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## PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to determine the feasibility of reducing traffic lanes along Hampton Avenue between Chippewa Street and Gravois Avenue. The motivation for reducing lanes or implementing a "road diet" is a desire for Hampton Avenue to more effectively serve all users of the street, including pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and motorists. Today, Hampton Avenue functions as an arterial street that prioritizes vehicle traffic over other modes. Hampton has two traffic lanes in each direction. Traffic signal cycles are long to accommodate through traffic. Many areas along the corridor lack adequate pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.

At the same time, the land use context along Hampton Avenue is evolving. Small businesses and restaurants are reinvigorating existing commercial buildings. These new businesses, particularly the restaurants, have amplified the need for parking. Many restaurants rely upon on-street parking along Hampton Avenue to serve their patrons. Adjacent neighborhood residents are more and more seeking a walkable community and an urban experience.

Implementing a "road diet" along Hampton Avenue would reduce traffic speeds, improve safety, and promote a more welcoming environment for non-motorized users of the street. This study objectively evaluates the feasibility of a "road diet" along the Hampton Avenue corridor by detailing its anticipated benefits and impacts to traffic.


## Figure 1. Hampton Corrridor City Wards

## LOCATION

The study runs along Hampton Avenue from Chippewa Street to the north to Gravois Avenue to the south. This area touches both Ward 16 and Ward 12 of the City of St. Louis and three neighborhoods - St. Louis Hills, Princeton Heights, and South Hampton. Ward and neighborhood maps are depicted in Figure 1 and Figure 2. The surrounding neighborhoods are mostly single-family. The northern portion of the corridor is commercial including large retail centers with off-street parking, such as the Hampton Village Shopping Center. The middle portion contains small-scale commercial uses with buildings abutting the sidewalks and onstreet parking. The southern portion of the corridor is lined with mostly residential uses and Willmore Park.



Figure 2. Hampton Corridor Neighborhoods



## SCOPE

To assess the feasibility of a road diet, this study first evaluated existing conditions along Hampton Avenue based on the current configuration of the corridor. The existing conditions were then compared to a road diet configuration. Both scenarios were evaluated using existing traffic volumes.

To determine the feasibility of a "road diet", this study evaluated traffic operations, parking, and safety along the study corridor, focusing on the major study intersections:

Hampton Avenue and Chippewa Street
Hampton Avenue and Bancroft Avenue
Hampton Avenue and Nottingham Avenue
Hampton Avenue and Eichelberger Street
Hampton Avenue and Holly Hills Avenue
Hampton Avenue and Loughborough Avenue
Hampton Avenue and Jamieson Avenue
Hampton Avenue and Gravois Avenue/Germania Street
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## Lane Configuration

The Hampton Avenue curb-to-curb width is 54 to 55 feet along the length of the corridor. However, the lane designations vary. Between Chippewa Street and Lansdowne Avenue, the street has five lanes including two through lanes in each direction plus a center lane for left-turns. To the south of Lansdowne Avenue, Hampton Avenue is mostly four lanes with two through lanes in each direction. Hampton has dedicated left-turn lanes at its intersections with Eichelberger Street, with Jamieson Avenue, and at the Willmore Park entrance.

The study corridor contains 7 signalized intersections-6 operate as part of a coordinated system maintained by the City of St. Louis. Missouri Department of Transportation operates the intersection of Hampton Avenue and Gravois Avenue. The lane configuration and method of traffic control at each study intersection is depicted in Figure 3

## 袮

## Pedestrian Conditions

Sidewalks line both sides of Hampton Avenue along length of the corridor. The width of sidewalk varies by location from narrow 4-foot sidewalks to very wide 12 -foot sidewalks. The signalized intersections have marked pedestrian crosswalks with push buttons and pedestrian signal indicators across most legs. Sidewalk condition and the degree of ADA compliance varies throughout the corridor. The intersection of Hampton Avenue with Jamieson Avenue lacks crosswalks entirely. In fact, Hampton Avenue lacks east-west pedestrian crossings between Loughborough Avenue and Gravois Avenue - a distance of over 3,600 feet.

Figure 4. Pedestrian Crossings Along Major Intersections




## హో

## Bicycle Conditions

Hampton Avenue from Eichelberger Street to Gravois Avenue is an official bicycle route designated by Bike St. Louis. From Eichelberger Street to Robert Avenue, Hampton has a share-the-road configuration denoted by painted "sharrows". Dedicated on-street bicycle lanes are marked on both sides of the street south of Robert Avenue. While the northbound onstreet bike lane continues south to Gravois Avenue, the southbound lane is interrupted by on-street parking adjacent to Willmore Park and returns to a share-the-road configuration.

To the south of the study area, the on-street lanes continue along Germania Street. To the north, the bike route continues east on Eichelberger Street and angles north along Wherry Ave to Macklind Avenue. A map of the designated bicycle routes is shown in Figure 5

## Transit

The study corridor is served by Metro Transit and the \#90 MetroBus route. Service is provided at 30-minute headways throughout the day with additional service during peak periods. There are 11 southbound and 9 northbound bus stops in the study area, none of which have covered shelters.



## Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Turning movement counts were collected at each of the study intersections during the weekday peak hours. Counts were performed in February and March of 2019. The weekday peak hours occurred from 7:15 AM to 8:15 AM in the morning and from 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM in the evening. These periods were the focus of the traffic analysis. The peak hour volumes are summarized by intersection and movement in

## Figure 6

In general, traffic volumes are heavier in northern portions of the corridor. The busiest intersections are at the north (Chippewa Street) and south (Gravois Avenue) limits of the study area.

## Daily Traffic Volumes

The daily traffic volume on Hampton Avenue was measured for one weekday at a location between Delor Street and Itaska Street. The daily traffic volume was 16,332 vehicles per day. As expected, volumes were balanced northbound and southbound over the course of the day. The hourly traffic fluctuation throughout the day by direction is depicted in Figure 7.

Traffic is heaviest in the northbound direction in the morning and in the southbound direction in the afternoon. This reflects prevailing commuter traffic patterns oriented towards Interstates 44 and 64 in the morning and away from those interstates in the afternoon.

Figure 7. Daily Traffic Volumes on Hampton Ave.
Measured between Delor and Itaska



Figure 8. Existing Peak Hour Pedestrian \& Bike Volumes


Legend
$\overrightarrow{\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{Y})} \quad \mathrm{AM}(\mathrm{PM})$ Peak Hour
$\mathrm{X}(\mathrm{Y}) \quad$ Bicycle Vol (vph)
$\overleftrightarrow{X(Y)} \quad$ AM(PM) Peak Hour
$X(Y) \quad$ Pedestrian Vol (vph)

AM Peak-7:15 AM to 8:15 AM PM Peak - 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM

## Peak Hour Pedestrian \& Bicycle Volumes

Pedestrian volumes were modest while bicycle volumes were nominal. These low volumes were likely impacted by the winter season in which the counts were performed. Pedestrian and bicycle volumes collected at each study intersection are summarized for the traffic peak hours in Figure 8.

Figure 9. Average Weekday Speed, Hampton Ave

## Speed

The posted speed limit on Hampton Avenue is 35 miles per hour (mph). Vehicle speeds on Hampton were measured for one weekday at a location between Delor Street and Itaska Street to determine motorists' compliance with the posted limit. Speed data is typically summarized by the 85th percentile speed, which is the speed at which 85 percent of the motoring public are traveling at or below. The 85th percentile speed is useful because it represents the collective judgment of most drivers and ignores high-speed outliers. Along the Hampton corridor, the 85th percentile speed was 37.3 mph , which is relatively consistent with the posted speed limit. The speed profile for Hampton Avenue is summarized in Figure 9.



Figure 10. Weekday Mid-day On-Street Parking Utilization


## Figure 11. Friday Evening On-Street Parking Utilization



## Parking

Hampton Avenue accommodates on-street parking on both sides of the street from around Lansdowne Avenue south to Gravois Avenue. Parking is interrupted in sections for dedicated left-turn lanes and on-street bike lanes but is provided throughout most of the corridor. The total amount of on-street parking was estimated to be 500 spaces

On-street parking along Hampton Avenue was measured in the field during the midday period on a weekday (12:00 PM - 2:00 PM) and during the evening on a Friday (6:00 PM - 8:00 PM). These periods capture the highest demands for on-street parking. Parking utilization along the corridor is illustrated in Figure 10 and Figure 11.

