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 55 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 32 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 22 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 17 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 60 | 15 | 0 | 40 | 8 | 20 | 0 | 9 | 27 | 37 | 0 | 75 | 25 | 2 | 318 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 39 | 13 | 0 | 33 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 26 | 0 | 49 | 17 |  | 1207 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## All Traffic Data <br> Services Inc.

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 2 I-90 EB RAMPS \& DEERVIEW ROAD AM Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 07:00 AM - 08:00 AM
Peak 15-Minutes: 07:00 AM - 07:15 AM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | DEERVIEW ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | DEERVIEW ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | I-90 EB RAMPS <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  | I-90 EB RAMPS <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 39 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 22 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 10 | 31 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 61 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 40 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 12 | 29 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 51 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 25 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 44 | 131 | 0 | 18 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 5 | 1 | 35 | 273 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 36 | 82 | 0 | 10 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 120 | 177 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | DEERVIEW ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | DEERVIEW ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | I-90 WB RAMPS <br> Northbound |  |  |  | I-90 WB RAMPS <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | eft | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 15 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 16 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 20 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 25 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 20 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 19 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 12 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 8 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 40 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 15 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 135 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 32 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## All Traffic Data <br> Services Inc 101011

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | DEERVIEW ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | DEERVIEW ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | SPRING VALLEY RD Northbound |  |  |  | SPRING VALLEY RD Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left |  | Right |  | Uurn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 01 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 30 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | DEERVIEW ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | DEERVIEW ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | SIDNEY STAGE RD <br> Northbound |  |  |  | SIDNEY STAGE RD <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  | urn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 2 | 20 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 12 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 5 | 10 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 8 | 15 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 3 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 7 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 14 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 9 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 21 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 12 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 26 | 90 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 57 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 6 STURGIS RD \& ELK CREEK ROAD AM Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 07:00 AM - 08:00 AM
Peak 15-Minutes: 07:15 AM - 07:30 AM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | ELK CREEK ROAD Westbound |  |  |  | STURGIS RD <br> Northbound |  |  |  | STURGIS RD <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 54 | 460 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 65 | 574 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 33 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 36 | 7 | 0 | 136 | 592 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 41 | 0 | 1 | 36 | 9 | 0 | 63 | 15 | 2 | 205 | 515 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 34 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 54 | 30 | 1 | 168 | 375 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 30 | 11 | 1 | 83 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 59 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 65 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 2 | 66 | 8 | 0 | 29 | 90 | 142 | 0 | 18 | 105 | 31 | 0 | 256 | 82 | 6 | 835 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 2 | 34 | 6 | 0 | 21 | 53 | 114 | 0 | 8 | 82 | 22 | 0 | 183 | 63 |  | 4592 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 7 I-90 EB RAMPS \& ELK CREEK ROAD AM
Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 06:45 AM - 07:45 AM
Peak 15-Minutes: 07:15 AM - 07:30 AM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | I-90 EB RAMPS <br> Northbound |  |  |  | I-90 EB RAMPS <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru |  | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 14 | 20 | 0 | 25 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 77 | 470 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 10 | 21 | 0 | 23 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 78 | 554 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 22 | 31 | 0 | 33 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 137 | 552 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 39 | 43 | 0 | 23 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 178 | 463 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 23 | 42 | 0 | 36 | 40 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 161 | 352 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 15 | 22 | 0 | 17 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 76 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 48 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 18 | 22 | 0 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 67 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 149 | 211 | 0 | 179 | 221 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 822 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 94 | 137 | 0 | 115 | 170 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |  | 0 | 15 | 554 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 8 I-90 WB RAMPS \& ELK CREEK ROAD AM
Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 06:45 AM - 07:45 AM
Peak 15-Minutes: 07:15 AM - 07:30 AM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts


(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 9 SIDNEY STAGE ROAD SPLIT \& I-90 WB RAMP AM
Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 06:45 AM - 07:45 AM
Peak 15-Minutes: 07:30 AM - 07:45 AM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval <br> Start Time | I-90 WB ON RAMP <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | I-90 WB RAMP <br> Westbound |  |  |  | SIDNEY STAGE ROAD SPLITSIDNEY STAGE ROAD SPLIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn |  | Thru |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 18 |  | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 16 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 24 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |  | 34 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 36 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 12 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 10 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 15 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |  | 0 | 165 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |  | 0 | 110 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval Start Time | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | HILLS VIEW DR EAST <br> Northbound |  |  |  | HILLS VIEW DR EAST Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | eft | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left |  |  | Right |  |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 47 | 283 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 337 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 94 | 337 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 98 | 282 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | ) | 101 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | , | 44 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 2 | 39 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 117 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 337 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |  | 6 | 489 |  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 1 | 66 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 252 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 2 | 337 |  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | ELK CREEK ROAD Westbound |  |  |  | GLENWOOD DR <br> Northbound |  |  |  | GLENWOOD DR Southbound |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 223 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 265 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 267 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 218 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 51 | 55 | 0 | 3 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0379 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 31 | 33 | 0 | 2 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0267 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 12 STURGIS RD \& STAGESTOP ROAD AM Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 07:00 AM - 08:00 AM
Peak 15-Minutes: 07:00 AM - 07:15 AM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | STAGESTOP ROAD Eastbound |  |  |  | STAGESTOP ROAD Westbound |  |  |  | STURGIS RD <br> Northbound |  |  |  | STURGIS RD <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 51 | 342 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 26 | 0 | 21 | 10 | 0 | 79 | 402 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 32 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 0 | 113 | 407 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 28 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 99 | 345 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 25 | 0 | 38 | 14 | 1 | 111 | 299 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 20 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 1 | 84 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 51 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 53 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 70 | 12 | 56 | 0 | 6 | 89 | 177 | 0 | 143 | 82 | 2 | 641 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 7 | 34 | 0 | 3 | 60 | 105 | 0 | 99 | 55 | 2 | 2407 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | STAGESTOP ROAD Eastbound |  |  |  | STAGESTOP ROAD Westbound |  |  |  | I-90 EB RAMPS <br> Northbound |  |  |  | I-90 EB RAMPS <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 14 | 22 | 0 | 29 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 88 | 446 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 22 | 28 | 0 | 18 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 100 | 478 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 37 | 39 | 0 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 130 | 474 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 21 | 36 | 0 | 33 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 128 | 400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 20 | 37 | 0 | 34 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 120 | 336 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 15 | 23 | 0 | 15 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 96 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 56 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 13 | 14 | 0 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 64 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 157 | 208 | 0 | 181 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 58 | 782 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 100 | 140 | 0 | 105 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |  | $0 \quad 37$ | 478 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | STAGESTOP ROAD Eastbound |  |  |  | STAGESTOP ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  |  | I-90 WB RAMPS Northbound |  |  |  | I-90 WB RAMPS <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left |  | Thru R | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left |  | Thru | Right |  |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 37 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 69 | 333 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 27 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 74 | 369 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 21 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 35 | 15 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 104 | 371 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 44 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 86 | 325 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 40 | 14 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 105 | 296 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 4 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 26 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 76 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 17 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 58 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 24 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 57 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 92 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 250 | 55 | 0 | 68 | 3 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 629 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 50 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 145 | 42 | 0 | 36 | 1 | 40 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 371 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 15 LARUE RD \& STAGESTOP ROAD AM Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 06:45 AM - 07:45 AM
Peak 15-Minutes: 07:30 AM - 07:45 AM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | STAGESTOP ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | STAGESTOP ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | LARUE RD <br> Northbound |  |  |  | LARUE RD <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | eft | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left |  | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 6:30:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 13 | 20 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:45:00 AM | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 11 | 21 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:00:00 AM | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 14 | 25 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 8 | 14 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30:00 AM | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 15 | 27 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45:00 AM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 11 | 19 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00:00 AM | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 11 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 4 | 9 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 83 | 146 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | - 48 | 87 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 1 STURGIS RD \& DEERVIEW ROAD PM Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 05:00 PM - 06:00 PM
Peak 15-Minutes: 05:15 PM - 05:30 PM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | DEERVIEW ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | DEERVIEW ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | STURGIS RD <br> Northbound |  |  |  | STURGIS RD <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 37 | 153 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 29 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 43 | 178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 44 | 178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 40 | 181 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 51 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 43 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 47 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 45 | 43 | 68 | 0 | 9 | 31 | 33 | 0 | 46 | 32 | 4 | 334 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 26 | 22 | 40 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 28 | 16 | 4 | 181 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 2 I-90 EB RAMPS \& DEERVIEW ROAD PM Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 05:00 PM - 06:00 PM
Peak 15-Minutes: 05:45 PM - 06:00 PM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | DEERVIEW ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | DEERVIEW ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | I-90 EB RAMPS <br> Northbound |  |  |  | I-90 EB RAMPS <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 33 | 122 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 43 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 25 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 42 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 45 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 29 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 47 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 40 | 58 | 0 | 21 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 46 | 285 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 15 | 37 | 0 | 11 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 31 | 129 | 163 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 3 I-90 WB RAMPS \& DEERVIEW ROAD PM Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 04:00 PM - 05:00 PM
Peak 15-Minutes: 04:30 PM - 04:45 PM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts


(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 4 SPRING VALLEY RD \& DEERVIEW ROAD PM
Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 04:00 PM - 05:00 PM
Peak 15-Minutes: 04:00 PM - 04:15 PM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.