## Weekday midday parking utilization was

 low, averaging 9 percent. Of the 500 spaces in the corridor, under 50 spaces were used. No individual block segment exceeded 55 percent utilization.Friday evening utilization was higher, averaging 17 percent. While this is still relatively low, multiple block segments on the west side exceeded 80 percent utilization. There were also five instances of illegal parking.


## Safety

A safety analysis was performed using crash data from the Hampton Avenue corridor from 2016 and 2017. This analysis was supplemented by a review of individual reports for injury crashes furnished by the City of St. Louis from 2016, 2017, and 2018.

## Crash Type

Rear-end crashes (32\%) and angle crashes (25\%) were most common. These types of crashes are typical for urban arterials with frequent intersections and a high concentration of driveways. 8 percent of crashes involved parked cars, which was expected given the on-street parking along Hampton Avenue. Pedestrian crashes made up 5 percent of all crashes.

## Crash Severity

Over the 2-year crash analysis period, the Hampton Avenue corridor experienced 1 fatal crash and 2 crashes with incapacitating or disabling injury. In total, there were 165 crashes in 2016 and 2017 as summarized in Figure 13.


Figure 13. Crashes by Severity, total (2016-2017)



## Safety

## Crash Location

The one fatal crash occurred at Hampton Avenue and Jamieson Avenue and involved a car colliding with a bicycle in the dark. Both disabling injury crashes involved head-on collisions resulting from improper lane usage. One of the disabling injury crashes also occurred at the Hampton Avenue and Jamieson Avenue intersection. The other occurred at Hampton Avenue and Nottingham Avenue.

A heat map of crashes shown in Figure 14 highlights the intersections of both frequent and high severity crashes, Jamieson Avenue and Hampton Avenue being the intersection with the most frequent and severe crashes. Most crashes resulted in minor injuries or property damage. These crashes were distributed throughout the Hampton Avenue corridor, although the segment between Eichelberger Street and Holly Hills Avenue experienced a larger amount of these crashes. This is likely due to a high number of active commercial driveways in that section.

## 曏

## Traffic Operations

Traffic operating conditions were evaluated during the weekday morning and evening commuter peak hours. If traffic is well accommodated during peak periods, it will be accomodated at all other times. Each intersection was graded with six levels of traffic service (LOS) from A through F. LOS E represents acceptable intersection performance in urban areas. Intersection LOS for the morning and evening peak hours are illustrated in Figure 15 and Figure 16

All study intersections operate at acceptable overall levels of service - LOS C or better in the morning and LOS D or better in the evening.

In the evening, several minor approaches to intersections operate at LOS E or F. This is in part due to long traffic signal cycle lengths (740 seconds).

Evaluation of traffic operations focused on intersection performance, since the number of vehicles that can be served at major intersections dictates Hampton Avenue's capacity. Existing traffic operations in the study corridor were evaluated using Synchro 10 The traffic operational analysis methodology is summarized in Appendix $\mathbf{D}$. Detailed intersection operating summaries are provided in Appendix E, including LOS, delay, and queue lengths by intersection approach.

## Figure 15. Existing Traffic Operations, AM Peak Hour



Figure 16. Existing Traffic Operations, PM Peak Hour



## "ROAD DIET" CONCEPT

A "road diet" concept was developed and tailored to conditions in the Hampton Avenue corridor. The "road diet" conceptual design was evaluated for its feasibility and likelihood of success.

This objective evaluation is intended to provide decision-makers with the most accurate information to assess the feasibility of the road diet alternative. This study does not offer a recommendation for or against the "road diet" alternative.

## Conceptual Design

The "road diet" concept includes 3 traffic lanes - 1 through lane in each direction plus a center twoway left-turn lane. Converting roadways from 4 lanes to 3 lanes is the most common "road diet" application. This concept maintains existing on-street parking, except for the parking along the west side of the street adjacent to Willmore Park. With negligible parking usage in that area, the pavement is instead designated for a southbound on-street bicycle lane. This mirrors the existing northbound bicycle lane on the other side of the street.

Starting at the north end of the study corridor, the road diet begins just south of Bancroft Avenue near Lansdowne Avenue. This location was chosen because beginning the "road diet" further to the north would significantly impact traffic; there are heavy traffic volumes at the Chippewa Street intersection, combined with insufficient distance for lane transitions between Chippewa and Bancroft Avenue. This concept assumes the intersections of Hampton Avenue with Chippewa Street and with Bancroft Avenue would not change. Figure $\mathbf{1 7}$ shows the "road diet" locations within the study corridor.

The 3-lane "road diet" would proceed south from Lansdowne to the entrance of Willmore Park. South of that location, the three-lane road would transition back to the existing 4-lane crosssection. The intersection at Gravois Avenue would remain in place.




## Conceptual Design

The typical cross-section with the "road diet" concept assumes 10-foot traffic lanes in each direction plus a 13-foot center two-way leftturn lane plus 10-foot outside parking lanes on each side of the street or 5-foot bike lanes plus a 5-foot buffer. On-street parking remains interrupted for transit stops. These cross sections are illustrated in Figure 18 and Figure 19.

## Intersection Improvements

Select intersections modified with the "road diet" concept are described below. the "road diet" lane configuration is depicted in Figure $\mathbf{2 0}$.
The intersection of Hampton Avenue with Nottingham Avenue includes a short dedicated southbound right-turn lane. This will help increase southbound capacity for the evening peak hours and enable right-turning vehicles to decelerate out of the through lane. Deceleration will improve safety at the intersection given limited visibility with the curvature of Hampton Avenue. The traffic signal at Hampton Avenue and Nottingham Avenue is modified to eliminate protected turn arrows (phases) for eastbound and westbound traffic. Instead, these vehicles proceed during a common green phase, yielding to oncoming traffic as necessary. The changes to this intersection simplify the traffic signal's operation, lessening the impact of fewer lanes on Hampton Avenue.

All signalized intersections include physically raised curb bump outs to reduce intersection sizing and shorten pedestrian crossing distances. The shorter crossing distances reduce the pedestrian crossing time, which allows shorter signal cycle lengths. With the bumpouts, ADA-compliant curb ramps and pedestrian signal push buttons are included. The existing curb line is maintained along Hampton Avenue between major intersections.

Intersection improvements to increase safety are merited at the Hampton Avenue and Jamieson Avenue independent of the "road diet" alternative. This intersection is excessively large and lacks any pedestrian crosswalks, despite adjoining residential and recreational (Willmore Park) uses. This intersection was the scene of 2 serious crashes ( 1 fatal and 1 with disabling injury) during the recent 2-year period. Recognizing funding limitations, the "road diet" alternative reduces the size of this intersection with painted pavement and a physical bollard or planter. The eastbound approach is reduced to 2 lanes ( 7 left-turn and 1 right-turn). Just a single lane departs the intersection in the westbound direction. Pedestrian crosswalks are provided across the west and north legs. Given the volume of traffic on Hampton Avenue and the absence of a traffic signal, a pedestrian refuge is added in the median of and rectangular rapid flashing beacons are provided to improve safety.

The full conceptual design of the "road diet" concept is illustrated in Appendix F. The cost to implement the full "road diet" concept assuming fully constructed bumpouts at intersections is $\$ 916,301$. A low-cost striping only concept, which avoids upgrades to traffic signals and relies on pavement marking and planters/bollards to delineate bumpouts is $\$ 193,680$. All cost estimates are summarized in Appendix $G$

Figure 20. Proposed Lane Configuration with Road Diet


## Operational Feasibility

The traffic operational feasibility of implementing the "road diet" concept was considered by applying the same methodology used for existing conditions. Existing traffic volumes were evaluated. No traffic diversions were assumed, despite multiple north-south parallel routes. However, research shows previous "road diet" implementations diverted 2 percent to 15 percent of their prior traffic volume.

## Volumes

Industry guidance suggests that a street is a candidate for a 4-lane to 3-lane "road diet" conversion if the average daily traffic volume does not exceed 20,000 vehicles per day. The daily traffic volume along Hampton Avenue was 16,332 which is well below that threshold

The heaviest direction on Hampton Avenue is southbound during the evening peak hour when 1,020 through vehicles approach Nottingham Avenue - the first "road diet" signal. This is higher than volumes traveling through the similar South Grand Boulevard "road diet" (which is 842 from a recent count). From that neighborhood's perspective, the Grand Boulevard road diet is a success. Some traffic diversions from Hampton Avenue may be necessary for the "road diet" to function as well as Grand. If diversions reach 17 percent, peak volumes along the two corridors would be effectively equal.

## Figure 21. AM LOS with Road Diet



## Figure 22. PM LOS with Road Diet



## Operational Feasibility

## Intersection Level of Service (LOS)

In general, the "road diet" concept would not impact the intersection LOS in the corridor The most tangible traffic impact would be onger queues on Hampton Avenue at the intersections with Nottingham Avenue and with Eichelberger Street, particularly in the southbound direction during the evening peak hour. The 95th percentile queue approaching both intersections would exceed 800 feet, which is several orders of magnitude greater than existing queues. That said, for most signal cycles, all vehicles in queue would clear the intersection on a single green. Intersection LOS for the morning and evening peak hours with the "road diet" concept are illustrated in Figure 21 and Figure 22

## Operational Feasibility

## Intersection Level of Service (LOS)

Traffic impacts to other intersections in the corridor would be mostly negligible. The intersection of Hampton Avenue and Loughborough Avenue would experience less delay and the minor street approaches would actually improve from LOS E/F to LOS D, as a result of a shorter traffic signal cycle. A summary of the impacts on each intersection is below:

| Chippewa St. | No anticipated impact |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bancroft Ave. | No anticipated impact |
| Nottingham Ave. | LOS unchanged, lengthy southbound queuing during PM peak <br> hour |
| Eichelberger St. | Similar LOS, lengthy northbound and southbound queuing during <br> AM and PM peak hours |
| Holly Hills Ave. | No anticipated impact | | Loughborough Ave. LOS improved, particularly for minor approaches |
| :--- | :--- |



## Anticipated Benefits

A decrease in speeds along Hampton Avenue is expected due to the inability of higher speed motorists to make lane changes. Case studies reveal an average speed reduction of approximately 5 mph.

## Pedestrian Crossings

Shorter pedestrian crossings resulting from curb bump outs reduce the likelihood of pedestrian-related crashes and promote a more welcoming environment for pedestrians. The "road diet" alternative reduces the distance to cross Hampton Avenue by approximately 15 feet. More significant pedestrian improvements are included at the Jamieson Avenue intersection.

The "road diet" alternative extends the southbound onstreet bike lane along Willmore Park closing an existing gap between Gravois Avenue and Jamieson Avenue. The additional pavement width allows for the existing on-street lanes to be segregated from moving vehicles by a 5-feet buffer zone.

Safety
"Road diet" installations typically reduce crashes due to the elimination of passing maneuvers and the introduction of a continuous lane for left-turns. Published guidance by the Federal Highway Administration suggests that a crash reduction of 29 percent is most applicable for the "road diet" alternative in the Hampton Avenue corridor.

## Parking

For much of the study corridor, the "road diet" alternative does not impact the supply of on-street parking where it is in highest demand. The "road diet" increases the width of the parking lane from a narrow 7 feet to a safer and more comfortable 10 feet. The "road diet" alternative eliminates about 80 unused parking spaces along Willmore Park to expand an on-street bike lane.

## Transit

Transit operations should not be affected by the "road diet" alternative as it does not modify bus stops. Improved safety is expected due to the increased width of the parking lane. This provides additional space for buses to pull out of the traffic lane to stop and allow passengers to board or disembark.

## Anticipated Draw-Backs

## $\uparrow$ Traffic Diversion

Traffic may be diverted to parallel north south streets, particularly Jamieson Ave, Macklind Ave, and Kingshighway. According to published research, traffic diversion to parallel routes from road diet implementation ranges from $2 \%$ to 15\%.

## Perceived Congestion

Motorists traveling on Hampton Avenue may perceive increased congestion due to the inability to pass slower moving traffic and the resulting uniformity of traffic flow. These conditions should be limited to the weekday peak commuter periods. At other non-peak times of the day, the "road diet" alternative should not adversely impact traffic operations. The "road diet" alternative is expected to provide benefits at all times of day.


## CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the feasibility of reducing traffic lanes along Hampton Avenue between Chippewa Street and Gravois Avenue. The goal of this objective evaluation is to provide information to help decision makers. A recommendation is not offered for or against the "road diet" concept.

The "road diet" concept includes 3 traffic lanes - 1 through lane in each direction plus a center two-way left-turn lane. Lane modifications occur between Lansdowne Avenue and the entrance to Willmore Park. The traffic operational feasibility of implementing the "road diet" concept is summarized as follows:

- The Hampton Avenue corridor is a good candidate for a road diet. Industry guidance suggests road diets are appropriate for streets with volumes below 20,000 vehicles per day - Hampton Avenue's is 16,332 vehicles per day.
- The "road diet" would not impact overall intersection levels of service. The most tangible traffic impact is likely to be longer queues during the peak periods on Hampton Avenue at the intersections with Nottingham Avenue and with Eichelberger Street.
- The "road diet" would promote a more welcoming environment for all modes by reducing traffic speeds, improving safety, shortening pedestrian crosswalks, enlarging spaces for on-street parking and transit stops, and improving onstreet bicycle lanes.

The cost estimate for the low-cost striping only concept for the "road diet" is $\$ 193,680$. The cost estimate of the full "road diet" concept is $\$ 916,301$. Both cost estimates are detailed in Appendix G.

## APPENDIX

Appendix A: Existing Count Data
Appendix B: Speed Data


Engineering Design Source Inc
16141 Swingley Ridge Road
sterfield, Missouri, United States 12345 636.537.5585 go@engdesignsource.com

Count Name: Hampton and Chippewa Site Code: 01

Date: 03/07/2019
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Southbound Approach Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. Total |
| 7:00 AM | 15 | 67 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 7:15 AM | 28 | 88 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 136 |
| 7:30 AM | 34 | 105 | 26 | 0 | 4 | 165 |
| 7:45 AM | 35 | 96 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 157 |
| Hourly Total | 112 | 356 | 90 | 0 | 6 | 558 |
| 8:00 AM | 20 | 80 | 28 | 0 | 3 | 128 |
| 8:15 AM | 32 | 73 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 143 |
| 8:30 AM | 29 | 68 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 124 |
| 8:45 AM | 28 | 102 | 37 | 0 | 1 | 167 |
| Hourly Total | 109 | 323 | 130 | 0 | 5 | 562 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *** BREAK *** | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 4:00 PM | 52 | 249 | 79 |  | 3 | 380 |
| 4:15 PM | 60 | 292 | 67 | 0 | 3 | 419 |
| 4:30 PM | 52 | 244 | 60 | 0 | 7 | 356 |
| 4:45 PM | 46 | 277 | 68 | 0 | 2 | 391 |
| Hourly Total | 210 | 1062 | 274 | 0 | 15 | 1546 |
| 5:00 PM | 44 | 263 | 69 | 0 | 4 | 376 |
| 5:15 PM | 51 | 259 | 90 | 0 | 1 | 400 |
| 5:30 PM | 53 | 257 | 71 | 0 |  | 381 |
| 5:45 PM | 40 | 208 | 83 | 0 | 1 | 331 |
| Hourly Total | 188 | 987 | 313 | 0 | 9 | 1488 |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Grand Total | 619 | 2732 | 807 |  | 35 | 4158 |
| Approach \% | 14.9 | 65.7 | 19.4 | 0.0 | - | $\checkmark$ |
| Total \% | 4.7 | 20.6 | 6.1 | 0.0 | - | 31.4 |
| Motorcycles | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 |
| Cars \& Light Goods | 608 | 2686 | 785 | 0 | - | 4079 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Cars \& Light } \\ \text { Goods } \end{gathered}$ | 98.2 | 98.3 | 97.3 | - | - | 98.1 |
| Buses | 3 | 22 | 14 | 0 | - | 39 |
| \% Buses | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1.7 | - | - | 0.9 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 6 | 17 | 6 | 0 | $-$ | 29 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.7 | - | - | 0.7 |
| Articulated Trucks | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | - | 8 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | - | - | 0.2 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 |