## All Traffic Data <br> Services Incerion

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts


(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 6 STURGIS RD \& ELK CREEK ROAD PM
Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 05:00 PM - 06:00 PM
Peak 15-Minutes: 05:30 PM - 05:45 PM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | ELK CREEK ROAD Westbound |  |  |  | STURGIS RD <br> Northbound |  |  |  | STURGIS RD <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 17 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 8 | 2 | 93 | 360 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 9 | 0 | 94 | 347 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30:00 PM | 0 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 85 | 358 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 11 | 1 | 88 | 393 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 2 | 0 | 80 | 397 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 0 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 14 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 105 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 31 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 120 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 92 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 7 | 58 | 10 | 0 | 52 | 95 | 156 | 0 | 18 | 94 | 14 | 0 | 181 | 69 | 3 | 757 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 3 | 35 | 6 | 0 | 25 | 57 | 88 | 0 | 9 | 47 | 14 | 0 | 77 | 36 | 0 | - 397 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 7 I-90 EB RAMPS \& ELK CREEK ROAD PM
Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 04:45 PM - 05:45 PM
Peak 15-Minutes: 05:30 PM - 05:45 PM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | I-90 EB RAMPS <br> Northbound |  |  |  | I-90 EB RAMPS <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 11 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 82 | 337 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 21 | 18 | 0 | 9 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 80 | 348 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 17 | 13 | 0 | 17 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 88 | 357 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 16 | 13 | 0 | 12 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 87 | 385 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 20 | 14 | 0 | 15 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 93 | 384 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 25 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 10 | 89 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 24 | 9 | 0 | 16 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 116 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 9 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 86 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 152 | 100 | 0 | 98 | 252 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 50 | 721 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 85 | 42 | 0 | 52 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 030 | 385 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | I-90 WB RAMPS Northbound |  |  |  | I-90 WB RAMPS <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left |  | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 8 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 6 | 0 | 19 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 100 | 391 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 6 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 85 | 393 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30:00 PM | 0 | 4 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 94 | 416 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45:00 PM | 0 | 5 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 7 | 0 | 23 | 1 | 36 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 112 | 450 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 8 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 102 | 430 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 0 | 7 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 26 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 108 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 9 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 128 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 0 | 4 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 6 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 92 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 51 | 175 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 184 | 32 | 0 | 167 | 8 | 196 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 821 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 29 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 13 | 0 | 95 | 4 | 116 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3450 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 9 SIDNEY STAGE ROAD SPLIT \& I-90 WB RAMP PM
Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 05:00 PM - 06:00 PM
Peak 15-Minutes: 05:15 PM - 05:30 PM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | I-90 WB ON RAMP Eastbound |  |  |  | I-90 WB RAMP <br> Westbound |  |  |  | SIDNEY STAGE ROAD SPLITSIDNEY STAGE ROAD SPLIT Northbound Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn |  | Thru Rig |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru |  | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 14 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 16 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 8 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 9 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 10 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 17 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 9 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | , | 0 | 13 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 22 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 96 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 12 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | - | 5 |  | 04 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 10 HILLS VIEW DR EAST \& ELK CREEK ROAD PM
Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 04:45 PM - 05:45 PM
Peak 15-Minutes: 04:45 PM - 05:00 PM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | ELK CREEK ROAD Westbound |  |  |  | HILLS VIEW DR EAST <br> Northbound |  |  |  | HILLS VIEW DR EAST Southbound |  |  |  | Total |  | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | eft | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 29 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 63 |  | 273 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 3 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 60 | 271 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 30 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 67 | 286 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 55 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 83 | 298 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 38 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 61 | 279 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 51 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 75 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 42 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 79 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 32 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 64 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 6 | 314 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 186 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 552 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 2 | 186 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 91 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - 3 | 3 | 0 | 298 |  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | ELK CREEK ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | GLENWOOD DR <br> Northbound |  |  |  | GLENWOOD DR Southbound |  |  |  | Total |  | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | ft | Thru |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 53 |  | 215 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 16 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 50 | 210 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 52 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 15 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 60 | 226 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 15 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 48 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 53 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 17 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 65 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 16 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 48 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 126 | 129 | 0 | 3 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 429 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 66 | 76 | 0 | 3 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 226 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 12 STURGIS RD \& STAGESTOP ROAD PM
Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 05:00 PM - 06:00 PM
Peak 15-Minutes: 05:15 PM - 05:30 PM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | STAGESTOP ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | STAGESTOP ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | STURGIS RD <br> Northbound |  |  |  | STURGIS RD Southbound |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 19 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 101 | 396 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 99 | 385 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 18 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 1 | 103 | 397 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 93 | 397 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 17 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 90 | 406 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 111 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 19 | 0 | 14 | 11 | 0 | 103 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 22 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 102 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 211 | 7 | 173 | 0 | 1 | 93 | 145 | 0 | 82 | 83 | 1 | 802 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 111 | 1 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 75 | 0 | 39 | 38 |  | 0406 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | STAGESTOP ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | STAGESTOP ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | I-90 EB RAMPS <br> Northbound |  |  |  | I-90 EB RAMPS <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  | J-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 22 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 104 | 413 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 26 | 7 | 0 | 14 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 8 | 0 | 17 | 104 | 441 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 17 | 15 | 0 | 9 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 91 | 461 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 25 | 7 | 0 | 19 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 | 14 | 114 | 481 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 27 | 15 | 0 | 11 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 132 | 455 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 30 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 11 | 0 | 18 | 124 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 34 | 14 | 0 | 9 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 1 | 11 | 111 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 88 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 196 | 82 | 0 | 93 | 334 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 55 | 1 | 107 | 868 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 116 | 46 | 0 | 50 | 190 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 1 | 51 | 481 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 14 I-90 WB RAMPS \& STAGESTOP ROAD PM Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 04:30 PM - 05:30 PM
Peak 15-Minutes: 05:15 PM - 05:30 PM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | STAGESTOP ROAD <br> Eastbound |  |  |  | STAGESTOP ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | I-90 WB RAMPS Northbound |  |  |  | I-90 WB RAMPS <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R | Right | U-Turn | Left |  | Thru |  | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 83 |  | 400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 96 | 448 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 4:30:00 PM | 0 | 8 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 114 | 484 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45:00 PM | 0 | 9 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 7 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 107 | 471 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 7 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 5 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 131 | 463 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 0 | 9 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 5 | 0 | 37 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 132 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 12 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 101 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 0 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 99 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 72 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 178 | 38 | 0 | 269 | 1 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 863 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 33 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 20 | 0 | 154 | 1 | 90 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 484 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

(303) 216-2439
www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 15 LARUE RD \& STAGESTOP ROAD PM
Date and Start Time: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Peak Hour: 05:00 PM - 06:00 PM
Peak 15-Minutes: 05:45 PM - 06:00 PM


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles in Crosswalk


Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

## Traffic Counts

| Interval | STAGESTOP ROAD Eastbound |  |  |  | STAGESTOP ROAD <br> Westbound |  |  |  | LARUE RD <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  | LARUE RD <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrain Crossings |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru R | Right |  | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | West | East | South |  |
| 4:00:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15:00 PM | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30:00 PM | 0 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45:00 PM | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00:00 PM | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15:00 PM | 0 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30:00 PM | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45:00 PM | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 20 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 59 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - 24 | 125 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 34 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | $0 \quad 14$ | 67 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## APPENDIX C

EXISTING CONDITIONS LOS WORKSHEETS

FREEWAY LOS

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/2/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | E/O Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1384 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.86 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 402 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | $\%$ |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 1.00 |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

Lane width
Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD
Number of lanes, $N$
Free-flow speed:
FFS or BFFS
Lane width adjustment, fLW
Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC
TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS

- ft
- ft
- ramps/mi

2
Measured

| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 853 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

11.4

B
$\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
pc/mi/ln
.

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/2/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | E/O Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 702 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.79 | v |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 222 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 471 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 6.3 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | $12 / 2 / 2015$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | Exit 48 - Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1174 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.86 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 341 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 724 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 9.7 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

724
75.0 mi/h
.
9.7

A

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | $12 / 2 / 2015$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | Exit 48-Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 724 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.79 | v |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 229 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 486 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 6.5 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

$1 n$
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
pc/mi/ln

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | $12 / 2 / 2015$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | Exit 46-Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 896 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.86 | v |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 260 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

- ft

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD

- ft

Number of lanes, N 2
Free-flow speed:
2

FFS or BFFS
Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lane width adjustment, fLW

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC

- $\quad \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS
75.0

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 552 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 7.4 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
2
7.4 pc/mi/ln

A
mi/h
mi/h
ft
ramps/mi
i/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | $12 / 2 / 2015$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | Exit 46-Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 721 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.79 | v |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 228 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 484 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 6.5 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

/n
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
pc/mi/ln

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/2/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | NO Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 821 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.86 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 239 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - | m |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 506 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 6.7 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
2

A

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/2/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | NO Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 742 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.79 | v |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 235 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Flow rate, vp | 498 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average passenger-car speed, S | 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 2 |  |
| Density, D | 6.6 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LOS | A |  |

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/2/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | E/O Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 917 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 249 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

- ft

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD

- ft

Number of lanes, $N$ 2
Free-flow speed:
2

FFS or BFFS
Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lane width adjustment, fLW

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS
75.0

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 528 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 7.0 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

poln
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
pc/mi/ln
A
mi/h
mi/h
ft
ramps/mi
i/h
mi/h

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/2/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | E/O Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1361 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.95 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 358 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | $\%$ |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 1.00 |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 759 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 10.1 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

A

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | $12 / 2 / 2015$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | Exit 48-Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 893 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 243 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

- ft

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD

- ft

Number of lanes, N 2
Free-flow speed:
2

FFS or BFFS
Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lane width adjustment, fLW

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS
75.0

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 514 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 6.9 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

514
75.0
75.0
6.9

A
mi/h
mi/h
ft
ramps/mi
ramps/mi
mi/h
mi/h
$\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \ln$
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
pc/mi/ln

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | $12 / 2 / 2015$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | Exit 48-Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1184 | veh/h |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.95 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 312 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | $\bigcirc$ | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  |
| Grade | - | \% |
| Segment length | - | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 0.943 |  |
| Driver population factor, fp | 1.00 |  |
| Flow rate, vp | 661 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 661 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 8.8 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

A
$\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
pc/mi/ln

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD
Number of lanes, $N$
Free-flow speed:
FFS or BFFS
Lane width adjustment, fLW
Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC
TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | $12 / 2 / 2015$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | Exit 46-Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 864 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 235 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Flow rate, vp | 498 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average passenger-car speed, S | 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 2 |  |
| Density, D | 6.6 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LOS | A |  |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/2/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | Exit 46-Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 968 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.95 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 255 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | \% |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 540 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 7.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |


| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/2/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | NO Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 847 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 230 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 488 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 6.5 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/2/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | NO Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 900 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.95 | v |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 237 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 502 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 6.7 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
2

A
$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 785 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

111 vph
700 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 785 |  | 111 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.86 |  | 0.73 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 228 |  | 38 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
0.943
0.943
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


|  | Actual | Flow Entering Merge Influence | Area_ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| violation? |  |  |  |
| R12 | 1129 | 4600 | No | Level of Service Determination (if not F)

Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=9.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $A$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.284$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S_{S}=65.6$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S_{R}=N / A$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.6$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | $12 / 31 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 693 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph
$49 \quad$ vph
375
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

Does adjacent ramp exist? Volume on adjacent Ramp Position of adjacent Ramp Type of adjacent Ramp Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 693 |  | 49 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.79 |  | 0.84 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 219 |  | 15 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00

Estimation of V12 Merge Areas $\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 992 | 4600 | No |

V ${ }^{\text {R12 }}$ 4600

No
Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=10.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.305$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=64.9$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=64.9$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

721 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP 1.00

$$
1.00
$$

Flow rate, vp

Estimation of V12 Diverge Areas


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual
v 967
Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 v_{12}-0.009 L_{D}$
$=$
$9.2 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ D
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence A

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.431$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.8$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.8$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

821 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 1012 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
v
12

Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=10.9 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.433$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.7$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.7$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 806 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

58 vph
700 ft
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 806 |  | 58 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.87 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 219 |  | 17 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00

Estimation of V12 Merge Areas $\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1000 | 4600 | No |

v R12

Max Desirable 4600

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=8.9 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $A$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.283$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.7$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=65.7$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 884 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

16 vph
375

ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks



Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=10.9 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.305$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=64.9$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=64.9$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

884 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00

Estimation of V12 Diverge Areas


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 986

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
v
12
Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad D=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}=9.4 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
R 12 D
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence A
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.437$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.6$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.6$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

847 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 41 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 225 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
|  |  |  |
|  | No |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? |  | vph |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  |  |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
1.00

Estimation of V12 Diverge Areas $\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 976 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=10.6 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | $12 / 31 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 870 | vph |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

304 vph
645 ft
ft
$f t$

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

Does adjacent ramp exist? Volume on adjacent Ramp Position of adjacent Ramp Type of adjacent Ramp Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1485 | 4600 | No |

V R 12 4600

No
Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=12.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.293$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.3$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=65.3$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | $12 / 31 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 612 | vph |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

109 vph
615
_Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable Violation?
v R12

Max Desirable 4600

Violation?
No

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=9.1 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $A$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.288$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.5$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
$\qquad$ Off Ramp Data

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

724 vph

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-Flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

112 vph
515 ft
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent ramp
Position of adjacent ramp
Type of adjacent ramp
Distance to adjacent ramp
No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 971 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad D=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}=8.0 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
R 12 D
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence A
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
$\qquad$ Off Ramp Data

| Diverge |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 |  |
| 75.0 | mph |
| 896 | vph |

mph
vph
Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-Flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

23 vph
450 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent ramp
Position of adjacent ramp
Type of adjacent ramp
Distance to adjacent ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 1104 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
) $\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$\mathrm{D}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}=9.7 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
R 12 D D A

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,
$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 781 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

112 vph
645 ft
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

Does adjacent ramp exist? Volume on adjacent Ramp Position of adjacent Ramp Type of adjacent Ramp Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 781 |  | 112 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.83 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 212 |  | 34 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


|  | Actual | Flow | Max Desirable |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| V | 1043 | 4600 | Violation? |
| R12 |  |  | No | Level of Service Determination (if not F)

Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=9.5 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $A$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.287$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.5$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 926 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph
$42 \quad \mathrm{vph}$
615
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

Does adjacent ramp exist? Volume on adjacent Ramp Position of adjacent Ramp Type of adjacent Ramp Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 926 |  | 42 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.95 |  | 0.72 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 244 |  | 15 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00

1033
62
pcph

Estimation of V12 Merge Areas $\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable 1095 4600

Violation?
No
v R12

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=10.1 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.290$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.4$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=65.4$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1184 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 1321 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Density, $\quad \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=11.0 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.456$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.0$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.0$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph
$864 \quad$ vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 83 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 450 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
|  |  |  |
|  | No |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? |  | vph |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  |  |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 995

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
v
Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\quad D=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}=8.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
R 12 D
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence A
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.438$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.6$ | mph |
| $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.6$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Freeway |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | Merge |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 2 |  |
| Volume on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
|  | 1100 | vph |
|  | On Ramp Data |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

284 vph
640 ft
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 1100 |  | 284 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.86 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 320 |  | 77 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


|  | Actual | M Merge Influe | Violation? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $v$ | 1683 | 4600 | No | Level of Service Determination (if not F)

Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=14.4 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.297$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.2$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.2$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | $12 / 31 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 609 | vph |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

115 vph
620 ft
ft
_Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks

 Level of Service Determination (if not F)

Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=9.0 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $A$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.288$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S_{R}=N / A$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.5$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
$\qquad$ Off Ramp Data

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

702 vph

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-Flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

93 vph
500
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent ramp
Position of adjacent ramp
Type of adjacent ramp
Distance to adjacent ramp
No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 942 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=7.9 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence A
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.438$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.5$ | mph |
| $R$ |  |
| $S^{0}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.5$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
$\qquad$ Off Ramp Data

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1174 vph

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-Flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

74 vph
350

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent ramp
Position of adjacent ramp
Type of adjacent ramp
Distance to adjacent ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00 1447
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 1447 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
v
12

Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=13.5 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
R 12 D
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.436$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.6$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.6$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 799 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

118 vph
640 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


|  | Actual | Flow | Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v Desirable |  | Violation? |  |
| R12 | 1067 | 4600 | No |

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=9.7 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $A$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.288$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=65.5$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 1094 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

90 vph
620 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable 1325 4600

Violation?
No
v R12

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=11.9 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.292$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.4$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=65.4$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
$\qquad$ Off Ramp Data

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1361 vph
Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-Flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/dec
Length of second accel/de

Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent ramp
Position of adjacent ramp
Type of adjacent ramp Distance to adjacent ramp

Right
1
35.0 mph

267 vph
500 ft
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 1519 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
v
12

Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=12.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.456$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.0$ | mph |
| $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.0$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph 893 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 94 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 350 | $f \mathrm{t}$ |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | $f t$ |
| Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) |  |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  | ft |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 1029

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
v
12 Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=10.0-\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence A

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.438$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.6$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.6$ | mph |

## SURFACE STREET LOS

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 1-Chimney Canyon/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Chimney Canyon |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.85 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 48 | 16 |  | 41 | 1 | 14 |  | 5 | 14 | 32 |  | 60 | 20 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


[^1]
## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 2-Deerview Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.73 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 38 | 102 |  | 8 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1 | 30 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 3-Deerview Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 37 | 6 |  |  |  | 16 | 12 |  | 18 | 0 | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 4-Deerview Road/Sidney |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Sidney Stage Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.71 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 11 | 4 | 1 |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |  | 1 | 7 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 5-Deerview Road/Spring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Spring Valley Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.38 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 | 5 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 6-Elk Creek Road/Strugis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.72 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 2 | 41 | 7 |  | 25 | 64 | 137 |  | 10 | 98 | 26 |  | 220 | 76 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 7-Elk Creek Road/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.78 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 119 | 168 |  | 136 | 212 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 0 | 14 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 8-Elk Creek Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.85 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 58 | 73 |  |  |  | 260 | 58 |  | 80 | 4 | 28 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 9-Sidney Stage Rd/WB Ramp |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | WB Ramp |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Sidney Stage |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.76 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |

Lanes


Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 109 | 11 |  |  |  | 8 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 10-Elk Creek/Hills View |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Hills View Drive |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 89 | 5 |  | 1 | 292 |  |  | 10 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 11-Elk Creek/Glenwood |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Glenwood Drive |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 37 | 40 |  | 1 | 127 |  |  | 113 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 12-Stage Stop Rd/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Stugis Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  | LT |  | R |  | L |  | TR |  | L |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |  | 47 | 8 | 41 |  | 4 | 72 | 126 |  | 119 | 66 | 2 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 12-Stage Stop Rd/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | T | R |  | L |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 112 | 162 |  | 122 | 98 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 24 | 0 | 50 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 14-Stage Stop Rd/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 15-Stage Stop Rd/LaRue Rd |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | LaRue Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 13 | 5 |  |  |  | 25 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 58 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 1-Chimney Canyon/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Chimney Canyon |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 8 | 4 |  | 34 | 29 | 53 |  | 8 | 18 | 17 |  | 37 | 19 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


[^2]
## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 2-Deerview Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 18 | 44 |  | 13 | 81 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1 | 35 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 3-Deerview Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 14 | 9 |  |  |  | 25 | 2 |  | 70 | 0 | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 4-Deerview Road/Sidney |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Sidney Stage Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 10 | 12 | 1 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |  | 5 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 17 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 5-Deerview Road/Spring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Spring Valley Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.85 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 1 | 11 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 6-Elk Creek Road/Strugis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: North-South
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 7-Elk Creek Road/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 103 | 50 |  | 62 | 170 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47 | 0 | 36 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 8-Elk Creek Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 35 | 115 |  |  |  | 114 | 16 |  | 114 | 5 | 139 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 9-Sidney Stage Rd/WB Ramp |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | WB Ramp |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Sidney Stage |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.72 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |

Lanes


Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 42 | 14 |  |  |  | 4 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 10-Elk Creek/Hills View |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Hills View Drive |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 223 | 10 |  | 1 | 109 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 11-Elk Creek/Glenwood |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Glenwood Drive |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 12-Stage Stop Rd/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | Stugis Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  | LT |  | R |  | L |  | TR |  | L |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 121 | 1 | 114 |  | 0 | 49 | 89 |  | 53 | 47 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 13-Stage Stop Rd/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

Site Information

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | T | R |  | L |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 140 | 55 |  | 62 | 232 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 32 | 1 | 61 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

Major Street: East-West

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 14-Stage Stop Rd/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 60 | 112 |  |  |  | 120 | 29 |  | 174 | 1 | 92 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 15-Stage Stop Rd/LaRue Rd |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $11 / 20 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2015 | North/South Street | LaRue Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes
Site Information

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.


Major Street: East-West

## APPENDIX D <br> FUTURE NO BUILD LOS WORKSHEETS

FREEWAY LOS

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | S/O Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1540 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 418 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | $\%$ |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 1.00 |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 887 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| 11.8 |  |

11.8
pc/mi/ln
pe/h
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
po/mi/ln

B

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD
Number of lanes, $N$
Free-flow speed:
FFS or BFFS
Lane width adjustment, fLW
Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC
TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | S/O Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 785 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | v |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 213 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 452 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 6.0 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | Exit 48-Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1305 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 355 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 752 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| 10.0 |  |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | Exit 48 - Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 810 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 220 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 467 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 6.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | Exit 46-Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 995 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 270 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{mc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

- ft

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD

- ft

Number of lanes, $N$ 2
Free-flow speed:
2

FFS or BFFS
Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lane width adjustment, fLW

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS
75.0
mi/h
mi/h

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 573 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 7.6 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | Exit 46-Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 805 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 219 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 464 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 6.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

$-\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
5. 0
pc/mi/ln
A

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | NO Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 915 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 249 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 527 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 7.0 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | NO Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 830 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 226 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 478 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 6.4 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | S/O Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1030 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 280 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 593 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 7.9 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

59
75.0

2
7.9

A
.
$\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
pc/mi/ln

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD
Number of lanes, $N$
Free-flow speed:
FFS or BFFS
Lane width adjustment, fLW
Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC
TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | S/O Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1525 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 414 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | $\%$ |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 1.00 |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 879 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 11.7 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

B

Lane width

- ft

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD

- ft

Number of lanes, $N$ 2
Free-flow speed:
2

FFS or BFFS
Measured

| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

ft
ramps/mi
ane width adjustment, fLW
Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC
TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | Exit 48 - Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1000 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 272 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | \% |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 1.00 |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

- ft

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD

- ft

Number of lanes, $N$ 2
Free-flow speed:
2

FFS or BFFS
Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lane width adjustment, fLW

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS
75.0
mi/h
mi/h

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 576 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 7.7 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

/n
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
pc/mi/ln
A

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | Exit 48 - Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1325 | veh/h |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.95 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 349 | V |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  |
| Grade | - | \% |
| Segment length | - | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 0.943 |  |
| Driver population factor, fp | 1.00 |  |
| Flow rate, vp | 739 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 739 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 9.9 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

-mi/h
5.0
pc/mi/ln
A

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | Exit 46-Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 965 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 262 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

- ft

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD

- ft

Number of lanes, $N$ 2
Free-flow speed:
2

FFS or BFFS
Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lane width adjustment, fLW

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC

- $\quad \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS
75.0

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 556 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 7.4 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

$1 n$
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
pc/mi/ln
A
mi/h
mi/h
ft
ft
ramps/mi
i/h
mi/h

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | Exit 46-Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1085 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 295 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | \% |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 625 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 8.3 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

Ln
i/h
75.0

I
8.3
pc/mi/ln
A

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | NO Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 945 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 257 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 544 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 7.3 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

54
75.0

2
A
$\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
pc/mi/ln
Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD
Number of lanes, $N$
Free-flow speed:
FFS or BFFS
Lane width adjustment, fLW
Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC
TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | NO Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1010 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 274 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | $\%$ |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 1.00 |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 582 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 7.8 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Mergeeway |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 870 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway

Number of lanes in ramp
Right
Free-flow speed on ramp
1
Volume on ramp 125
Length of first accel/decel lane
35.0 mph

Length of second accel/decel lane
375

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists)
vph
ft
ft

| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Volume on adjacent Ramp | vph |  |
| Position of adjacent Ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent Ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent Ramp | ft |  |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable 1146 4600

Violation?
No
v R12

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=12.0 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.307$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=64.9$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=64.9$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 765 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

65 vph
175
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

Does adjacent ramp exist? Volume on adjacent Ramp Position of adjacent Ramp Type of adjacent Ramp Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 765 |  | 65 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 208 |  | 18 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp

Estimation of V12 Merge Areas $\qquad$


Capacity Checks



Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=11.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.319$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=64.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}^{0}=64.5$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Diver |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 805 | vph |
| Off Ramp Data |  |  |
| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 40 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 125 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
| Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) |  |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  | ft |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp

$$
1.00
$$

$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 927 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=11.1 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Diver |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 915 | vph |
| Off Ramp Data |  |  |
| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 45 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 100 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
| Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) |  |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  | ft |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 1054 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=12.4 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 895 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

70 vph
70
375
$\longrightarrow-f t$
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp

$$
1.00
$$

$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable
1112 4600

Violation?
No
v R12

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, ${\underset{R}{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=11.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.307$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=64.9$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=64.9$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


|  | Type of analysis | Merge |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |

Side of freeway

Right
Number of lanes in ramp
1
Free-flow speed on ramp
35.0 mph

Volume on ramp 20
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane
175

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists)

> vph
ft
ft

| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Volume on adjacent Ramp | vph |  |
| Position of adjacent Ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent Ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent Ramp | ft |  |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00

$$
1.00
$$ 1141

23
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable 1164 4600

Violation?
No
v R12

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=13.4 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.321$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=64.4$ | mph |  |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=$ | $S^{0}=\mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=64.4$ | mph |  |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1085 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00 109
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 1250

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=13.9 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.438$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.6$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.6$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Diver |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 945 | vph |
| Off Ramp Data |  |  |
| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 50 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 100 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
| Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) |  |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  | ft |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00

1089
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 1089 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
v
12

Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=12.7 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$

Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.433$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.7$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.7$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 955 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway

Right
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane
1
35.0 mph
$350 \quad$ vph
645 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable
1503 4600

Violation?
No
v R12

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=13.0 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.293$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.3$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.3$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 680 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

125 vph
615 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 927 | 4600 | No |

V R 12 4600 No Level of Service Determination (if not F)

Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=8.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $A$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.288$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S_{S}=65.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S_{R}=N / A$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.5$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Diver |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 810 | vph |
| Off Ramp Data |  |  |
| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 130 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 515 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
| Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) |  |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  | ft |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 933

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No

Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad D=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}=7.6 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
R 12 D
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence A
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.442$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.4$ | mph |
| $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.4$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Diver |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 995 | vph |
| Off Ramp Data |  |  |
| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 40 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 450 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
| Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) |  |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  | ft |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp

$$
1.00
$$

$\qquad$

| $\mathrm{L}=$ | (Equation 13-12 or 13-13) |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{EQ}_{\mathrm{EQ}}=$ | $1.000 \quad$ Using Equation 0 |
| $\mathrm{VD}_{12}=\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+\underset{\mathrm{F}}{\left(\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{F}}-\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}\right)} \mathrm{P} \underset{\mathrm{FD}}{ }=1146 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |

Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 1146 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=10.1 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,
$\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 865 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

135 vph
645 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 865 |  | 135 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 235 |  | 37 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp

Estimation of V12 Merge Areas $\qquad$


Capacity Checks


|  | Actual | Flow | Max Desirable |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v | 1153 | 4600 | Violation? |
| R12 |  |  | No | Level of Service Determination (if not F)

Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=10.4 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.288$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=65.5$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 1035 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

50 vph
615
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 1035 |  | 50 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 281 |  | 14 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1250 | 4600 | No |

v R12

Max Desirable 4600

Violation?
,

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=11.3 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.292$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.4$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=65.4$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1325 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 1527 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$
Density, $\quad \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=12.7 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.458$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=59.9$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=59.9$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Diver |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 965 | vph |
| Off Ramp Data |  |  |
| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 100 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 450 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
| Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) |  |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  | ft |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 1112 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$
Density, $\quad D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=9.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence A

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.438$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.5$ | mph |
| $R$ |  |
| $S^{D}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.5$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 1210 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway

Number of lanes in ramp
Right
Free-flow speed on ramp
1
35.0 mph

Volume on ramp 330
Length of first accel/decel lane
665
Length of second accel/decel lane
vph
ft
ft
_Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp
No
vph
ft
Conversion to pc/h Under Base Conditions


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual
1774

Max Desirable 4600

Violation?
No

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=15.0 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation $\qquad$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.297$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.2$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.2$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Mergeeway |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 670 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

140 vph
525 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 933 | 4600 | No |

v R12

Max Desirable 4600
$\qquad$
Violation?
$\qquad$
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=9.4 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $A$
Speed Estimation $\qquad$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.294$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.3$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.3$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Diver |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 785 | vph |
| Off Ramp Data |  |  |
| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 115 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 500 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
| Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) |  |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  | ft |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual
v 904
Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=7.5 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence A
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.440$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.5$ | mph |
| $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.5$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1305 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 95 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 875 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
|  |  |  |
|  | No |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? |  | vph |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Position of adjacent ramp <br> Type of adjacent ramp <br> Distance to adjacent ramp |  |  |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 1504 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$
Density, $\quad D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=9.3 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
R 12 D
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence A
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.438$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.6$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.6$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 885 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway

Right
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane
1
35.0 mph

145 vph
665 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable 1187 4600

Violation?
No

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=10.5 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation $\qquad$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.287$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}^{0}=65.5$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Freeway |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | Merge |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 2 |  |
| Volume on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
|  |  | 1215 |
|  | On Ramp Data |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

110 vph
525 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 1215 |  | 110 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 330 |  | 30 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable
1527 4600

Violation?
No
v R12

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=14.0 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.302$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.0$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=65.0$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1525 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 310 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 500 | $f \mathrm{t}$ |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | $f t$ |
| Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) |  |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  | ft |


| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 1525 |  | 310 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 414 |  | 84 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade | 0.00 | \% | 0.00 | \% | \% |  |
| Length | 0.00 | mi | 0.00 | mi | mi |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp

$$
1.00
$$

$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 1757 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=14.9 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.460$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=59.8$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=59.8$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | TS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2021 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Diver |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 1000 | vph |
| Off Ramp Data |  |  |
| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 115 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 875 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | $f t$ |
| Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) |  |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  | $f t$ |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 1152 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 v_{12}-0.009 L_{D}=$
$6.3 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ areas of influence A

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.440$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.5$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{2}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.5$ | mph |

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | East of Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 2195 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 596 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
$\qquad$

Lane width

- ft

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD

- ft

Number of lanes, N 2
Free-flow speed:
2

FFS or BFFS
Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lane width adjustment, fLW

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS
75.0
mi/h
mi/h
LOS and Performance Measures

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 1265 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 74.2 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 17.0 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

B
ft
ramps/mi
$\qquad$

B

Operational Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | $12 / 15 / 2015$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | East of Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1110 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 302 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | $\%$ |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 1.00 |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Flow rate, vp | 639 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average passenger-car speed, S | 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 2 |  |
| Density, D | 8.5 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LOS | A |  |

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | Exit 46-Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1845 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | v |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 501 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

- ft

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD

- ft

Number of lanes, $N$ 2
Free-flow speed:
2

FFS or BFFS
Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lane width adjustment, fLW

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC

- $\quad \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS
75.0

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 1063 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

14.2

B
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
ft
ramps/mi
mi/h
mi/h

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | Exit 46-Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1145 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 311 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

Lane width
Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD
Number of lanes, $N$
Free-flow speed:
FFS or BFFS
Lane width adjustment, fLW
Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC
TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS

- ft
- ft
- ramps/mi

2
Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

- mi/h
- mi/h
- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Flow rate, vp | 660 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average passenger-car speed, s | 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 2 |  |
| Density, D | 8.8 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LOS | A |  |

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | Exit 44 - Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1410 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 383 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

- ft

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD

- ft

Number of lanes, $N$ 2
Free-flow speed:
2

FFS or BFFS
Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lane width adjustment, fLW

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS
75.0
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 812 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 10.8 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | Exit 44 - Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1355 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 368 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | $\%$ |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 1.00 |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$ Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 781 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 10.4 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

$-\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
pc/mi/ln
5. 0
10.4
mi/h

A

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD
Number of lanes, $N$
Free-flow speed:
FFS or BFFS
Lane width adjustment, fLW
Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC
TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | West of Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1270 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 345 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

Lane width
Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD
Number of lanes, $N$
Free-flow speed:
FFS or BFFS
Lane width adjustment, fLW
Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC
TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS

- ft
- ft
- ramps/mi

2
Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

- mi/h
- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
- $\quad \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 732 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 9.8 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

$-\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
75.0
9.8

A
pc/mi/ln
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
pc/mi/ln

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | West of Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1180 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 321 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | \% |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 1.00 |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Flow rate, vp | 680 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average passenger-car speed, S | 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 2 |  |
| Density, D | 9.1 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LOS | A |  |

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | $12 / 15 / 2015$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | East of Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1445 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | v |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 393 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 832 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| 11.1 |  |

B

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | East of Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 2160 | veh/h |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 587 | V |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  |
| Grade | - | \% |
| Segment length | - | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 0.943 |  |
| Driver population factor, fp | 1.00 |  |
| Flow rate, vp | 1244 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width
Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD
Number of lanes, N
Free-flow speed:
2

FFS or BFFS
Lane width adjustment, fLW
Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC
TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS
LOS and Performance Measures

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

B

- ft

Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
75.0
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$\qquad$

| 1244 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 74.3 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 16.7 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

ft
ft
ramps/mi
ramps/mi
easured
pc/mi/ln
$\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \ln$
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | Exit 46-Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1405 | veh/h |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 382 | V |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  |
| Grade | - | \% |
| Segment length | - | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 0.943 |  |
| Driver population factor, fp | 1.00 |  |
| Flow rate, vp | 809 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 809 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| 10.8 |  |

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | Exit 46-Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1870 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 508 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | $\%$ |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 1.00 |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width
Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD
Number of lanes, N
Free-flow speed:
FFS or BFFS
Lane width adjustment, fLW
Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC
TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS
$\qquad$ LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

```
Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS
```

| 1077 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 74.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |

B

- ft
- 

Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

- $\quad \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
ft
ft
ramps/mi

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
pc/mi/ln

B

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | Exit 44 - Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1355 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 368 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | $\%$ |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 0.943 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 1.00 |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 781 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 |  |
| 10.4 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| A |  |

$-\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
5. 0
10.4
pc/mi/ln
A

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | 12/15/2015 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | Exit 44 - Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1520 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 413 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - | mi |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

- ft

Right-side lateral clearance
Total ramp density, TRD

- ft

Number of lanes, $N$ 2
Free-flow speed:
2

FFS or BFFS
Measured
$75.0 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lane width adjustment, fLW

- $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC

- $\quad \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

TRD adjustment
Free-flow speed, FFS
75.0

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, N
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 876 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| 11.7 |  |

11.7
pc/mi/ln
$\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
po/mi/ln

B
mi/h
mi/h
ft
ramps/mi
i/h
mi/h

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | $12 / 15 / 2015$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | EB |
| From/To: | West of Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1325 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 360 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - |  |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 763 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| 10.2 |  |
| A |  |

Operational Analysis

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency or Company: | FHU |
| Date Performed: | $12 / 15 / 2015$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Direction: | WB |
| From/To: | West of Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |

Flow Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Volume, V | 1395 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 379 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses | 12 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | Level |
| Terrain type: | - | mi |
| Grade | - | m |
| Segment length | 1.5 |  |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER |  |  |

Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$
Lane width

| - | ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | ft |
| - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| 2 |  |
| Measured |  |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

Flow rate, vp
Free-flow speed, FFS
Average passenger-car speed, S
Number of lanes, $N$
Density, D
Level of service, LOS

| 804 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 75.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| 10.7 |  |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Freeway |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | Merge |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 2 |  |
| Volume on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
|  |  | 1195 |
|  | On Ramp |  |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

215 vph
665 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 1195 |  | 215 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 325 |  | 58 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1625 | 4600 | No |

$\qquad$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.294$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.3$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.3$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | $12 / 31 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 1080 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

100 vph
525 ft
ft
_Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 1080 |  | 100 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 293 |  | 27 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  | \% |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable 1359 4600

Violation?
No
v R12

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=12.7 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.299$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.1$ | mph |  |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=65.1$ | mph |  |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1140 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 60 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 500 | $f \mathrm{t}$ |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | $f t$ |
| Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) |  |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  | ft |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00