|  |
| :---: |
|  |
| Rig |${ }^{\prime} 11$

Westbound Approach
Northbound Approach
Northbound
stbound Approac
Eastbound
Left U-Turn Ped

| App. Total | Righ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 159 | 5 |
| 137 | 7 |
| 174 | 5 |
| 169 | 13 |
| 639 | 30 |
| 155 | 9 |
| 134 | 3 |
| 142 | 8 |
| 133 | 9 |
| 564 | 29 |
| 0 | 0 |
| - | - |
| 0 | 0 |
| 204 | 20 |
| 180 | 21 |
| 218 | 25 |
| 191 | 30 |
| 793 | 96 |
| 229 | 18 |
| 201 | 25 |
| 197 | 21 |
| 215 | 20 |
| 842 | 84 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 2838 | 239 |
| - | 7.0 |
| 21.4 | 1.8 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2781 | 238 |
| 98.0 | 99.6 |
| 40 | 0 |
| 1.4 | 0.0 |
| 11 | 0 |
| 0.4 | 0.0 |
| 6 | 1 |
| 0.2 | 0.4 |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | Thru |
|  | 202 |
| 7 | 287 |
| 5 | 257 |
| 13 | 230 |
| 30 | 976 |
| 9 | 168 |
| 3 | 189 |
| 8 | 156 |
| 9 | 150 |
| 29 | 663 |
|  |  |

Left U-Turn Peds Ap

|  | Eastbound Approach <br> Eastbound <br> App. |  |  |  |  |  | Right |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. | Total | Int. Total |
| 229 | 6 | 71 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 594 |
| 309 | 8 | 96 | 48 | 0 | 1 | 152 | 734 |
| 290 | 8 | 137 | 54 | 0 | 1 | 199 | 828 |
| 274 | 11 | 109 | 39 | 0 | 2 | 159 | 759 |
| 1102 | 33 | 413 | 170 | 0 | 4 | 616 | 2915 |
| 199 | 16 | 92 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 129 | 611 |
| 220 | 7 | 87 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 634 |
| 197 | 11 | 104 | 35 | 0 | 1 | 150 | 613 |
| 186 | 12 | 97 | 34 | 0 | 1 | 143 | 629 |
| 802 | 46 | 380 | 133 | 0 | 3 | 559 | 2487 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 148 | 21 | 134 | 39 | 0 | 5 | 194 | 926 |
| 174 | 26 | 131 | 39 | 0 | 3 | 196 | 969 |
| 189 | 29 | 165 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 227 | 990 |
| 203 | 19 | 150 | 34 | 0 | 4 | 203 | 988 |
| 714 | 95 | 580 | 145 | 0 | 13 | 820 | 3873 |
| 194 | 22 | 159 | 50 | 0 | 2 | 231 | 1030 |
| 217 | 20 | 149 | 42 | 0 | 1 | 211 | 1029 |
| 195 | 23 | 130 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 968 |
| 203 | 28 | 131 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 202 | 951 |
| 809 | 93 | 569 | 177 | 0 | 3 | 839 | 3978 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 3428 | 267 | 1943 | 625 | 0 | 23 | 2835 | 13259 |
| - | 9.4 | 68.5 | 22.0 | 0.0 | - | - | - |
| 25.9 | 2.0 | 14.7 | 4.7 | 0.0 | - | 21.4 | - |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 2 | 6 |
| 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| 3378 | 262 | 1887 | 613 | 0 | - | 2762 | 13000 |
| 98.5 | 98.1 | 97.1 | 98.1 | - | - | 97.4 | 98.0 |
| 29 | 0 | 29 | 3 | 0 | - | 32 | 140 |
| 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.5 | - | - | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| 14 | 2 | 22 | 5 | 0 | - | 29 | 83 |
| 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.8 | - | - | 1.0 | 0.6 |
| 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | - | 10 | 29 |
| 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.5 | - | - | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 8.3 | - | - | - | - | - | 4.3 | - | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 35 | - | - | - | - | - | 34 | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | - | - | - | - | - | 22 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 91.7 | - | - | - | - | - | 95.7 | - | - |

Engineering Design Source Inc
16141 Swingley Ridge Road
Chesterfield, Missouri, United States 12345
636.537.5585 go@engdesignsource.com

Count Name: Hampton and Nottingham Site Code: 02

Date: 03/19/2019
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Southbound Approach Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. Total |
| 7:00 AM | 2 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| 7:15 AM | 5 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |
| 7:30 AM | 8 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| 7:45 AM | 8 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 72 |
| Hourly Total | 23 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 230 |
| 8:00 AM | 2 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| 8:15 AM | 2 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 70 |
| 8:30 AM | 4 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 |
| 8:45 AM | 6 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| Hourly Total | 14 | 291 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 305 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *** BREAK *** | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:00 PM | 7 | 231 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 238 |
| 4:15 PM | 8 | 236 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 |
| 4:30 PM | 4 | 264 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 268 |
| 4:45 PM | 16 | 252 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 268 |
| Hourly Total | 35 | 983 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1018 |
| 5:00 PM | 12 | 278 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 290 |
| 5:15 PM | 16 | 226 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 242 |
| 5:30 PM | 9 | 258 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 267 |
| 5:45 PM | 7 | 203 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 211 |
| Hourly Total | 44 | 965 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 1010 |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 116 | 2446 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 2563 |
| Approach \% | 4.5 | 95.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 2.0 | 41.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 43.8 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | - | 3 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.0 | 0.1 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.1 |
| Cars \& Light Goods | 114 | 2394 | 0 | 1 | - | 2509 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Cars \& Light } \\ \text { Goods } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 98.3 | 97.9 | - | 100.0 | - | 97.9 |
| Buses | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | - | 17 |
| \% Buses | 0.9 | 0.7 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.7 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 1 | 28 | 0 | 0 | - | 29 |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \text { Single-Unit } \\ \text { Trucks } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.9 | 1.1 | - | 0.0 | - | 1.1 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | - | 4 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.2 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.2 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |

Westbound Approach
Northbound Approac
Westbound

| Right |
| :---: |
| 13 |
| 14 |
| 10 |
| 14 |
| 51 |
| 18 |
| 10 |
| 1 |
| 9 |
| 48 |
| 0 |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| App. |  |
| otal |  | Righ


|  |
| :---: |
| Right |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |


| Thru |
| :---: |
| 146 |
| 209 |
| 196 |
| 177 |
| 728 |
| 152 |
| 185 |
| 160 |
| 152 |


| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 13.6 | - | - | - | - | - | 12.5 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 19 | - | - | - | - | - | 14 | - | - | - | - | - | 15 | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 86.4 | - | - | - | - | - | 87.5 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |

Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Southbound Approach <br> Southbound <br> Left |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Peds | App. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$|$

Westbound Approach
Northbound Approac
Left U-Turn Pe

| App. <br> Total |
| :---: |
| 85 |
| 92 |
| 92 |
| 77 |
| 346 |
| 56 |
| 45 |
| 60 |
| 22 |
| 213 |


| Right | Thru |
| :---: | :---: |
| 22 | 126 |
| 22 | 185 |
| 16 | 179 |
| 16 | 17 |
| 76 | 660 |
| 10 | 132 |
| 9 | 133 |
| 9 | 133 |
| 8 | 1 |
| 36 | 520 |

Northbound
U-Turn

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |


| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 12.5 | - | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 87.5 | - | - |

Engineering Design Source Inc
16141 Swingley Ridge Road
Chesterfield, Missouri, United States 12345
636.537.5585 go@engdesignsource.com

Count Name: Hampton and Holly Hills Site Code: 04

Date: 03/19/2019
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Southbound Approach Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound Approach Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Northbound Approach Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Eastbound Approach Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. | Int. Total |
| 7:00 AM | 11 | 51 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 127 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 204 |
| 7:15 AM | 6 | 62 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 228 |
| 7:30 AM | 2 | 69 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 161 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 239 |
| 7:45 AM | 1 | 54 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 |
| Hourly Total | 20 | 236 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 267 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 573 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 579 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 866 |
| 8:00 AM | 1 | 95 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 131 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 243 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 63 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 217 |
| 8:30 AM | 2 | 76 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 150 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 157 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 244 |
| 8:45 AM | 3 | 69 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 144 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 227 |
| Hourly Total | 6 | 303 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 330 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 574 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 591 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 931 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| *** BREAK *** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4:00 PM | 4 | 194 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 137 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 145 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 364 |
| 4:15 PM | 1 | 193 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 126 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 132 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 341 |
| 4:30 PM | 4 | 219 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 156 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 399 |
| 4:45 PM | 4 | 187 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 204 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 127 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 338 |
| Hourly Total | 13 | 793 | 53 | 1 | 0 | 860 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 18 | 546 | 8 | 1 | , | 573 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 1442 |
| 5:00 PM | 5 | 221 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 245 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 139 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 395 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 178 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 192 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 137 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 335 |
| 5:30 PM | 3 | 191 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 218 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 10 | 131 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 366 |
| 5:45 PM | 2 | 161 | 21 | 0 | 4 | 184 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 150 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 349 |
| Hourly Total | 11 | 751 | 77 | 0 | 4 | 839 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 28 | 557 | 10 | 0 |  | 595 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 1445 |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Grand Total | 50 | 2084 | 162 | 1 | 5 | 2297 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 25 | 4 | 62 | 2251 | 25 | 1 | 13 | 2339 | 26 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 16 | 46 | 4686 |
| Approach \% | 2.2 | 90.7 | 7.1 | 0.0 | - | - | 75.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 2.7 | 96.2 | 1.1 | 0.0 | - | - | 56.5 | 19.6 | 23.9 | 0.0 | - | - | - |
| Total \% | 1.1 | 44.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | - | 49.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | 1.3 | 48.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | - | 49.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | - | 1.0 | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | - | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 8 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.3 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | $-$ | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Cars \& Light Goods | 48 | 2038 | 157 | 1 | - | 2244 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 4 | 61 | 2199 | 23 | 1 | - | 2284 | 26 | 8 | 11 | 0 | - | 45 | 4577 |
| \% Cars \& Light Goods | 96.0 | 97.8 | 96.9 | 100.0 | - | 97.7 | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | - | - | 100.0 | 98.4 | 97.7 | 92.0 | 100.0 | - | 97.6 | 100.0 | 88.9 | 100.0 | - | - | 97.8 | 97.7 |
| Buses | 0 | 14 | 3 | 0 | - | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | - | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 39 |
| \% Buses | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 0.0 | - | 0.7 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.9 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 | - | - | 2.2 | 0.8 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 2 | 23 | 2 | 0 | - | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 22 | 2 | 0 | - | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 51 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Single-Unit } \\ \text { Trucks } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 4.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.0 | - | 1.2 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | - | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | - | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 10 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 |


| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 25 | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | - | - | - | - | - | 16 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |

Engineering Design Source Inc
16141 Swingley Ridge Road
16141 Swingley Ridge Road
Chesterfield, Missouri, United States 12345
636.537.5585 go@engdesignsource.com

Count Name: Hampton and Loughborough Site Code: 05
ate: 02/26/2019
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Southbound Approach Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. <br> Total |
| 7:00 AM | 8 | 74 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 92 |
| 7:15 AM | 4 | 75 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| 7:30 AM | 10 | 98 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| 7:45 AM | 9 | 95 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| Hourly Total | 31 | 342 | 35 | 0 | 1 | 408 |
| 8:00 AM | 7 | 65 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 78 |
| 8:15 AM | 2 | 57 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| 8:30 AM | 5 | 68 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 82 |
| 8:45 AM | 9 | 59 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 78 |
| Hourly Total | 23 | 249 | 31 | 0 | 2 | 303 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *** BREAK *** | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:00 PM | 11 | 162 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 189 |
| 4:15 PM | 9 | 144 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 175 |
| 4:30 PM | 14 | 184 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 215 |
| 4:45 PM | 12 | 156 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 186 |
| Hourly Total | 46 | 646 | 73 | 0 | 3 | 765 |
| 5:00 PM | 18 | 194 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 234 |
| 5:15 PM | 11 | 171 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 198 |
| 5:30 PM | 6 | 143 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 166 |
| 5:45 PM | 13 | 133 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 160 |
| Hourly Total | 48 | 641 | 69 | 0 | 4 | 758 |
| Grand Total | 148 | 1878 | 208 | 0 | 10 | 2234 |
| Approach \% | 6.6 | 84.1 | 9.3 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 2.5 | 32.1 | 3.6 | 0.0 | - | 38.1 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 |
| Cars \& Light Goods | 146 | 1853 | 203 | 0 | - | 2202 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Cars \& Light } \\ \text { Goods } \end{gathered}$ | 98.6 | 98.7 | 97.6 | - | - | 98.6 |
| Buses | 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | - | 15 |
| \% Buses | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 | - | - | 0.7 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 2 | 10 | 2 | 0 | - | 14 |
| $\begin{gathered} \% \text { Single-Unit } \\ \text { Trucks } \end{gathered}$ | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.0 | - | - | 0.6 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | - | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.0 | - | - | 0.1 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 |


| Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | 38 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| 16 | 48 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 71 |
| 23 | 56 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 86 |
| 20 | 40 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| 70 | 182 | 32 | 0 | 2 | 284 |
| 9 | 28 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| 12 | 29 | 4 | 0 |  | 45 |
| 11 | 18 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 35 |
| 15 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| 47 | 97 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 162 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 17 | 21 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 44 |
| 17 | 24 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 47 |
| 9 | 21 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 39 |
| 13 | 22 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 45 |
| 56 | 88 | 31 | 0 | 6 | 175 |
| 15 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| 13 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| 23 | 25 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| 24 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 46 |
| 75 | 79 | 30 | 0 | 1 | 184 |
| 249 | 446 | 111 | 0 | 10 | 806 |
| 30.9 | 55.3 | 13.8 | 0.0 | - | - |
| 4.2 | 7.6 | 1.9 | 0.0 | - | 13.8 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |
| 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | $-$ | 0.1 |
| 246 | 445 | 106 | 0 | - | 797 |
| 98.8 | 99.8 | 95.5 | - | - | 98.9 |
| 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | - | 4 |
| 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.8 | - | - | 0.5 |
| 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | - | 4 |
| 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.7 | - | - | 0.5 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 |


| Northbound Approach <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. |
| 2 | 103 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 107 |
| 5 | 166 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 180 |
| 4 | 166 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 176 |
| 5 | 122 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| 16 | 557 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 592 |
| 8 | 130 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 140 |
| 4 | 115 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| 4 | 110 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| 4 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| 20 | 472 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 504 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 114 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 121 |
| 9 | 126 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 136 |
| 14 | 113 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 128 |
| 14 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 149 |
| 41 | 488 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 534 |
| 10 | 134 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 148 |
| 7 | 159 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 171 |
| 4 | 108 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 115 |
| 11 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 146 |
| 32 | 536 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 580 |
| 109 | 2053 | 48 | 0 | 10 | 2210 |
| 4.9 | 92.9 | 2.2 | 0.0 | - | - |
| 1.9 | 35.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | - | 37.7 |
| 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 |
| 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.1 |
| 104 | 2016 | 45 | 0 | - | 2165 |
| 95.4 | 98.2 | 93.8 | - | - | 98.0 |
| 1 | 19 | 3 | 0 | - | 23 |
| 0.9 | 0.9 | 6.3 | - | - | 1.0 |
| 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | - | 16 |
| 3.7 | 0.6 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.7 |
| 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | - | 4 |
| 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.2 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 |


|  | Eastbound Approach <br> Eastbound <br> Left |  |  |  |  |  | U-Turn |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | Peds | App. |
| :---: |
| Total | Int. Total


| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |

Engineering Design Source Inc
16141 Swingley Ridge Road
16141 Swingley Ridge Road
Chesterfield, Missouri, United States 12345
636.537.5585 go@engdesignsource.com