Estimation of V12 Diverge Areas


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 1313 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
v
12

Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=11.0 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.434$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S^{R}=60.7$ | mph |
| $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.7$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
$\qquad$ Off Ramp Data

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1270 vph

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-Flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

75 vph
875
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent ramp
Position of adjacent ramp
Type of adjacent ramp
Distance to adjacent ramp
No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00

1463
86
pcph
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 1463 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)

$$
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { Density, } & D=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v} \underset{R}{ }-0.009 \mathrm{~L}=9.0 \mathrm{D}=\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln} \\
\text { Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence } A
\end{array}
$$

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.436$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.6$ | mph |
| $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.6$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 1245 | vph |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

110 vph
665 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 1245 |  | 110 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 338 |  | 30 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  | \% |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable 1561 4600

Violation?
No
v R12

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=13.4 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.293$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.3$ | mph |  |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=65.3$ | mph |  |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 1360 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

35 vph
525 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable Violation?
1607 4600

No
v R12

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=14.7 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.304$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.0$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=65.0$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
$\qquad$ Off Ramp Data

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1520 vph

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-Flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

160 vph
500 ft
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent ramp
Position of adjacent ramp
Type of adjacent ramp
Distance to adjacent ramp
No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 1751

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=14.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 44 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
$\qquad$ Off Ramp Data

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1325 vph

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-Flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

80 vph
875
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent ramp
Position of adjacent ramp
Type of adjacent ramp
Distance to adjacent ramp
No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 1527 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$
Density, $\quad D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=9.5 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
R 12 D
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence A
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.436$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.6$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.6$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 1350 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

495 vph
645 ft
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 1350 |  | 495 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 367 |  | 135 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable 2125 4600

Violation?
No
v R12

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=17.7 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.309$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=64.8$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=64.8$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 965 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

175 vph
615 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable Violation?
1314 4600

No
v R12

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=11.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.292$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.3$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.3$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1145 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 1319

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
v
12

Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=11.0 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.447$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.3$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.3$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1410 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 60 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 450 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
|  |  |  |
|  | No |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? |  | vph |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  |  |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
1.00

1625
69
pcph

Estimation of V12 Diverge Areas


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 1625 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
v
12

Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad D=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=14.2 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
R 12 D
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.434$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S^{R}=60.7$ | mph |
| $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.7$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 1210 | vph |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

195 vph
645 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1619 | 4600 | No |

v R12

Max Desirable 4600

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=14.0 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.296$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.2$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.2$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 1450 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

70 vph
615
ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

Does adjacent ramp exist? Volume on adjacent Ramp Position of adjacent Ramp Type of adjacent Ramp Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 1450 |  | 70 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 394 |  | 19 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00

81
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable Violation?
1752 4600

No
Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=15.2 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.300$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.1$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.1$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1870 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 420 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 515 | $f t$ |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | $f t$ |
| Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) |  |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | No |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  | $f t$ |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 2155 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
v
12

Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{~V}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=18.2 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.472$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=59.4$ | mph |
| $S^{R}=N / A$ | mph |
| $S_{0}=59.4$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 46 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
$\qquad$ Off Ramp Data

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1355 vph

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-Flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

145 vph
450 ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent ramp
Position of adjacent ramp
Type of adjacent ramp
Distance to adjacent ramp
No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 1561

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=13.6 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.443$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.4$ | mph |
| $R$ |  |
| $S^{D}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.4$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 1715 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph
$480 \quad \mathrm{vph}$
640 ft
ft
$f t$

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

Does adjacent ramp exist? Volume on adjacent Ramp Position of adjacent Ramp Type of adjacent Ramp Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2529 | 4600 | No |

v R12

Max Desirable 4600

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=20.9 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $C$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.325$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=64.3$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}^{0}=64.3$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


|  | Type of analysis | Merge |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

195 vph
620 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area
Actual Max Desirable 1320 4600

Violation?
No
v R12

Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=11.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.292$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.4$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=65.4$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1110 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 160 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 500 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
|  |  |  |
|  | No |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? |  | vph |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  |  |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 1279 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No
$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not F)
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=10.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.445$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.3$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.3$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1845 vph

Off Ramp Data $\qquad$

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 130 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 350 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
|  |  |  |
|  | No |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? |  | vph |
| Volume on adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Position of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp |  |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp |  |  |



Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 2126

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
v
12 Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=19.4 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$

Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B
Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.442$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.4$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.4$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 1240 | vph |
|  |  |  |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

205 vph
640 ft
ft
$f t$

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

Does adjacent ramp exist? Volume on adjacent Ramp Position of adjacent Ramp Type of adjacent Ramp Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 1240 |  | 205 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 337 |  | 56 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  | \% |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1665 | 4600 | No |

v R12

Max Desirable 4600
$\qquad$
Violation?
$\qquad$
Level of Service Determination (if not F)
Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=14.3 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation $\qquad$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.297$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=65.2$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S_{0}=65.2$ | mph |

$\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SSDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 | IMJR |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 2 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 75.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 1710 | vph |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
35.0 mph

160 vph
620 ft
ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

No
vph
ft

| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 1710 |  | 160 |  |  | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 |  | 0.92 |  |  |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 465 |  | 43 |  |  | v |
| Trucks and buses | 12 |  | 12 |  |  | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |
| Length |  | mi |  | mi |  | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |

Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


|  | Actual | Flow | Max Desirable |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v | 2154 | 4600 | Violation? |
| R12 |  |  | No | Level of Service Determination (if not F)

Density, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}}=18.3 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $M=0.311$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S^{S}=64.7$ | mph |  |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S^{R}=$ | $S^{0}=\mathrm{A}$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S^{0}=64.7$ | mph |  |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | WB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
$\qquad$ Off Ramp Data

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

2160 vph
Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-Flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/dec
Length of second accel/de

Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent ramp
Position of adjacent ramp
Type of adjacent ramp Distance to adjacent ramp

Right
1
35.0 mph

450 vph
500 ft
ft
$f t$

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
1.00 2489 518
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 2489 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
v
12 Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=21.2 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence C

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.475$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=59.3$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=59.3$ | mph |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | DCJ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | FHU |
| Date performed: | 12/31/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | EB |
| Junction: | Exit 48 |
| Jurisdiction: | FHWA/SDDOT |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |
| Description: Exit 46 IMJR |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
2
75.0 mph

1405 vph

Off Ramp Data

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 35.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 165 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 350 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |

Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent ramp
Position of adjacent ramp
Type of adjacent ramp
Distance to adjacent ramp

No
vph
ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.943
0.943

Driver population factor, fP
Flow rate, vp
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$


Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

Actual 1619 Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
v
12

Level of Service Determination (if not F) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}}=15.0 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence B

Speed Estimation $\qquad$
Intermediate speed variable,
Space mean speed in ramp influence area,
Space mean speed in outer lanes,
Space mean speed for all vehicles,

| $D=0.445$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $S$ |  |
| $S=60.3$ | mph |
| $R$ | $=\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $S^{0}$ | mph |
| $S^{0}=60.3$ | mph |

## SURFACE STREET LOS

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 1-Chimney Canyon/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Chimney Canyon |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 55 | 20 |  | 45 | 5 | 15 |  | 5 | 20 | 40 |  | 65 | 25 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 2-Deerview Road/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 45 | 110 |  | 15 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 | 1 | 35 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 3-Deerview Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 45 | 10 |  |  |  | 20 | 20 |  | 25 | 1 | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 4-Deerview Road/Sidney |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Sidney Stage Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 15 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 10 | 5 |  | 5 | 10 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 25 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 5-Deerview Road/Spring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Spring Valley Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 10 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


[^3]
## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 6-Elk Creek Road/Strugis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: North-South

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 45 | 10 |  | 30 | 70 | 160 |  | 15 | 110 | 30 |  | 250 | 85 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 7-Elk Creek Road/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 8-Elk Creek Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 65 | 85 |  |  |  | 295 | 70 |  | 90 | 5 | 35 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 10-Elk Creek/Hills View |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Hills View Drive |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 110 | 5 |  | 5 | 335 |  |  | 15 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 11-Elk Creek/Glenwood |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Glenwood Drive |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 45 | 45 |  | 5 | 145 |  |  | 130 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 12-Stage Stop Rd/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Stugis Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  | LT |  | R |  | L |  | TR |  | L |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 55 | 10 | 50 |  | 5 | 80 | 145 |  | 135 | 75 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 12-Stage Stop Rd/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West
Site Information


Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | T | R |  | L |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 130 | 185 |  | 140 | 115 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 30 | 5 | 60 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 14-Stage Stop Rd/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 75 | 85 |  |  |  | 200 | 60 |  | 55 | 5 | 55 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 15-Stage Stop Rd/LaRue Rd |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | LaRue Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West
Site Information


Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 15 | 5 |  |  |  | 30 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 65 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 1-Chimney Canyon/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Chimney Canyon |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 2-Deerview Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 20 | 55 |  | 15 | 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 | 1 | 40 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 3-Deerview Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 15 | 15 |  |  |  | 30 | 5 |  | 75 | 1 | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 4-Deerview Road/Sidney |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Sidney Stage Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 15 | 15 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 10 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 20 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 5-Deerview Road/Spring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Spring Valley Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 15 | 5 |  | 5 | 10 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 6-Elk Creek Road/Strugis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: North-South

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 40 | 10 |  | 40 | 75 | 120 |  | 10 | 60 | 15 |  | 120 | 50 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 7-Elk Creek Road/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 8-Elk Creek Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 40 | 130 |  |  |  | 130 | 25 |  | 130 | 5 | 155 |  | 5 |  | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 10-Elk Creek/Hills View |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Hills View Drive |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 250 | 15 |  | 5 | 125 |  |  | 10 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 11-Elk Creek/Glenwood |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Glenwood Drive |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 90 | 105 |  | 5 | 70 |  |  | 45 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 12-Stage Stop Rd/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Stugis Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  | LT |  | R |  | L |  | TR |  | L |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 135 | 5 | 130 |  | 5 | 55 | 100 |  | 60 | 55 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 13-Stage Stop Rd/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

Site Information

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | T | R |  | L |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 160 | 65 |  | 75 | 265 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 5 | 70 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

Major Street: East-West

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 14-Stage Stop Rd/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 70 | 130 |  |  |  | 140 | 35 |  | 200 | 5 | 105 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 15-Stage Stop Rd/LaRue Rd |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | LaRue Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West
Site Information


Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 45 | 15 |  |  |  | 15 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 90 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 1-Chimney Canyon/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Chimney Canyon |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 95 | 25 |  | 75 | 5 | 30 |  | 10 | 25 | 60 |  | 115 | 35 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 2-Deerview Road/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 75 | 195 |  | 20 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 | 1 | 60 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 3-Deerview Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 75 | 20 |  |  |  | 30 | 25 |  | 40 | 1 | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 4-Deerview Road/Sidney |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Sidney Stage Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 25 | 10 | 5 |  | 5 | 15 | 5 |  | 5 | 15 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 35 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 5-Deerview Road/Spring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Spring Valley Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 10 | 5 |  | 5 | 10 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 6-Elk Creek Road/Strugis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 45 | 10 |  | 50 | 70 | 250 |  | 15 | 155 | 50 |  | 365 | 120 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 7-Elk Creek Road/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 190 | 270 |  | 220 | 340 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 5 | 30 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 8-Elk Creek Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 95 | 120 |  |  |  | 415 | 95 |  | 130 | 5 | 45 |  | 5 |  | 15 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 14 |  | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 10-Elk Creek/Hills View |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Hills View Drive |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 145 | 10 |  | 5 | 470 |  |  | 20 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 11-Elk Creek/Glenwood |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Glenwood Drive |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West
Site Information

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 60 | 65 |  | 5 | 20 |  |  | 180 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 12-Stage Stop Rd/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Stugis Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 L | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  | LT |  | R |  | L |  | TR |  | L |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 10 | 10 | 10 |  | 75 | 15 | 65 |  | 10 | 115 | 200 |  | 190 | 105 | 10 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 13-Stage Stop Rd/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | T | R |  | L |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 185 | 270 |  | 205 | 165 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 5 | 85 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 14-Stage Stop Rd/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 105 | 120 |  |  |  | 295 | 85 |  | 75 | 5 | 80 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 15-Stage Stop Rd/LaRue Rd |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | LaRue Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 25 | 10 |  |  |  | 45 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 100 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 1-Chimney Canyon/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Chimney Canyon |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 2-Deerview Road/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 40 | 85 |  | 25 | 155 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 | 1 | 65 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 3-Deerview Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 30 | 25 |  |  |  | 50 | 5 |  | 130 | 1 | 30 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 4-Deerview Road/Sidney |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Sidney Stage Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 25 | 25 | 5 |  | 5 | 15 | 5 |  | 10 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 30 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 5-Deerview Road/Spring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Deerview Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Spring Valley Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 25 | 5 |  | 5 | 15 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 6-Elk Creek Road/Strugis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: North-South

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 40 | 10 |  | 65 | 75 | 195 |  | 10 | 85 | 20 |  | 190 | 70 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 7-Elk Creek Road/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 165 | 85 |  | 105 | 275 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80 | 5 | 60 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 8-Elk Creek Road/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 10-Elk Creek/Hills View |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Hills View Drive |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 360 | 20 |  | 5 | 175 |  |  | 15 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 11-Elk Creek/Glenwood |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Glenwood Drive |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 135 | 150 |  | 10 | 95 |  |  | 60 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 12-Stage Stop Rd/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Stugis Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  | LT |  | R |  | L |  | TR |  | L |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 10 | 10 | 10 |  | 195 | 10 | 180 |  | 10 | 80 | 140 |  | 85 | 75 | 10 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 13-Stage Stop Rd/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | T | R |  | L |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 235 | 95 |  | 105 | 385 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 55 | 5 | 105 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 14-Stage Stop Rd/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 105 | 185 |  |  |  | 200 | 50 |  | 290 | 5 | 155 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | DCJ | Intersection | 15-Stage Stop Rd/LaRue Rd |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Stage Stop Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | LaRue Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West
Site Information


Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 70 | 20 |  |  |  | 20 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 125 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## APPENDIX E

## FUTURE BUILD LOS WORKSHEETS

## SURFACE STREET LOS

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 6-Strugis/Big D Access |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Big D Truck Stop Access |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: North-South

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 |  | 55 |  |  |  |  |  | 85 | 270 |  |  |  | 335 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 7-Elk Creek Road/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |  | L |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 25 | 5 | 230 |  | 5 | 120 | 25 |  | 295 | 90 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 12 |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 8-Elk Creek Road/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Configuration |  |  | T | R |  | L | T |  |  |  |  |  |  | LT |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 135 | 190 |  | 155 | 240 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 | 0 | 20 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | Yes |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 9-Elk Creek Rd/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  | R |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 55 | 95 |  |  |  | 305 | 70 |  | 90 | 5 | 35 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 10-Elk Creek/Sidney Stage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Sidney Stage Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 6-Strugis/Big D Access |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Big D Truck Stop Access |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: North-South

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  | 85 | 180 |  |  |  | 170 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 7-Elk Creek Road/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |  | L |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 35 | 5 | 195 |  | 5 | 65 | 10 |  | 160 | 55 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 12 |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 8-Elk Creek Road/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Configuration |  |  | T | R |  | L | T |  |  |  |  |  |  | LT |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 115 | 60 |  | 70 | 195 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55 | 0 | 40 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | Yes |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 9-Elk Creek Rd/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | FHU | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  | R |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 25 | 145 |  |  |  | 135 | 25 |  | 130 | 5 | 155 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 10-Elk Creek/Sidney Stage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2021 | North/South Street | Sidney Stage Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L |  | TR |  | L |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 35 | 250 | 15 |  | 5 | 125 | 5 |  | 10 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 25 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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| ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL ANALYSIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  |  |  |  | Site Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analyst | ITS |  |  |  | Intersection |  |  |  |  | \#7 Elk CreekSturgis Road |  |  |
| Agency/Co. | FHU |  |  |  |  | Jurisdiction |  |  |  | SDD |  |  |
| Date Performed | 1/27/2 |  |  |  | Analysis Year |  |  |  |  | 2021 |  |  |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project ID Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| East/West Street: Ek Creek Road |  |  |  |  | \|North/South Street: Sturgis Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | 5 |  |  |  |  | R |  | L |  |  |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 5 |  |  | 5 |  | 25 |  |  |  | 230 |
| \%Thrus Left Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | L |  |  |  |  | R |  | L |  |  |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 5 |  | 20 |  |  | 25 |  | 29 |  |  |  | 5 |
| \%Thrus Left Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |
|  | L1 | L2 |  | L1 |  | L2 |  | L1 |  | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LTR |  |  | L |  | TR |  | L | TR | $R$ | L | TR |
| PHF | 0.92 |  |  | 0.92 |  | 0.92 |  | . 92 | 0.9 | 92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Flow Rate (veh/h) | 15 |  |  | 27 |  | 254 |  | 5 | 48 | 8 | 320 | 102 |
| \% Heavy Vehicles | 12 |  |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 | 12 | 2 | 12 | 12 |
| No. Lanes | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Geometry Group | $4 b$ |  | 5 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  | 5 |  |
| Duration, T | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet

| Prop. Left-Turns | 0.3 |  | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop. Right-Turns | 0.3 |  | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop. Heavy Vehicle | 0.1 |  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| hLT-adj | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| hadj, computed | 0.1 |  | 0.7 | -0.5 | 0.7 | -0.2 | 0.7 | 0.2 |

## Departure Headway and Service Time



Capacity and Level of Service

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 500 |  | 540 | 668 | 500 | 600 | 593 | 638 |
| Delay (s/veh) | 9.1 |  | 9.6 | 11.2 | 9.4 | 8.9 | 15.8 | 9.3 |
| LOS | A |  | A | B | A | A | C | A |
| Approach: Delay (s/veh) | 9.1 |  | 11.1 |  | 8.9 |  | 14.3 |  |
| LOS | A |  | B |  | A |  | B |  |
| Intersection Delay (s/veh) | 12.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet

| Prop. Left-Turns | 0.3 |  | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop. Right-Turns | 0.3 |  | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop. Heavy Vehicle | 0.1 |  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| hLT-adj | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| hadj, computed | 0.1 |  | 0.7 | -0.5 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.2 |