Count Name: Hampton and Gravois Site Code: 07

Date: 02/21/2019
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Southbound Approach Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. <br> Total |
| 7:00 AM | 50 | 55 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| 7:15 AM | 51 | 75 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| 7:30 AM | 67 | 88 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 161 |
| 7:45 AM | 74 | 73 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 154 |
| Hourly Total | 242 | 291 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 564 |
| 8:00 AM | 56 | 50 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 115 |
| 8:15 AM | 48 | 40 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 97 |
| 8:30 AM | 53 | 53 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 112 |
| 8:45 AM | 46 | 39 | 9 | 0 |  | 94 |
| Hourly Total | 203 | 182 | 33 | 0 |  | 418 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *** BREAK *** | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:00 PM | 88 | 95 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 204 |
| 4:15 PM | 89 | 112 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 208 |
| 4:30 PM | 105 | 144 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 258 |
| 4:45 PM | 112 | 115 | 17 | 0 | 4 | 244 |
| Hourly Total | 394 | 466 | 54 | 0 | 9 | 914 |
| 5:00 PM | 95 | 145 | 21 | 0 | 3 | 261 |
| 5:15 PM | 116 | 117 | 21 | 0 | 4 | 254 |
| 5:30 PM | 114 | 108 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 242 |
| 5:45 PM | 95 | 85 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 193 |
| Hourly Total | 420 | 455 | 75 | 0 | 7 | 950 |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 1259 | 1394 | 193 | 0 | 23 | 2846 |
| Approach \% | 44.2 | 49.0 | 6.8 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 11.0 | 12.2 | 1.7 | 0.0 | - | 25.0 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.1 |
| Cars \& Light Goods | 1251 | 1363 | 187 | 0 | - | 2801 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Cars \& Light } \\ \text { Goods } \end{gathered}$ | 99.4 | 97.8 | 96.9 | - | - | 98.4 |
| Buses | 2 | 16 | 2 | 0 | - | 20 |
| \% Buses | 0.2 | 1.1 | 1.0 | - | - | 0.7 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 4 | 12 | 4 | 0 | - | 20 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0.3 | 0.9 | 2.1 | - | - | 0.7 |
| Articulated Trucks | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.1 |

Westbound Approach $\mid \quad$ Northbound Approach

| Westbound | Northbound Appro |
| :--- | :--- |

Northbound

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 5 |
|  | 9 |
| 1 | 1 |
| 45 | 5 |
|  | 8 |
|  | 3 |
|  | 9 |
|  | 7 |
|  | 37 |
|  | 0 |
|  |  |
|  | 0 |
|  | 12 |
|  | 12 |
|  | 10 |
|  | 13 |
|  | 47 |
|  | 8 |
|  | 21 |
|  | 13 |
|  | 6 |
|  | 48 |
|  | 0 |
| 17 | 77 |
|  | . 7 |
|  | . 6 |
|  | 0 |
|  | . 0 |
|  | 45 |
| 81 | 1.9 |
|  | 29 |
|  | 6.4 |
|  | 3 |
|  | 1.7 |
|  | 0 |
|  | 0.0 |


| 144 |
| :---: |
| 166 |
| 602 |
| 131 |
| 129 |
| 110 |
| 120 |
| 490 |
| 0 |
| - |
| 0 |
| 215 |
| 198 |
| 198 |
| 183 |
| 794 |
| 201 |
| 179 |
| 203 |
| 179 |
| 762 |
| 2 |
| 2650 |
| - |
| 23.2 |
| 1 |
| 0.0 |
| 2577 |
| 97.2 |
| 49 |
| 1.8 |
| 20 |
| 0.8 |
| 2 |
| 0.1 |

Eastbound Approach
Eastbound
Left U-

| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 7.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 23 | - | - | - | - | - | 14 | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 92.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Southbound Approach Southbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound Approach |  |  |  |  | Eastbound Approach Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | U-Turn | Peds | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. Total | Right | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. Total |  |
| 7:00 AM | 6 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 135 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 183 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 305 |
| 7:15 AM | 3 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 162 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 228 | 34 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 364 |
| 7:30 AM | 5 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 169 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 411 |
| 7:45 AM | 1 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 138 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 37 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 348 |
| Hourly Total | 15 | 423 | 0 | 0 | 438 | 604 | 241 | 0 | 0 | 845 | 134 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 1428 |
| 8:00 AM | 3 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 128 | 38 | 0 | 1 | 166 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 269 |
| 8:15 AM | 3 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 124 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 269 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 127 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 31 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 33 | 253 |
| 8:45 AM | 4 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 98 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 218 |
| Hourly Total | 10 | 303 | 0 | 0 | 313 | 477 | 118 | 0 | 1 | 595 | 93 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 101 | 1009 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *** BREAK *** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:00 PM | 3 | 157 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 125 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 54 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 373 |
| 4:15 PM | 3 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 134 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 172 | 47 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 52 | 379 |
| 4:30 PM | 2 | 188 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 137 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 175 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 445 |
| 4:45 PM | 4 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 148 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 68 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 450 |
| Hourly Total | 12 | 674 | 0 | 0 | 686 | 544 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 700 | 249 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 261 | 1647 |
| 5:00 PM | 4 | 210 | 0 | 0 | 214 | 151 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 185 | 69 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 471 |
| 5:15 PM | 5 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 198 | 162 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 227 | 69 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 499 |
| 5:30 PM | 7 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 177 | 134 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 176 | 67 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 422 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 134 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 54 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 378 |
| Hourly Total | 16 | 704 | 0 | 0 | 720 | 581 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 775 | 259 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 275 | 1770 |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 53 | 2104 | 0 | 0 | 2157 | 2206 | 709 | 0 | 1 | 2915 | 735 | 47 | 0 | 3 | 782 | 5854 |
| Approach \% | 2.5 | 97.5 | 0.0 | - | - | 75.7 | 24.3 | 0.0 | - | - | 94.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | - | - | - |
| Total \% | 0.9 | 35.9 | 0.0 | - | 36.8 | 37.7 | 12.1 | 0.0 | - | 49.8 | 12.6 | 0.8 | 0.0 | - | 13.4 | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 2 | 0 | - | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | - | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 6 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.0 | 0.1 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Cars \& Light Goods | 52 | 2068 | 0 | - | 2120 | 2148 | 700 | 0 | - | 2848 | 725 | 45 | 0 | - | 770 | 5738 |
| \% Cars \& Light Goods | 98.1 | 98.3 | - | - | 98.3 | 97.4 | 98.7 | - | - | 97.7 | 98.6 | 95.7 | - | - | 98.5 | 98.0 |
| Buses | 1 | 15 | 0 | - | 16 | 31 | 2 | 0 | - | 33 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 | 51 |
| \% Buses | 1.9 | 0.7 | - | - | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.3 | - | - | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.3 | 0.9 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 18 | 0 | - | 18 | 19 | 4 | 0 | - | 23 | 7 | 1 | 0 | - | 8 | 49 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0.0 | 0.9 | - | - | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.6 | - | - | 0.8 | 1.0 | 2.1 | - | - | 1.0 | 0.8 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | - | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 9 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | - | - | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 1 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - |
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Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Southbound Approach Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. <br> Total |
| 7:00 AM | 50 | 55 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| 7:15 AM | 51 | 75 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| 7:30 AM | 67 | 88 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 161 |
| 7:45 AM | 74 | 73 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 154 |
| Hourly Total | 242 | 291 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 564 |
| 8:00 AM | 56 | 50 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 115 |
| 8:15 AM | 48 | 40 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 97 |
| 8:30 AM | 53 | 53 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 112 |
| 8:45 AM | 46 | 39 | 9 | 0 |  | 94 |
| Hourly Total | 203 | 182 | 33 | 0 |  | 418 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *** BREAK *** | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:00 PM | 88 | 95 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 204 |
| 4:15 PM | 89 | 112 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 208 |
| 4:30 PM | 105 | 144 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 258 |
| 4:45 PM | 112 | 115 | 17 | 0 | 4 | 244 |
| Hourly Total | 394 | 466 | 54 | 0 | 9 | 914 |
| 5:00 PM | 95 | 145 | 21 | 0 | 3 | 261 |
| 5:15 PM | 116 | 117 | 21 | 0 | 4 | 254 |
| 5:30 PM | 114 | 108 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 242 |
| 5:45 PM | 95 | 85 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 193 |
| Hourly Total | 420 | 455 | 75 | 0 | 7 | 950 |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 1259 | 1394 | 193 | 0 | 23 | 2846 |
| Approach \% | 44.2 | 49.0 | 6.8 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 11.0 | 12.2 | 1.7 | 0.0 | - | 25.0 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.1 |
| Cars \& Light Goods | 1251 | 1363 | 187 | 0 | - | 2801 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Cars \& Light } \\ \text { Goods } \end{gathered}$ | 99.4 | 97.8 | 96.9 | - | - | 98.4 |
| Buses | 2 | 16 | 2 | 0 | - | 20 |
| \% Buses | 0.2 | 1.1 | 1.0 | - | - | 0.7 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 4 | 12 | 4 | 0 | - | 20 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0.3 | 0.9 | 2.1 | - | - | 0.7 |
| Articulated Trucks | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.1 |