## Departure Headway and Service Time

| hd, initial value (s) | 3.20 |  | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| x, initial | 0.01 |  | 0.03 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.15 | 0.05 |
| hd, final value $(\mathrm{s})$ | 5.77 |  | 6.09 | 4.91 | 6.20 | 5.61 | 6.01 | 5.51 |
| x, final value | 0.024 |  | 0.064 | 0.295 | 0.009 | 0.125 | 0.289 | 0.090 |
| Move-up time, $\mathrm{m}(\mathrm{s})$ | 2.3 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.3 |  |
| Service Time, $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{s})$ | 3.5 |  | 3.8 | 2.6 | 3.9 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.2 |

## Capacity and Level of Service

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 750 |  | 633 | 745 | 500 | 667 | 597 | 656 |
| Delay (s/veh) | 8.6 |  | 9.2 | 9.7 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 11.1 | 8.8 |
| LOS | A |  | A | A | A | A | B | A |
| Approach: Delay (s/veh) | 8.6 |  | 9.6 |  | 9.1 |  | 10.5 |  |
| LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  | $B$ |  |
| Intersection Delay (s/veh) | 9.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 6-Strugis/Big D Access |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Big D Truck Stop Access |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: North-South

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 |  | 55 |  |  |  |  |  | 85 | 410 |  |  |  | 485 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 7-Elk Creek Road/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |  | L |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 45 | 5 | 320 |  | 5 | 170 | 45 |  | 410 | 125 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 12 |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 8-Elk Creek Road/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Configuration |  |  | T | R |  | L | T |  |  |  |  |  |  | LT |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 190 | 270 |  | 220 | 340 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 5 | 30 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | Yes |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 9-Elk Creek Rd/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  | R |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 85 | 130 |  |  |  | 430 | 85 |  | 130 | 5 | 45 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 10-Elk Creek/Sidney Stage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Sidney Stage Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L |  | TR |  | L |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  |  | LTR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 10 | 155 | 10 |  | 5 | 485 | 10 |  | 20 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2016 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 6-Strugis/Big D Access |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Big D Truck Stop Access |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: North-South

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  | 85 | 285 |  |  |  | 260 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 7-Elk Creek Road/Sturgis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Sturgis Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | T | R |  | L | T | R |  | L |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 60 | 5 | 270 |  | 5 | 95 | 15 |  | 230 | 75 | 5 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 12 |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 8-Elk Creek Road/EB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | EB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Configuration |  |  | T | R |  | L | T |  |  |  |  |  |  | LT |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 165 | 85 |  | 105 | 275 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80 | 5 | 60 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | Yes |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 9-Elk Creek Rd/WB Ramps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | FHU | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $01 / 06 / 2016$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | WB Ramps |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes


Major Street: East-West

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | L | T |  |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  | R |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 40 | 205 |  |  |  | 195 | 15 |  | 185 | 10 | 225 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop Control Summary Report

General Information

| Analyst | TS | Intersection | 10-Elk Creek/Sidney Stage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Felsburg Holt \& Ullevig | Jurisdiction | South Dakota DOT / FHWA |
| Date Performed | $12 / 15 / 2015$ | East/West Street | Elk Creek Road |
| Analysis Year | 2045 | North/South Street | Sidney Stage Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM | Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | I-90 Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |

Lanes

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments
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## Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet

| Prop. Left-Turns | 0.3 |  | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prop. Right-Turns | 0.3 |  | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop. Heavy Vehicle | 0.1 |  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| hLT-adj | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| hadj, computed | 0.1 |  | 0.7 | -0.5 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.2 |

## Departure Headway and Service Time



## Capacity and Level of Service

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 500 |  | 480 | 559 | 500 | 516 | 511 | 560 |
| Delay (s/veh) | 10.8 |  | 11.2 | 19.2 | 10.4 | 15.1 | 40.1 | 11.4 |
| LOS | B |  | B | C | B | C | E | B |
| Approach: Delay (s/veh) | 10.8 |  | 18.3 |  | 15.0 |  | 33.2 |  |
| LOS | B |  | C |  | B |  | D |  |
| Intersection Delay (s/veh) | 24.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Departure Headway and Service Time

| hd, initial value (s) | 3.20 |  | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| x, initial | 0.01 |  | 0.06 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.22 | 0.08 |
| hd, final value (s) | 6.41 |  | 6.54 | 5.36 | 6.76 | 6.16 | 6.45 | 5.90 |
| x, final value | 0.027 |  | 0.118 | 0.443 | 0.009 | 0.204 | 0.446 | 0.141 |
| Move-up time, m (s) | 2.3 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.3 |  |
| Service Time, $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{s})$ | 4.1 |  | 4.2 | 3.1 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.6 |

## Capacity and Level of Service

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 500 |  | 542 | 677 | 500 | 595 | 553 | 614 |
| Delay (s/veh) | 9.3 |  | 10.1 | 12.3 | 9.5 | 10.4 | 14.2 | 9.6 |
| LOS | A |  | B | B | A | B | B | A |
| Approach: Delay (s/veh) | 9.3 |  | 11.9 |  | 10.4 |  | 13.0 |  |
| LOS | A |  | B |  | B |  | B |  |
| Intersection Delay (s/veh) | 12.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| General Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Intersection Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Duration, h |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |
| Analyst |  |  |  | Analysi | is Date | 1/27 | 2016 |  | Area Type |  | Other |  |  |  |  |
| Jurisdiction |  |  |  | Time P | eriod |  |  |  | PHF |  | 0.92 |  | - | fit |  |
| Urban Street |  | Elk Creek Road |  | Analysi | is Year | 2016 |  |  | Analysis | Period | 1>7:00 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection |  | Elk Creek Road/Sturgis... |  | File Name |  | \#7 - Elk Creek-Sturgis Road PM.xus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description |  | Exit 46 IMJR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demand Information |  |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |
| Approach Movement |  |  |  | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |  |  |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 60 | 5 | 270 | 5 | 95 | 15 | 230 | 75 | 5 |
| Signal Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle, s | 36.1 | Reference Phase | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End |  |  |  |  | 1.6 | 5.3 | 0.0 |  |  | $\boxed{7}$ |  |  |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  | 5 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Timer Results |  |  |  | EBL |  | EBT | WBL | WBT |  | NBL | NBT |  | SBL | SBT |  |
| Assigned Phase |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  | 6 | 3 |  | 8 | 7 |  | 4 |
| Case Number |  |  |  |  |  | 8.3 | 1.0 |  | 3.0 | 1.1 |  | 3.0 | 1.1 |  | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s |  |  |  |  |  | 10.0 | 6.9 |  | 16.9 | 4.3 |  | 9.3 | 9.9 |  | 14.9 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), s |  |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH), s |  |  |  |  |  | 3.3 | 3.0 |  | 3.3 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( g ) , s |  |  |  |  |  | 2.3 | 3.1 |  | 8.4 | 2.1 |  | 4.1 | 6.5 |  | 3.5 |
| Green Extension Time ( ge ), s |  |  |  |  |  | 0.3 | 0.0 |  | 0.4 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.1 |
| Phase Call Probability |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | 0.48 |  | 1.00 | 0.05 |  | 0.88 | 0.92 |  | 0.99 |
| Max Out Probability |  |  |  |  |  | 0.74 | 1.00 |  | 0.08 | 0.09 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Movement Group Results |  |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Approach Movement |  |  |  | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement |  |  |  | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h |  |  |  |  | 16 |  | 65 | 5 | 293 | 5 | 103 | 16 | 250 | 87 |  |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/n |  |  |  |  | 1456 |  | 1531 | 1607 | 1362 | 1531 | 1607 | 1362 | 1531 | 1589 |  |
| Queue Service Time ( $g$ s), s |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  | 1.1 | 0.1 | 6.4 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 4.5 | 1.5 |  |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ), s |  |  |  |  | 0.3 |  | 1.1 | 0.1 | 6.4 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 4.5 | 1.5 |  |
| Green Ratio ( g/C ) |  |  |  |  | 0.17 |  | 0.30 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.37 | 0.30 |  |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h |  |  |  |  | 375 |  | 522 | 574 | 486 | 386 | 234 | 198 | 554 | 479 |  |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) |  |  |  |  | 0.043 |  | 0.125 | 0.009 | 0.604 | 0.014 | 0.441 | 0.082 | 0.452 | 0.181 |  |
| Available Capacity ( $c$ a $)$, veh/h |  |  |  |  | 375 |  | 654 | 668 | 566 | 627 | 267 | 227 | 556 | 479 |  |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) |  |  |  |  | 0.1 |  | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.3 |  |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.00 |  |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh |  |  |  |  | 12.7 |  | 9.3 | 7.5 | 9.5 | 12.9 | 14.1 | 13.3 | 9.0 | 9.3 |  |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh |  |  |  |  | 12.7 |  | 9.3 | 7.5 | 10.1 | 12.9 | 14.6 | 13.4 | 9.2 | 9.4 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) |  |  |  |  | B |  | A | A | B | B | B | B | A | A |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS |  |  |  | 12.7 |  | B | 10.0 |  | A | 14.3 |  | B | 9.2 |  | A |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS |  |  |  | 10.4 |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multimodal Results |  |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS |  |  |  | 2.4 |  | B | 2.2 |  | B | 2.4 |  | B | 2.1 |  | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS |  |  |  | 0.5 |  | A | 1.1 |  | A | 0.7 |  | A | 1.0 |  | A |


[^0]:    Existing conditions LOS worksheets are included in Appendix C.
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