Westbound Approach $\mid \quad$ Northbound Approach

| Westbound | Northbound Appro |
| :--- | :--- |

Northbound

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 5 |
|  | 9 |
| 1 | 1 |
| 45 | 5 |
|  | 8 |
|  | 3 |
|  | 9 |
|  | 7 |
|  | 37 |
|  | 0 |
|  |  |
|  | 0 |
|  | 12 |
|  | 12 |
|  | 10 |
|  | 13 |
|  | 47 |
|  | 8 |
|  | 21 |
|  | 13 |
|  | 6 |
|  | 48 |
|  | 0 |
| 17 | 77 |
|  | . 7 |
|  | . 6 |
|  | 0 |
|  | . 0 |
|  | 45 |
| 81 | 1.9 |
|  | 29 |
|  | 6.4 |
|  | 3 |
|  | 1.7 |
|  | 0 |
|  | 0.0 |


| 144 |
| :---: |
| 166 |
| 602 |
| 131 |
| 129 |
| 110 |
| 120 |
| 490 |
| 0 |
| - |
| 0 |
| 215 |
| 198 |
| 198 |
| 183 |
| 794 |
| 201 |
| 179 |
| 203 |
| 179 |
| 762 |
| 2 |
| 2650 |
| - |
| 23.2 |
| 1 |
| 0.0 |
| 2577 |
| 97.2 |
| 49 |
| 1.8 |
| 20 |
| 0.8 |
| 2 |
| 0.1 |

Eastbound Approach
Eastbound
Left U-

| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 7.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 23 | - | - | - | - | - | 14 | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 92.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Hampton Ave Between Delor and Itaska

85th percentile speed $=38.6$


Volume (vpd)

## Hampton Ave Between Delor and Itaska

85th percentile speed $=35$


Volume (vpd)

## Hampton Ave Between Delor and Itaska

85th percentile speed $=37.5$


Volume (vpd)

## Hampton Ave Between Delor and Itaska

85th percentile speed $=37.3$


■ Off- Peak

Volume (vpd)

|  |  |  | Weekday 2/26/2019 12:00 PM to 2:00 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Southbound Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  | Northbound Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Block <br> Average <br> Utilization |
|  |  |  | Available Spots | Par <br> Veh <br> Ru | $\begin{aligned} & \text { red } \\ & \text { cles } \\ & \text { n\# } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Average <br> Utilization | Illega <br> Vehic |  |  | Available Spots |  |  | Average <br> Utilization |  | Pa |  |  |
| HAMPTON AVE |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | Total | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | Total | 1 | 2 |  |
| Chippewa | to | Bancroft | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |
| Bancroft | to | Sutherland | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |
| Sutherland | to | Lansdowne | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |
| Lansdowne | to | Devonshire | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Devonshire | to | Nottingham | 18 | 5 | 5 | 28\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13\% |
| Nottingham | to | Neosho | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 25\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13\% |
| Neosho | to | Itaska | 10 | 1 | 1 | 10\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 10\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10\% |
| Itaska | to | Delor | 8 | 1 | 1 | 13\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 25\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19\% |
| Delor | to | Walsh | 5 | 1 | 2 | 30\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 7\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17\% |
| Walsh | to | Eichelberger | 4 | 2 | 1 | 38\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15\% |
| Eichelberger | to | Goethe | 7 | 1 | 1 | 14\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7\% |
| Goethe | to | Milentz | 10 | 5 | 6 | 55\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 23\% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 38\% |
| Milentz | to | Rhodes | 5 | 3 | 0 | 30\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 20\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23\% |
| Rhodes | to | Holly Hills | 6 | 2 | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 10\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16\% |
| Holly Hills | to | Finkman | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 30\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17\% |
| Finkman | to | Lisette | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Lisette | to | Gresham | 11 | 3 | 3 | 27\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 9\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18\% |
| Gresham | to | Loughborough | 15 | 2 | 1 | 10\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 25\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15\% |
| Loughborough | to | Robert | 16 | 1 | 0 | 3\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 3 | 3 | 11\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8\% |
| Robert | to | Sunshine | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 7\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4\% |
| Sunshine | to | Jamieson | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Jamieson | to | Parkview | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Parkview | to | Hampshire | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Hampshire | to | Gravois | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| SB Corridor Total |  |  | 237 | 27 | 22 | 10\% |  |  |  | 271 | 19 | 21 | 7\% | NB Corridor Total |  |  |  |


| Corridor Grand Total | 508 | 46 | 43 | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


|  |  |  | Friday 3/1/2019 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Southbound Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Northbound Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Available Spots | Parked Vehicles Run \# |  |  |  |  |  | Average Utilization | Illegal Parked Vehicles Run \# |  |  |  |  |  |  | Available Spots | Parked Vehicles Run \# |  |  |  |  |  | Average <br> Utilization | Illegal Parked VehiclesRun \# |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Block <br> Average Utilization |
| HAMPTON AVE |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | Total | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | Total | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |
| Chippewa | to | Bancroft | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bancroft | to | Sutherland | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sutherland | to | Lansdowne | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lansdowne | to | Devonshire | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Devonshire | to | Nottingham | 18 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 19\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9\% |
| Nottingham | to | Neosho | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 21\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13\% |
| Neosho | to | Itaska | 10 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 13\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10\% |
| Itaska | to | Delor | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 98\% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 73\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85\% |
| Delor | to | Walsh | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 73\% | 2 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 24\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44\% |
| Walsh | to | Eichelberger | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Eichelberger | to | Goethe | 7 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 26\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13\% |
| Goethe | to | Milentz | 10 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 90\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 50\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69\% |
| Milentz | to | Rhodes | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 83\% | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 10 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 42\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56\% |
| Rhodes | to | Holly Hills | 6 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 50\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 23\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33\% |
| Holly Hills | to | Finkman | 8 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 52\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42\% |
| Finkman | to | Lisette | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Lisette | to | Gresham | 11 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 27\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 15\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21\% |
| Gresham | to | Loughborough | 15 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 67\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 54\% | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 62\% |
| Loughborough | to | Robert | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2\% |
| Robert | to | Sunshine | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2\% |
| Sunshine | to | Jamieson | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Jamieson | to | Parkview | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Parkview | to | Hampshire | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Hampshire | to | Gravois | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| SB Corridor Total |  |  | 237 | 45 | 51 | 52 | 55 | 59 | 56 | 22\% | NB Corridor Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 271 | 28 | 29 | 29 | 34 | 33 | 32 | 11\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix D: Traffic Operational Analysis Methodology

Traffic operating conditions were evaluated using Synchro 10 traffic modeling software, which is based upon methodologies outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual, $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition (HCM) published by the Transportation Research Board.

The performance of a transportation system is quantified by Levels of Service (LOS), which are measures of traffic flow that consider factors such as speed, delay, interruptions, safety, and driver comfort and convenience. There are six levels of service ranging from LOS A ("free flow") to LOS F ("oversaturated"). LOS C is commonly used for design purposes and represents a roadway with volumes utilizing 70 to 80 percent of its capacity. LOS E is typically considered acceptable for peak period conditions in urban areas.

Level of service criteria vary depending upon the roadway component being evaluated. Intersections are most commonly evaluated since roadway capacity is typically dictated by the number of vehicles that can be served at critical intersections. For intersections, the criteria are based on delay and the type of control (i.e., whether it is signalized or unsignalized/roundabout).

Signalized intersections reflect higher delay tolerances as compared to unsignalized locations because motorists are accustomed to and accepting of longer delays at signals. For signalized and all-way stop intersections, the average control delay per vehicle is estimated for each movement and then aggregated for each approach and the intersection as a whole. For intersections with partial (side-street) stop control, the delay is calculated for the minor movements only (side-street approaches and major road left-turns) since through traffic on the major road is not required to stop. The thresholds for intersection levels of service are summarized in Table D1.

Table D1: Intersection Level of Service Thresholds

| Level of Service | Delay per Vehicle (sec/veh) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Signalized | Unsignalized |
| A | $<10$ | $0-10$ |
| B | $>10-20$ | $>10-15$ |
| C | $>20-35$ | $>15-25$ |
| D | $>35-55$ | $>25-35$ |
| E | $>55-80$ | $>35-50$ |
| F | $>80$ | $>50$ |

## Appendix E: Traffic Operating Conditions

Table E1: Existing Operating Conditions

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Int } \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | Intersection/ Approach | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue ( } \mathrm{ft} \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | LOS | Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue ( } \mathrm{ft} \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | Hampton Ave @ Chippewa St (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall Intersection | C | 35.5 | - | D | 52.4 | - |
|  | Eastbound Approach | D | 50.4 | 254 | F | 81.9 | \#503 |
|  | Westbound Approach | C | 30.1 | 250 | E | 67.4 | \#472 |
|  | Northbound Approach | C | 30.3 | 511 | C | 32.9 | 301 |
|  | Southbound Approach | C | 32.5 | 205 | D | 37.4 | 642 |
| 2 | Hampton Ave @ Bancroft Ave (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall Intersection | A | 9.8 | - | B | 13.9 | - |
|  | Eastbound Approach | D | 40.5 | 77 | D | 37.6 | 129 |
|  | Westbound Approach | D | 35.2 | 32 | F | 83.4 | \#168 |
|  | Northbound Approach | B | 10.4 | 335 | A | 7.9 | 136 |
|  | Southbound Approach | A | 0.4 | 12 | A | 2.5 | m104 |
| 3 | Hampton Ave @ Nottingham Ave (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall Intersection | C | 23.0 | - | B | 17.1 | - |
|  | Eastbound Approach | D | 41.3 | 109 | D | 48.4 | 124 |
|  | Westbound Approach | C | 30.4 | 100 | D | 48.5 | 149 |
|  | Northbound Approach | C | 25.1 | 305 | B | 12.7 | 181 |
|  | Southbound Approach | A | 8.2 | 50 | B | 11.3 | 224 |
| 4 | Hampton Ave @ Eichelberger St (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall Intersection | C | 35.2 | - | C | 25.6 | - |
|  | Eastbound Approach | D | 47.7 | 101 | E | 63.8 | 266 |
|  | Westbound Approach | E | 63.4 | \#308 | D | 51.8 | 183 |
|  | Northbound Approach | C | 30.2 | 328 | C | 21.5 | 305 |
|  | Southbound Approach | A | 9.9 | 46 | A | 5.3 | 54 |
| 5 | Hampton Ave @ Holly Hills Ave (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall Intersection | A | 3.4 | - | A | 2.0 | - |
|  | Eastbound Approach | C | 31.8 | 27 | A | 0.0 | 0 |
|  | Northbound Approach | A | 3.8 | m262 | A | 1.7 | 91 |
|  | Southbound Approach | A | 0.9 | 54 | A | 2.3 | 293 |


| 6 | Hampton Ave @ Loughborough Ave (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Overall Intersection | C | 23.5 | - | B | 20.0 | - |
|  | Eastbound Approach | D | 45.4 | 82 | E | 60.2 | 254 |
|  | Westbound Approach | E | 75.5 | \#331 | F | 109.5 | \#256 |
|  | Northbound Approach | A | 7.9 | m82 | A | 5.9 | 133 |
|  | Southbound Approach | A | 4.0 | 37 | A | 2.4 | 42 |
| 7 | Hampton Ave @ Jamieson Ave (Unsignalized, Side Street STOP Control) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eastbound Approach | C | 15.1 | 20 | C | 20.0 | 80 |
|  | Northbound Left-Turn | A | 9.6 | 25 | B | 11.3 | 28 |
| 8 | Hampton Ave/Germania St @ Gravois Ave (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall Intersection | C | 46.4 | - | D | 45.4 | - |
|  | Eastbound Approach | D | 47.7 | \#313 | D | 47.6 | \#323 |
|  | Westbound Approach | C | 27.1 | 217 | C | 27.6 | 276 |
|  | Northbound Approach | E | 66.5 | \#301 | E | 61.5 | 280 |
|  | Southbound Approach | D | 37.8 | m174 | D | 46.1 | \#312 |

\#-95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer; queue shown is maximum after two cycles $m$ - volume for the 95th percentile queue is metered by the upstream signal

Table E2: Forecasted Operating Conditions with "Road Diet" Alternative

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Int } \\ \# \end{gathered}$ | Intersection/ Approach | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | LOS | Delay (sec/veh) | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (ft) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | Hampton Ave @ Chippewa St (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall Intersection | C | 36.8 | - | D | 52.9 | - |
|  | Eastbound Approach | D | 50.4 | 254 | F | 81.9 | \#503 |
|  | Westbound Approach | C | 30.1 | 250 | E | 67.4 | \#472 |
|  | Northbound Approach | C | 30.3 | 469 | D | 35.6 | 335 |
|  | Southbound Approach | C | 32.6 | 205 | D | 37.4 | 642 |
| 2 | Hampton Ave @ Bancroft Ave (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall Intersection | A | 5.2 | - | B | 13.1 | - |
|  | Eastbound Approach | D | 40.5 | 77 | D | 37.6 | 129 |
|  | Westbound Approach | D | 35.2 | 32 | F | 83.4 | \#168 |
|  | Northbound Approach | A | 3.3 | 171 | A | 4.6 | 100 |
|  | Southbound Approach | A | 0.4 | 12 | A | 2.5 | m104 |
| 3 | Hampton Ave @ Nottingham Ave (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall Intersection | A | 7.4 | - | B | 15.7 | - |
|  | Eastbound Approach | D | 39.3 | 88 | D | 45.9 | 100 |
|  | Westbound Approach | C | 26.9 | 11 | D | 35.0 | 103 |
|  | Northbound Approach | A | 3.6 | m94 | A | 4.6 | 281 |
|  | Southbound Approach | A | 5.3 | 98 | B | 15.0 | \#886 |
| 4 | Hampton Ave @ Eichelberger St (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall Intersection | C | 33.9 | - | C | 29.2 | - |
|  | Eastbound Approach | D | 37.4 | 78 | D | 46.7 | 202 |
|  | Westbound Approach | D | 46.5 | \#225 | D | 44.0 | 142 |
|  | Northbound Approach | C | 32.4 | \#701 | B | 19.0 | 386 |
|  | Southbound Approach | C | 22.7 | 233 | C | 24.3 | \#819 |
| 5 | Hampton Ave @ Holly Hills Ave (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall Intersection | A | 3.2 | - | A | 2.8 | - |
|  | Eastbound Approach | C | 22.5 | 21 | A | 0.2 | 0 |
|  | Northbound Approach | A | 3.5 | 198 | A | 3.2 | 217 |
|  | Southbound Approach | A | 1.4 | 59 | A | 2.6 | m312 |
| 6 | Hampton Ave @ Loughborough Ave (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall Intersection | B | 18.8 | - | B | 15.0 | - |


|  | Eastbound Approach | C | 24.6 | 55 | D | 41.7 | 190 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Westbound Approach | D | 38.7 | 206 | D | 53.5 | \#256 |
|  | Northbound Approach | B | 13.6 | 343 | A | 8.5 | 268 |
|  | Southbound Approach | B | 10.9 | 140 | A | 5.2 | 95 |
| 7 | Hampton Ave @ Jamieson Ave (Unsignalized, Side Street STOP Control) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eastbound Approach | C | 13.6 | 28 | E | 39.5 | 200 |
|  | Northbound Left-Turn | A | 9.6 | 25 | B | 11.3 | 28 |
| 8 | Hampton Ave/Germania St @ Gravois Ave (Signalized) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Overall Intersection | C | 44.8 | - | D | 45.4 | - |
|  | Eastbound Approach | D | 47.7 | \#313 | D | 47.6 | \#323 |
|  | Westbound Approach | C | 27.1 | 217 | C | 27.6 | 276 |
|  | Northbound Approach | E | 66.5 | \#301 | E | 61.5 | 280 |
|  | Southbound Approach | C | 29.8 | 163 | D | 46.1 | \#312 |

\#-95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer; queue shown is maximum after two cycles
m - volume for the 95 th percentile queue is metered by the upstream signal







